
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.

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

DEAR COUNCILLORS,

RE: POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF CREWS HILL BUSINESS AREA FOR HOUSING.

THE VERY IDEA THAT THIS AREA OF LAND SHOULD BE GIVEN OVER TO HOUSING IS PREPOSTEROUS. ALREADY, LONDON SUFFERS FROM BUSINESSES NOT HAVING THE SPACE REQUIRED TO FUNCTION BECAUSE OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT. THIS IS A UNIQUE AREA WHERE BOTH SUPPLIERS AND CUSTOMERS CAN CONDUCT THEIR BUSINESSES, WITHOUT MENANCE TO THE PUBLIC.

JUST AS MUCH AS WE NEED HOUSING, WE ALSO NEED LOCAL BUSINESS ECONOMIES TOO.

I URGE THE COUNCIL TO RE-CONSIDER ITS PLANS.

New Enfield Plan – Hadley Wood

The plan appears to treat all stations as being equal for growth. To compare HW as being similar to the transport nodes on the Piccadilly line is not valid. At best HW has but 4 trains/hr at peak times and a maximum of 2/hr on Sundays. Its best to think of HW as an isolated village surrounded by green belt with only limited transport links. Apart from the north south trains the only other link is a bus service west to Barnet which is limited to 10am to 3pm on the hr on weekdays.

Other public services are also thin. Our Public House was closed 100 yrs ago and our PO some 10yrs ago. HW has no NHS doctor or dentist nor any banking facility.

Against this backdrop of poor amenities it is worth noting that the number of households has increased from 1,028 in 2000 to some 1,500 at present. HW is not suitable for the further unprecedented level of housing growth envisaged in the Plan.

The Plan regarding HW needs to be downsized.

Dear Enfield Council

Re. Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

While I support the ambition to meet Enfield's housing needs, I strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes. My responses to the consultation questions below reflect my beliefs 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.

Question 1 –

I have identified the following policies that are still Relevant because they highlight the importance of and/or protect the Green Belt:

Core Strategy: 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 20, 21, 25, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36.

Development Management Document: 59, 61-65, 72-75, 77, 82-91.

The following policies that relate to the Green Belt need to be Changed:

Core Strategy: 29 and 32 should be changed to reflect the importance of the Green Belt to these functions.

Development Management Document: 71, 78, 79 and 80 should remove the loopholes that make the stated protection dubious.

Several policies in both documents need to be changed to allow changes of land use [excluding the Green Belt] that would permit mixed use development.

Question 2 –

1. NO GREEN BELT SITES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED FOR RELEASE. GROWTH CAN BE ACCOMMODATED ON PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND/ BROWNFIELD.

2. Enfield RoadWatch and CPRE-London have compiled a comprehensive register of brownfield opportunities of all types and sizes which shows sufficient sites for housing and infrastructure during the plan period and beyond.

3. The A10 Retail Parks and Southbury area should be masterplanned before piecemeal development picks away at the prime sites. With increased train service, this area could provide a new mixed-use community of many more homes than Meridian Water.

4. Enfield's Strategic Industrial Locations [SIL] need to be masterplanned so that areas closest to public transport can be released for mixed use development, while other areas can be intensified through stacking or better land-use, with no loss of employment.

Question 3 –

a) All the options listed on page 9 are worth exploring, except for the final option which suggests revisiting the Green Belt boundaries, which is unnecessary, given that a robust, thorough and professional boundary review was conducted, approved and adopted in 2013. To quote the Council itself: *The review's primary objective is to provide for a strong defensible Green Belt boundary that will endure and protect the openness*

*and rural character of the surrounding countryside of Enfield from encroachment. The review provides an understanding of the current strengths and weaknesses of the existing Green Belt boundaries and has in turn recommended amending the boundary where appropriate to provide certainty **over the next 15 to 20 years**. Another boundary review should not be needed until 2028 at the earliest.*

- b) The Council should explore the development opportunities offered by possible increased service on the Liverpool Street – Cheshunt line, which would allow some development and improvements on suitable sites at Southbury and Turkey Street Stations, in addition to Edmonton Green. It should also explore the possibility of reinstating the Carterhatch Lane Station on this line between Southbury and Turkey Street, to permit some development in that area.
- c) The Local Plan revision should not be used as a reason to release Green Belt. It is unnecessary.
- d) Please see my response to Q2.
- e) The suggested options will definitely contribute to the accommodation of Enfield's growing population. However, these options need to be combined with creative masterplanning of several large sites, including the Southbury/A10 corridor, Brimsdown and Edmonton Green and its surrounds, and more estate regeneration, all in conjunction with transportation upgrades. All these solutions together will not only provide good homes for the borough's residents, but will create new vibrant communities and improvements in deprived areas. **THERE IS NO NEED TO BUILD ON THE GREEN BELT!**

Question 4 –

- a) Yes!
- b) The options are not clear, but I would support a policy that values and protects Enfield's heritage and culture.
- d) Hard to answer without a definition of 'appropriate'.

Question 5 –

- a) Yes
- b) Depends on the location
- c) Yes

Question 8 –

Please refer to my response to Q2 about the brownfield register.

Question 10 –

- c) Please refer to my responses to Q2 and Q3.
- d) Industry should not be moved into the Green Belt. Additional employment space can be achieved by mixed-use development and intensification of existing industrial sites.

Question 13 –

All of the above, plus leisure centres, Council offices, transport hubs and retail.

Question 14 –

- c) The importance of open and blue spaces cannot be judged by their quality, accessibility or size. Open spaces serve a wide variety of purposes. In addition to the traditional five purposes of the Green Belt, a long list of environmental, economic and social benefits have now been identified including:
 - Creating a sense-of-place and facilitating community cohesion;
 - Increasing physical activity for adults and children;
 - Adapting to climate change through CO2 absorption, shading or flood alleviation;
 - Improving mental health;

- Creating more attractive places to work, live and visit;
- Encouraging active transport like walking and cycling;
- Improving air quality;
- Improving water quality by reducing harmful runoff into local rivers; and
- Enhancing biodiversity and opportunities for wildlife.

Therefore, open spaces, including Green Belt sites, which may appear inaccessible or of low quality, are in fact serving very important functions. For these reasons, all our Green Belt sites should be preserved and protected. I would also like to reinforce my response to Q2 that another Green Belt Boundary Review is unnecessary because the 2013 review is still valid.

d) and e) I refer you to my previous response. Open spaces, including the Green Belt, serve many functions and should be preserved and protected.

h) It can contribute a lot by not building on the Green Belt!

Question 16 –

c) Protect the Green Belt and don't suggest building on it.

I look forward to a Draft Local Plan that has creative solutions and does not target any sections of the Green Belt for de-designation.

Other:

I own a small landscape garden business in central London and we regularly use the businesses in Crews Hill. These are a vital source of plants and products for not just mine but many gardening businesses throughout London. If the businesses in Crews Hill were no longer there, it would be really difficult to continue trading. Crews Hill is unique to London and is a vital source of horticultural products just outside of London. It supports many businesses in London and would have a detrimental impact if the businesses were moved because of housing development. I'm sure many of the businesses would not be able to find other suitable premises within the Enfield/Herts/London area.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

I have lived in Enfield since 1986 . I taught in Secondary Schools and brought up my family in the area. We have always appreciated the open spaces in Enfield which are so widely used by all groups in the community. I object strongly to the loss of any of these spaces which are an integral part of Enfield. Please register my protest against developing open spaces for other uses and the consequential loss to the people of Enfield

Dear Enfield Council

As 28 year residents in Crews Hill where we have raised our family and intend to live during our retirement years we thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

While we support housing development and support the ambition to meet Enfield's housing needs, we as a family strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes.

Our responses to the consultation questions below reflect our beliefs 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.

Enfield Council's Planning Department and Planning Enforcement departments are both failing in their duty to both residents and to the area in which we live.

With so many outstanding breaches of planning regulations within the Crews Hill area alone, which now number in excess of 24 identified sites as acknowledged by the Planning Enforcement Department, there is clear evidence that Enfield Council is unfit to manage, care and plan for the future as it is incapable of doing so at present.

Enfield council's investment in Sloemans Farm, Whitewebbs Road, Enfield at a cost of £21m of tax payers money reflects this poor and inadequate direction.

The dumping of tonnes of road planing material on the Browns Garden Centre site on the corner field at Whitewebbs Road and Theobalds Park Road is a clear example of both Enfield Council and The Environment Agency's failure to protect this once green field site.

The site known as 'Pine Tops' opposite Kings Oak Riding Stables on Theobalds Park Road is now a small village with unchallenged construction of buildings and with people living and sleeping on the site which is used for vehicle storage by a national auction company.

Enfield council's reason for being unable to address these 24 breaches of planning in the Crews Hill area has been blamed on their being unable to recruit and retain staff in the planning department.

So not only are they unable to perform the duties and responsibilities of a planning department but their HR Personnel department are also failing to recruit staff for the posts in the council.

Its a very shameful situation for which individuals need to be held accountable.

Question 1 –

I have identified the following policies that are still Relevant because they highlight the importance of and/or protect the Green Belt:

Core Strategy: 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 20, 21, 25, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36.

Development Management Document: 59, 61-65, 72-75, 77, 82-91.

The following policies that relate to the Green Belt need to be Changed:
Core Strategy: 29 and 32 should be changed to reflect the importance of the Green Belt to these functions.
Development Management Document: 71, 78, 79 and 80 should remove the loopholes that make the stated protection dubious.

Several policies in both documents need to be changed to allow changes of land use [excluding the Green Belt] that would permit mixed use development.

Question 2 –

1. NO GREEN BELT SITES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED FOR RELEASE.

We all have a responsibility to future generations and for the health of our planet, not to continue to encroach the Green Belt.

This is an easy and lazy approach and most destructive to the environment.

**GROWTH CAN BE ACCOMMODATED ON PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND/
BROWNFIELD.**

2. Enfield RoadWatch and CPRE-London have compiled a comprehensive register of brownfield opportunities of all types and sizes which shows sufficient sites for housing and infrastructure during the plan period and beyond.

3. The A10 Retail Parks and Southbury area should be masterplanned before piecemeal development picks away at the prime sites. With increased train service, this area could provide a new mixed-use community of many more homes than Meridian Water.

4. Enfield's Strategic Industrial Locations [SIL] need to be masterplanned so that areas closest to public transport can be released for mixed use development, while other areas can be intensified through stacking or better land-use, with no loss of employment.

Question 3 –

a) All the options listed on page 9 are worth exploring, except for the final option which suggests revisiting the Green Belt boundaries, which is unnecessary, given that a robust, thorough and professional boundary review was conducted, approved and adopted in 2013. To quote the Council itself: *The review's primary objective is to provide for a strong defensible Green Belt boundary that will endure and protect the openness and rural character of the surrounding countryside of Enfield from encroachment. The review provides an understanding of the current strengths and weaknesses of the existing Green Belt boundaries and has in turn recommended amending the boundary where appropriate to provide certainty over the next 15 to 20 years.* Another boundary review should not be needed until 2028 at the earliest.

b) The Council should explore the development opportunities offered by possible increased service on the Liverpool Street – Cheshunt line, which would allow some development and improvements on suitable sites at Southbury and Turkey Street Stations, in addition to Edmonton Green.

It should also explore the possibility of reinstating the Carterhatch Lane Station on this line between Southbury and Turkey Street, to permit some development in that area.

c) The Local Plan revision should not be used as a reason to release Green Belt. It is

unnecessary.

d) Please see my response to Q2.

e) The suggested options will definitely contribute to the accommodation of Enfield's growing population. However, these options need to be combined with creative masterplanning of several large sites, including the Southbury/A10 corridor, Brimsdown and Edmonton Green and its surrounds, and more estate regeneration, all in conjunction with transportation upgrades. All these solutions together will not only provide good homes for the borough's residents, but will create new vibrant communities and improvements in deprived areas.

THERE IS NO NEED TO BUILD ON THE GREEN BELT!

Question 4 –

- a) Yes!
- b) The options are not clear, but I would support a policy that values and protects Enfield's heritage and culture.
- d) Hard to answer without a definition of 'appropriate'.

Question 5 –

- a) Yes
- b) Depends on the location
- c) Yes

Question 8 –

Please refer to my response to Q2 about the brownfield register.

Question 10 –

- c) Please refer to my responses to Q2 and Q3.
- d) Industry should not be moved into the Green Belt. Additional employment space can be achieved by mixed-use development and intensification of existing industrial sites.

Question 13 –

All of the above, plus leisure centres, Council offices, transport hubs and retail.

Question 14 –

c) The importance of open and blue spaces cannot be judged by their quality, accessibility or size. Open spaces serve a wide variety of purposes. In addition to the traditional five purposes of the Green Belt, a long list of environmental, economic and social benefits have now been identified including:

- Creating a sense-of-place and facilitating community cohesion;
- Increasing physical activity for adults and children;
- Adapting to climate change through CO2 absorption, shading or flood alleviation;
- Improving mental health;
- Creating more attractive places to work, live and visit;
- Encouraging active transport like walking and cycling;
- Improving air quality;
- Improving water quality by reducing harmful runoff into local rivers; and
- Enhancing biodiversity and opportunities for wildlife.

Therefore, open spaces, including Green Belt sites, which may appear inaccessible or of low quality, are in fact serving very important functions. For these reasons, all our Green Belt sites should be preserved and protected. I would also like to reinforce my

response to Q2 that another Green Belt Boundary Review is unnecessary because the 2013 review is still valid.

d) and e) I refer you to my previous response. Open spaces, including the Green Belt, serve many functions and should be preserved and protected.

h) It can contribute a lot by not building on the Green Belt!

Question 16 –

c) Protect the Green Belt and don't suggest building on it.

I look forward to a Draft Local Plan that has creative solutions and does not target any sections of the Green Belt for de-designation.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

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.

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

Hello

I totally do with the proposed changes. Green Belt and open spaces should not be used for new developments. We need to keep Enfield as it is with the green belt and open spaces.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

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.**

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

So to Crews Hill all the time.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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 business centres there provide employment and a resource for people from Enfield and beyond and the business centres 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 CPRF-London, Enfield Road Watch 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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, housing, employment and a resource for people from Enfield 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 97,000 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Re. Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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. My responses to the consultation questions below reflect my beliefs 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.

Question 1 –

I have identified the following policies that are still Relevant because they highlight the importance of and/or protect the Green Belt:

Core Strategy: 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 20, 21, 25, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36.

Development Management Document: 59, 61-65, 72-75, 77, 82-91.

The following policies that relate to the Green Belt need to be Changed:

Core Strategy: 29 and 32 should be changed to reflect the importance of the Green Belt to

these functions.

Development Management Document: 71, 78, 79 and 80 should remove the loopholes that

make the stated protection dubious.

Several policies in both documents need to be changed to allow changes of land use [excluding the Green Belt] that would permit mixed use development.

Question 2 –

1. NO GREEN BELT SITES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED FOR RELEASE. GROWTH CAN BE ACCOMMODATED ON PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND/ BROWNFIELD.

2. Enfield RoadWatch and CPRE-London have compiled a comprehensive register of brownfield opportunities of all types and sizes which shows sufficient sites for housing and infrastructure during the plan period and beyond.

3. The A10 Retail Parks and Southbury area should be masterplanned before piecemeal development picks away at the prime sites. With increased train service, this area could provide a new mixed-use community of many more homes than Meridian Water.

4. Enfield's Strategic Industrial Locations [SIL] need to be masterplanned so that areas closest to public transport can be released for mixed use development, while other areas can be intensified through stacking or better land-use, with no loss of employment.

Question 3 –

a) All the options listed on page 9 are worth exploring, except for the final option which suggests revisiting the Green Belt boundaries, which is unnecessary, given that a robust, thorough and professional boundary review was conducted, approved and adopted in 2013. To quote the Council itself: *The review's primary objective is to provide for a strong defensible Green Belt boundary that will endure and protect the openness*

*and rural character of the surrounding countryside of Enfield from encroachment. The review provides an understanding of the current strengths and weaknesses of the existing Green Belt boundaries and has in turn recommended amending the boundary where appropriate to provide certainty **over the next 15 to 20 years**. Another boundary review should not be needed until 2028 at the earliest.*

- b) The Council should explore the development opportunities offered by possible increased service on the Liverpool Street – Cheshunt line, which would allow some development and improvements on suitable sites at Southbury and Turkey Street Stations, in addition to Edmonton Green. It should also explore the possibility of reinstating the Carterhatch Lane Station on this line between Southbury and Turkey Street, to permit some development in that area.
- c) The Local Plan revision should not be used as a reason to release Green Belt. It is unnecessary.
- d) Please see my response to Q2.
- e) The suggested options will definitely contribute to the accommodation of Enfield's growing population. However, these options need to be combined with creative masterplanning of several large sites, including the Southbury/A10 corridor, Brimsdown and Edmonton Green and its surrounds, and more estate regeneration, all in conjunction with transportation upgrades. All these solutions together will not only provide good homes for the borough's residents, but will create new vibrant communities and improvements in deprived areas. **THERE IS NO NEED TO BUILD ON THE GREEN BELT!**

Question 4 –

- a) Yes!
- b) The options are not clear, but I would support a policy that values and protects Enfield's heritage and culture.
- d) Hard to answer without a definition of 'appropriate'.

Question 5 –

- a) Yes
- b) Depends on the location
- c) Yes

Question 8 –

Please refer to my response to Q2 about the brownfield register.

Question 10 –

- c) Please refer to my responses to Q2 and Q3.
- d) Industry should not be moved into the Green Belt. Additional employment space can be achieved by mixed-use development and intensification of existing industrial sites.

Question 13 –

All of the above, plus leisure centres, Council offices, transport hubs and retail.

Question 14 –

- c) The importance of open and blue spaces cannot be judged by their quality, accessibility or size. Open spaces serve a wide variety of purposes. In addition to the traditional five purposes of the Green Belt, a long list of environmental, economic and social benefits have now been identified including:
 - Creating a sense-of-place and facilitating community cohesion;
 - Increasing physical activity for adults and children;
 - Adapting to climate change through CO2 absorption, shading or flood alleviation;
 - Improving mental health;

- Creating more attractive places to work, live and visit;
- Encouraging active transport like walking and cycling;
- Improving air quality;
- Improving water quality by reducing harmful runoff into local rivers; and
- Enhancing biodiversity and opportunities for wildlife.

Therefore, open spaces, including Green Belt sites, which may appear inaccessible or of low quality, are in fact serving very important functions. For these reasons, all our Green Belt sites should be preserved and protected. I would also like to reinforce my response to Q2 that another Green Belt Boundary Review is unnecessary because the 2013 review is still valid.

d) and e) I refer you to my previous response. Open spaces, including the Green Belt, serve many functions and should be preserved and protected.

h) It can contribute a lot by not building on the Green Belt!

Question 16 –

c) Protect the Green Belt and don't suggest building on it.

I look forward to a Draft Local Plan that has creative solutions and does not target any sections of the Green Belt for de-designation.

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

Having glanced through the consultation document i find very little on allotments, in fact it is mentioned once.

With the ever increasing pressure on land and building future homes should provision within these developments not be given to some form of allotment provision. Often called growing spaces as the modern equivalent where families come together to grow a mix of crops for distribution amongst themselves or small growing spaces for individuals. Many of Enfields remaining allotment sites are offered protection from development but nothing is in place to find or provide land for the projected increased demand in coming years. The south east corner of the borough is totally deprived of any allotment land a throw back of the industrial areas that once predominated the area.

Please consider future provision and investment in allotments/growing spaces for the future generations.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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]. 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.

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

I AM INDEBTED TO 'ENFIELD ROADWATCH' IN PROVIDING THE LITERATURE EXPLAINING THE 'LOCAL PLAN' BUT AS A RESIDENT OF ENFIELD FOR NIGH ON 20 YEARS (AND MY WIFE FOR A SIMILAR PERIOD) WE ARE DISMAYED AT THE THOUGHT OF LOSING ANY OF OUR GREEN BELT - 'THE LUNGS OF LONDON!' DO NOT TOUCH CREWS HILL - IT IS USED BY THE CO NI AND PROVIDES EMPLOYMENT VIA THE NURSERIES. THERE ARE SITES AROUND THE A10/SOUTHURY ROAD AND MERIDIAN AREA THAT CAN BE UTILISED!

Regards

NAME:

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

I also wish to ~~support~~ and endorse the concerns expressed by Enfield Sport in its comments on the Plan, specifically that the commitments included in the Enfield Playing Pitch Strategy are confirmed as commitments in the Local Plan.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

Whilst 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 centers 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 National Planning Policy Framework, and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the Local Plan.

Enfield councils, please listen to your residents we need the green belt for our children to benefit in the future.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

Whilst 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 centers 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 National Planning Policy Framework, and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the Local Plan.

Enfield councils, please listen to your residents we need the green belt for our children to benefit in the future.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

Since moving to Enfield Town 33 years ago I've been using the Garden centres of Crews Hill, visiting the CarBoot sales, Jollyes Pet store etc. These businesses and the beautiful bit of greenbelt they're set in provide important leisure amenities to the residents of Enfield and further afield in London. You can't have endless urban areas without places like Crews Hill

I am concerned that Crews Hill has been singled out for release from the Green Belt. 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.

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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

Whilst 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 National Planning Policy Framework, and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the Local Plan.

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

Re Response to Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

We would like to take this opportunity to respond to a number of points on the above which are our own carefully considered views, as follows:

Question 1:

We have picked out the following policies which are relevant to the Green Belt as they about the importance of maintaining and protecting the green belt about which we feel very strongly:

Core Strategy: 7,8,9,11,12,13,20,21,25,30,31,33,34,35,36

Development Management: 59, 61-65, 72, 75, 77,82-91

The following policies relating to the green belt need to be changed:

Core Strategy: 29 and 32 need to underline the importance of the green belt for these functions.

Dev Management Document: 71, 78 and 80 should remove any loopholes that do not fully cover protection for the green belt.

There are several policies in both documents that need to be changed to allow changes of land use, excluding the green belt that could permit mixed use development.

Question 2:

1. **No green belt sites should be considered for release as it is entirely possible that growth can be accommodated on previously developed land/brown field sites.**
2. You will note that Enfield RoadWatch and CPRE-London have compiled a register of brown field sites of all descriptions which illustrates that sufficient sites for housing and infrastructure are available.
3. The A10 Retail Parks and related areas could be closely looked at, bearing in mind the proximity of the railway, to provide adequate transport for new homes.
4. Industrial Locations need to be planned away from the green belt but close to public transport where possible to ease congestion on the roads.

Question 3:

We do not agree with revisiting the green belt boundaries, as there is no need to build on green belt land.

Question 4:

- a. Yes
- b. We agree to the protection of Enfield's heritage.

Question 8:

Refer to EnfieldWatch list of brown sites.

Question 10:

- a. We think our response to questions 2 and 3 covers this.
- d. On no account should industry be moved to the green belt. Additional employment is best met close to new housing developments, as responded to in question 2, points 2 and 3.

Question 14:

The importance of open and blue spaces cannot be under-estimated, as open spaces, most certainly, achieve the following:

- Encourages exercise, ie walking and cycling
- Relaxation for busy families without the need to spend extra hard earned money.
- A de-stress place for people after, +for example a weekly commute into London.
- Improves air quality, thereby reducing the rising problem of asthma, particularly in the young.
- A place the for local wild life to thrive
- A sense of well being promoted by being in open green spaces.
- A good place for future generations to be able visit.

In conclusion, the reason that many people love and wish to move to Enfield, ourselves included, is for the open spaces and the enjoyment of being able to enjoy the outdoors close to home. We truly hope that the importance of the green belt staying untouched for now and the future is kept to the fore front of any new plans.

Re Response to Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

We would like to take this opportunity to respond to a number of points on the above which are our own carefully considered views, as follows:

Question 1:

We have picked out the following policies which are relevant to the Green Belt as they about the importance of maintaining and protecting the green belt about which we feel very strongly:

Core Strategy: 7,8,9,11,12,13,20,21,25,30,31,33,34,35,36

Development Management: 59, 61-65, 72, 75, 77,82-91

The following policies relating to the green belt need to be changed:

Core Strategy: 29 and 32 need to underline the importance of the green belt for these functions.

Dev Management Document: 71, 78 and 80 should remove any loopholes that do not fully cover protection for the green belt.

There are several policies in both documents that need to be changed to allow changes of land use, excluding the green belt that could permit mixed use development.

Question 2:

1. **No green belt sites should be considered for release as it is entirely possible that growth can be accommodated on previously developed land/brown field sites.**
2. You will note that Enfield RoadWatch and CPRE-London have compiled a register of brown field sites of all descriptions which illustrates that sufficient sites for housing and infrastructure are available.
3. The A10 Retail Parks and related areas could be closely looked at, bearing in mind the proximity of the railway, to provide adequate transport for new homes.
4. Industrial Locations need to be planned away from the green belt but close to public transport where possible to ease congestion on the roads.

Question 3:

We do not agree with revisiting the green belt boundaries, as there is no need to build on green belt land.

Question 4:

- a. Yes
- b. We agree to the protection of Enfield's heritage.

Question 8:

Refer to EnfieldWatch list of brown sites.

Question 10:

- a. We think our response to questions 2 and 3 covers this.
- d. On no account should industry be moved to the green belt. Additional employment is best met close to new housing developments, as responded to in question 2, points 2 and 3.

Question 14:

The importance of open and blue spaces cannot be under-estimated, as open spaces, most certainly, achieve the following:

- Encourages exercise, ie walking and cycling
- Relaxation for busy families without the need to spend extra hard earned money.
- A de-stress place for people after, +for example a weekly commute into London.
- Improves air quality, thereby reducing the rising problem of asthma, particularly in the young.
- A place the for local wild life to thrive
- A sense of well being promoted by being in open green spaces.
- A good place for future generations to be able visit.

In conclusion, the reason that many people love and wish to move to Enfield, ourselves included, is for the open spaces and the enjoyment of being able to enjoy the outdoors close to home. We truly hope that the importance of the green belt staying untouched for now and the future is kept to the fore front of any new plans.

Yours faithfully



Hello,

As an Enfield Council Housing leaseholder, I welcome the renewal aspect of the draft plan in relation to housing estates (page 44) I am however very concerned with the 'intensification' of estates and in particular any plan to 'intensify' the estate I live on: Merryhills Court, N14 4AY. I bought my flat on the open market some 25 years ago. One of the factors that appealed to me about the flat was that it was, and, still is, a top-floor flat; the idea of there being the possibility of having additional floors added to the block fills me with alarm. Other points:

- The area where I live is congested, at times, with motor traffic
- There is noise and air pollution
- Presently parking on the estate is a major problem
- Primary health care in the area is already stretched
- The quality of life of existing residents needs serious consideration

I welcome the protection of the Green Belt and would be concerned about encroachment on to it.

Brownfield site should be utilised as should vacant commercial premises situated on the high streets in the towns in the Borough as a first step in meeting the housing shortage. I note the Enfield Society in its response to the draft consultation, 'Enfield Society News', NO. 213, Spring 2019, suggests the projected need for housing in the future may be overestimated.

I attended the presentation at The Civic Centre of the draft plan on Thursday last and found it helpful. The 'Summary and Questionnaire Booklet is a useful tool.

I am involved with Enfield Council Housing as a member of Customer Voice, I attend the Leaseholder Forum and I sit on the Housing Board.

Please feel free to use my submission as you think fit.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Care must be taken in the Freedom Water development concept funding. When the small site in Vanage Row was developed about 20 years ago it was necessary to use a pump as water kept infiltrating with the building. Being a vastly larger site M.W needs to be built with great care.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Parents used to own a garden centre !!

Nice to come here every summer!
used to come when little and now love
bringing my children!

Regards

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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 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.

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

I am writing to ask that you urgently rethink plans to build on green spaces as outlined in the proposed Local Development Plans. .

Having previously worked for Shelter I am keenly aware of the need for new housing. But Enfield's 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.

I support housing development and support the ambition to meet Enfield's housing needs, but I strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or any 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 do not want the green belt reduced because it is essential for London and particularly important for Enfield to have a green lung and a green buffer zone. I work in the media and know how important green spaces are to improving air quality. It is particularly important because of the M25, A10 and the North Circular running through/near Enfield. This borough has one of the worst air qualities in London.

Poor air quality is linked to asthma and other life-threatening illnesses in children and young people. Please consider how children's welfare is affected by a reduction in green spaces.

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. The GLA and the Mayor's Office has a responsibility to all Londoners, too.

London's green spaces are too important to build on. As a local resident, I am particularly keen not to see a loss of green belt and green spaces in general.

I am also concerned that Crews Hill has been identified 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. The Council could show leadership in supporting local food and plant production at low prices because poorer local residents are increasingly dependent on food banks.

I am copying in my MP, Joan Ryan, about my concerns, too.

We feel strongly that the Green Belt should NOT be lost to building. Please keep us in the loop.
We are away on 28th Feb so keep us in the loop.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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 particularly 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 National Planning Policy Framework, and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan.

Thank you for taking my views into consideration on this important consultation.

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 brownfield land. The report, Space to Build, Enfield which was recently published by CPRE-London, Enfield RoadWatch and The Enfield Society 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.

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

Dear Sir or Madam

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

While I support the ambition to meet Enfield's housing needs, I strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes. This could radically change the character of the borough. 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 to housing, its horticultural activities should be encouraged and enhanced so that in a changed climate it can once again be a hub for food and plant production.

Enfield's ambitious housing targets can be accommodated on previously-built brownfield land. I refer you to the report, Space to Build, Enfield (<http://www.cprelondon.org.uk/projects/item/2427-space-to-build-in-enfield>) 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.

For all the many environmental, ecological, economic, public health and other reasons that have been identified, the Green Belt is too valuable to lose. 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.

Development also needs to take account of other factors such as scale and I am concerned at the proposal to build an 18-storey tower close to Southgate station. While development close to transport hubs makes sense, a building on this scale would dominate the landscape, set a precedent for other towers, and alter the character of the area.

The Council also has a duty to protect birds in the borough, native or visitors, including swifts which are amber-listed in the UK due to their rapid decline, and house sparrows which are red-listed. Loss of nest sites is a significant factor in their decline. This demand for nest sites can be met by integrated nesting sites in buildings; integrated roosting sites can also be provided for bats. These are low cost and zero maintenance.

It is vital that Section 9.5, Biodiversity and Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, includes a requirement for integrated nesting and roosting sites in new development. The draft London Plan requires that : *"in developing Development Plan policies, boroughs should... 3) support the protection and conservation of priority species and habitats **that sit outside the SINC network...** 4)... [include] **features such as artificial nest sites**, that are of particular relevance and benefit in an urban context"* Chapter 8 Policy G6B.

There are examples of good practice in neighbouring boroughs:

- The draft Hackney Plan 2033 includes a specific requirement for nesting boxes for swifts, sparrows, starlings and/or bats in developments (Section LP47 Biodiversity, clause D).
- The draft Islington Plan 2020-2035 includes a suitable standard clause as follows:

G4 section 5.27 page 153 states that: *"Islington's wildlife depends not only on green spaces, but also on the artificial fabric of the city. Buildings can provide roosting sites for bats and nesting opportunities for birds such as swifts, house sparrow, peregrine falcon and black redstart, species that have seen large population declines, and which are dependent on built areas for their survival. Walls can provide habitats for many of species of plant, including ferns and mosses, and also provide spaces for invertebrates. Developments involving refurbishment and/or extension of existing buildings may impact species using the existing buildings, therefore measures to ensure retention and enhancement of such species will be required. Developments involving new and existing buildings should also utilise opportunities to attract new species to a site through such measures. All wildlife habitats must be designed in accordance with the council's Biodiversity Action Plan, and in many cases, will include micro habitat creation. **Artificial nest boxes/bricks should be incorporated within developments (refurbishments, extensions and/or new build) to provide nesting and roosting opportunities for birds, including species under threat such as swifts, house martins, swallows and house sparrows, and where appropriate, bats.**"*

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

Concerning point 2.12 Strategic plan-led approach to Green Belt, and image 2.2 Growth Options Diagram:

Enfield should be proud of its Green Belt and nurture it. It has been eroded due to poor enforcement practice in the past, but this does not justify further encroachments. Surely altering Green Belt boundaries can only be justified in exceptional circumstances, and where all other options have been considered.

Dear Enfield Council

Re. Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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. Below reflects my beliefs 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.

Question 1 –

The following policies are still relevant because they highlight the importance of and/or protect the Green Belt:

Core Strategy: 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 20, 21, 25, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36.

Development Management Document: 59, 61-65, 72-75, 77, 82-91.

The following policies that relate to the Green Belt need to be changed:

Core Strategy: 29 and 32 should be changed to reflect the importance of the Green Belt to these functions.

Development Management Document: 71, 78, 79 and 80 should remove the loopholes that make the stated protection dubious.

Several policies in both documents need to be changed to allow changes of land use [excluding the Green Belt] that would permit mixed use development.

Question 2 –

1. NO GREEN BELT SITES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED FOR RELEASE. GROWTH CAN BE ACCOMMODATED ON PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND/ BROWNFIELD.
2. Enfield RoadWatch and CPRE-London have compiled a comprehensive register of brownfield opportunities of all types and sizes which shows sufficient sites for housing and infrastructure during the plan period and beyond.
3. The A10 Retail Parks and Southbury area should be planned before piecemeal development picks away at the prime sites. With increased train service, this area could provide a new mixed-use community of many more homes than Meridian Water.
4. Enfield's Strategic Industrial Locations [SIL] need to be planned so that areas closest to public transport can be released for mixed use development, while other areas can be intensified through stacking or better land-use, with no loss of employment.

Question 3 –

a) All the options listed on page 9 are worth exploring, except for the final option which suggests revisiting the Green Belt boundaries, which is unnecessary, given that a robust, thorough and professional boundary review was conducted, approved and adopted in 2013. To quote the Council itself: *The review's primary objective is to provide for a strong defensible Green Belt boundary that will endure and protect the openness and rural character of the surrounding countryside of Enfield from encroachment. The review provides an understanding of the current strengths and weaknesses of the existing Green Belt boundaries and has in turn recommended amending the boundary where appropriate to provide certainty over*

the next 15 to 20 years. Another boundary review should not be needed until 2028 at the earliest.

- b) The Council should explore the development opportunities offered by possible increased service on the Liverpool Street – Cheshunt line, which would allow some development and improvements on suitable sites at Southbury and Turkey Street Stations, in addition to Edmonton Green. It should also explore the possibility of reinstating the Carterhatch Lane Station on this line between Southbury and Turkey Street, to permit some development in that area.
- c) The Local Plan revision should not be used as a reason to release Green Belt. It is unnecessary.
- d) Please see the response to Q2.
- e) The suggested options will definitely contribute to the accommodation of Enfield's growing population. However, these options need to be combined with creative planning of several large sites, including the Southbury/A10 corridor, Brimsdown and Edmonton Green and its surrounds, and more estate regeneration, all in conjunction with transport upgrades. All these solutions together will not only provide good homes for the borough's residents, but will create new vibrant communities and improvements in deprived areas. **THERE IS NO NEED TO BUILD ON THE GREEN BELT!**

Question 4 –

- a) Yes!
- b) The options are not clear, but I would support a policy that values and protects Enfield's heritage and culture.
- d) Hard to answer without a definition of 'appropriate'.

Question 5 –

- a) Yes
- b) Depends on the location
- c) Yes

Question 8 –

Please refer to the response to Q2 about the brownfield register.

Question 10 –

- c) Please refer to the responses to Q2 and Q3.
- d) Industry should not be moved into the Green Belt. Additional employment space can be achieved by mixed-use development and intensification of existing industrial sites.

Question 13 –

All of the above, plus leisure centres, Council offices, transport hubs and retail.

Question 14 –

c) The importance of open and blue spaces cannot be judged by their quality, accessibility or size. Open spaces serve a wide variety of purposes. In addition to the traditional five purposes of the Green Belt, a long list of environmental, economic and social benefits have now been identified including:

- Creating a sense-of-place and facilitating community cohesion;
- Increasing physical activity for adults and children;
- Adapting to climate change through CO2 absorption, shading or flood alleviation;
- Improving mental health;
- Creating more attractive places to work, live and visit;
- Encouraging active transport like walking and cycling;
- Improving air quality;
- Improving water quality by reducing harmful runoff into local rivers; and
- Enhancing biodiversity and opportunities for wildlife.

Therefore, open spaces, including Green Belt sites, which may appear inaccessible or of low quality, are in fact serving very important functions. For these reasons, all our Green Belt sites should be preserved and protected. In my opinion another Green Belt

Boundary Review is not necessary as the 2013 review is still valid.

d) and e) I refer you to the previous response. Open spaces, including the Green Belt, serve many functions and should be preserved and protected.

h) It can contribute a lot by not building on the Green Belt!

Question 16 –

c) Protect the Green Belt and don't suggest building on it.

I look forward to a Draft Local Plan that has creative solutions and does not target any sections of the Green Belt for development.

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

Recent reports suggest that Enfield Council is planning to use Enfield Green Sites for house building. Before doing so they should consider using the numerous Brown Sites situated in the Borough which are lying empty and neglected. It is a fact that once a Green Site has been sacrificed it will never be recovered.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Save Greenbelt areas for our children
to enjoy.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

We need to keep Greenbelt land
people need open space to live.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

Whilst 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 National Planning Policy Framework, and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the Local Plan.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

Whilst 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 National Planning Policy Framework, and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the Local Plan.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

Whilst 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 National Planning Policy Framework, and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the Local Plan.

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

Please Don't ruin our green belt with more violence!

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

Whilst 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 National Planning Policy Framework, and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the Local Plan.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Re. Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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. My responses to the consultation questions below reflect my beliefs 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. We also need to consider the Green Belt and Open spaces as stepping stones for wildlife moving from one area to another across the borough.

Question 1 –

I have identified the following policies that are still Relevant because they highlight the

importance of and/or protect the Green Belt:

Core Strategy: 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 20, 21, 25, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36.

Development Management Document: 59, 61-65, 72-75, 77, 82-91.

The following policies that relate to the Green Belt need to be Changed:

Core Strategy: 29 and 32 should be changed to reflect the importance of the Green Belt to these functions.

Development Management Document: 71, 78, 79 and 80 should remove the loopholes that make the stated protection dubious.

Several policies in both documents need to be changed to allow changes of land use [excluding the Green Belt] that would permit mixed use development.

Question 2 –

1. NO GREEN BELT SITES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED FOR RELEASE. GROWTH CAN BE ACCOMMODATED ON PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND/ BROWNFIELD.

2. Enfield RoadWatch and CPRE-London have compiled a comprehensive register of brownfield opportunities of all types and sizes which shows sufficient sites for housing and infrastructure during the plan period and beyond.

3. The A10 Retail Parks and Southbury area should be masterplanned before piecemeal development picks away at the prime sites. With increased train service, this area could provide a new mixed-use community of many more homes than Meridian Water.

4. Enfield's Strategic Industrial Locations [SIL] need to be masterplanned so that areas closest to public transport can be released for mixed use development, while other areas can be intensified through stacking or better land-use, with no loss of employment.

Question 3 –

a) All the options listed on page 9 are worth exploring, except for the final option which suggests revisiting the Green Belt boundaries, which is unnecessary, given that a robust, thorough and professional boundary review was conducted,

approved and adopted in 2013. To quote the Council itself: *The review's primary objective is to provide for a strong defensible Green Belt boundary that will endure and protect the openness and rural character of the surrounding countryside of Enfield from encroachment. The review provides an understanding of the current strengths and weaknesses of the existing Green Belt boundaries and has in turn recommended amending the boundary where appropriate to provide certainty over the next 15 to 20 years.* Another boundary review should not be needed until 2028 at the earliest.

b) The Council should explore the development opportunities offered by possible increased service on the Liverpool Street – Cheshunt line, which would allow some development and improvements on suitable sites at Southbury and Turkey Street Stations, in addition to Edmonton Green. It should also explore the possibility of reinstating the Carterhatch Lane Station on this line between Southbury and Turkey Street, to permit some development in that area.

c) The Local Plan revision should not be used as a reason to release Green Belt. It is unnecessary.

d) Please see my response to Q2.

e) The suggested options will definitely contribute to the accommodation of Enfield's growing population. However, these options need to be combined with creative masterplanning of several large sites, including the Southbury/A10 corridor, Brimsdown and Edmonton Green and its surrounds, and more estate regeneration, all in conjunction with transportation upgrades. All these solutions together will not only provide good homes for the borough's residents, but will create new vibrant communities and improvements in deprived areas. **THERE IS NO NEED TO BUILD ON THE GREEN BELT!**

Question 4 –

a) Yes!

b) The options are not clear, but I would support a policy that values and protects Enfield's heritage and culture.

d) Hard to answer without a definition of 'appropriate'.

Question 5 –

a) Yes

b) Depends on the location

c) Yes

Question 8 –

Please refer to my response to Q2 about the brownfield register.

Question 10 –

c) Please refer to my responses to Q2 and Q3.

d) Industry should not be moved into the Green Belt. Additional employment space can be achieved by mixed-use development and intensification of existing industrial sites.

Question 13 –

All of the above, plus leisure centres, Council offices, transport hubs and retail.

Question 14 –

c) The importance of open and blue spaces cannot be judged by their quality,

accessibility or size. Open spaces serve a wide variety of purposes. In addition to the traditional five purposes of the Green Belt, a long list of environmental, economic and social benefits have now been identified including:

- Creating a sense-of-place and facilitating community cohesion;
- Increasing physical activity for adults and children;
- Adapting to climate change through CO2 absorption, shading or flood alleviation;
- Improving mental health;
- Creating more attractive places to work, live and visit;
- Encouraging active transport like walking and cycling;
- Improving air quality;
- Improving water quality by reducing harmful runoff into local rivers; and
- Enhancing biodiversity and opportunities for wildlife.

Therefore, open spaces, including Green Belt sites, which may appear inaccessible or of low quality, are in fact serving very important functions. For these reasons, all our Green Belt sites should be preserved and protected. I would also like to reinforce my response to Q2 that another Green Belt Boundary Review is unnecessary because the 2013 review is still valid.

d) and e) I refer you to my previous response. Open spaces, including the Green Belt, serve many functions and should be preserved and protected.

h) It can contribute a lot by not building on the Green Belt!

Question 16 –

c) Protect the Green Belt and don't suggest building on it.

I look forward to a Draft Local Plan that has creative solutions and does not target any sections of the Green Belt for de-designation.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Re. Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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. My responses to the consultation questions below reflect my own views and beliefs 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. We also need to consider that the Green Belt and Open Spaces provide a natural stepping stone for our wildlife.

Question 1 –

I have identified the following policies that are still Relevant because they highlight the importance of and/or protect the Green Belt:

Core Strategy: 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 20, 21, 25, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36.

Development Management Document: 59, 61-65, 72-75, 77, 82-91.

The following policies that relate to the Green Belt need to be Changed:

Core Strategy: 29 and 32 should be changed to reflect the importance of the Green Belt to these functions.

Development Management Document: 71, 78, 79 and 80 should remove the loopholes that make the stated protection dubious.

Several policies in both documents need to be changed to allow changes of land use [excluding the Green Belt] that would permit mixed use development.

Question 2 –

1. NO GREEN BELT SITES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED FOR RELEASE. GROWTH CAN BE ACCOMMODATED ON PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND/ BROWNFIELD.

2. Enfield RoadWatch and CPRE-London have compiled a comprehensive register of brownfield opportunities of all types and sizes which shows sufficient sites for housing and infrastructure during the plan period and beyond.

3. The A10 Retail Parks and Southbury area should be masterplanned before piecemeal development picks away at the prime sites. With increased train service, this area could provide a new mixed-use community of many more homes than Meridian Water.

4. Enfield's Strategic Industrial Locations [SIL] need to be masterplanned so that areas closest to public transport can be released for mixed use development, while other areas can be intensified through stacking or better land-use, with no loss of employment.

Question 3 –

a) All the options listed on page 9 are worth exploring, except for the final option which suggests revisiting the Green Belt boundaries, which is unnecessary, given that a robust, thorough and professional boundary review was conducted, approved and adopted in 2013. To quote the Council itself: *The review's primary objective is to provide for a strong defensible Green Belt boundary that will endure and protect the openness and rural character of the surrounding countryside of Enfield from encroachment. The review provides an understanding of the current strengths and weaknesses of the existing Green Belt boundaries and has in turn recommended amending the boundary where appropriate to provide certainty **over the next 15 to 20 years**.* Another boundary review should not be needed until 2028 at the earliest.

b) The Council should explore the development opportunities offered by possible increased service on the Liverpool Street – Cheshunt line, which would allow some development and improvements on suitable sites at Southbury and Turkey Street Stations, in addition to Edmonton Green. It should also explore the possibility of reinstating the Carterhatch Lane Station on this line between Southbury and Turkey Street, to permit some development in that area.

c) The Local Plan revision should not be used as a reason to release Green Belt. It is unnecessary.

d) Please see my response to Q2.

e) The suggested options will definitely contribute to the accommodation of Enfield's growing population. However, these options need to be combined with creative masterplanning of several large sites, including the Southbury/A10 corridor, Brimsdown and Edmonton Green and its surrounds, and more estate regeneration, all in conjunction with transportation upgrades. All these solutions together will not only provide good homes for the borough's residents, but will create new vibrant communities and improvements in deprived areas. **THERE IS NO NEED TO BUILD ON THE GREEN BELT!**

Question 4 –

a) Yes!

b) The options are not clear, but I would support a policy that values and protects Enfield's heritage and culture.

d) Hard to answer without a definition of 'appropriate'.

Question 5 –

a) Yes

b) Depends on the location

c) Yes

Question 8 –

Please refer to my response to Q2 about the brownfield register.

Question 10 –

c) Please refer to my responses to Q2 and Q3.

d) Industry should not be moved into the Green Belt. Additional employment space can be achieved by mixed-use development and intensification of existing industrial sites.

Question 13 –

All of the above, plus leisure centres, Council offices, transport hubs and retail.

Question 14 –

c) The importance of open and blue spaces cannot be judged by their quality, accessibility or size. Open spaces serve a wide variety of purposes. In addition to the traditional five purposes of the Green Belt, a long list of environmental, economic and social benefits have now been identified including:

- Creating a sense-of-place and facilitating community cohesion;
- Increasing physical activity for adults and children;
- Adapting to climate change through CO2 absorption, shading or flood alleviation;
- Improving mental health;
- Creating more attractive places to work, live and visit;
- Encouraging active transport like walking and cycling;
- Improving air quality;
- Improving water quality by reducing harmful runoff into local rivers; and
- Enhancing biodiversity and opportunities for wildlife.

Therefore, open spaces, including Green Belt sites, which may appear inaccessible or of low quality, are in fact serving very important functions. For these reasons, all our Green Belt sites should be preserved and protected. I would also like to reinforce my response to Q2 that another Green Belt Boundary Review is unnecessary because the 2013 review is still valid.

d) and e) I refer you to my previous response. Open spaces, including the Green Belt, serve many functions and should be preserved and protected.

h) It can contribute a lot by not building on the Green Belt!

Question 16 –

c) Protect the Green Belt and don't suggest building on it.

I look forward to a Draft Local Plan that has creative solutions and does not target any sections of the Green Belt for de-designation.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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 particularly 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 National Planning Policy Framework, and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan.

Thank you for taking my views into consideration on this important consultation.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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 particularly 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. In particular the Council should explore the development opportunities offered by possible increased service on the Liverpool Street – Cheshunt line, which would allow some development and improvements on suitable sites at Southbury and Turkey Street Stations, in addition to Edmonton Green. It should also explore the possibility of reinstating the Carterhatch Lane Station on this line between Southbury and Turkey Street, to permit some development in that area. There also needs to be creative masterplanning of several large sites, including the Southbury/A10 corridor, Brimsdown and Edmonton Green and its surrounds, and more estate regeneration, all in conjunction with transportation upgrades. All these solutions together will not only provide good homes for the borough's residents, but will create new vibrant communities and improvements in deprived areas.

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 National Planning Policy Framework, and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan.

Thank you for taking my views into consideration on this important consultation.

Dear Enfield Council

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

THIS IS a lovely Place and
We need to protect this
environment from Development

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

This is a beautiful place and needs
Protecting from development

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

I support this initiative.
Bogdan Dumitru.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Keep the Green Belt for future generation →, for cleaner air.

Dear Enfield Council,

Regarding Your Plan Reference: page 50 item 2.12.2

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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 the area, the Council should encourage and enhance it 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] [refer to the report Space to Build, Enfield](#) which was recently published by CDF London, Enfield Roadwatch and The Enfield Society. It provides evidence of sites for at least 7,000 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

I am writing to express my views on the Council's Draft Local Plan 2018-2036 concerning the proposed development on Green Belt Land.

I understand that land is required to meet Enfield's housing needs, but I strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes. I believe that alternative land is available to meet housing targets and that we should do our utmost to preserve the Green Belt for the health and enjoyment of future generations. They are the green lungs of Enfield, are a haven for wildlife, help to give it its special character and make it a pleasant borough to live in, accessible just a short distance from our Town Centre.

I am particularly concerned that Crews Hill has been singled out for release from the Green Belt. The garden centres and other businesses there draw customers from, and provide employment for, people from both Enfield and outside the Borough. They are one of Enfield's 'Jewels in its Crown'. Indeed, instead of losing Crews Hill to housing, its horticultural activities should even be enhanced so that it could again be a hub for food and plant production (One only needs to look at the success of Forty Hall farm and its organic market garden, to see how this activity has been embraced by the residents of Enfield).

If Crews Hill is developed, more costly infrastructure will be needed to support the new housing (roads, utilities etc) and I believe that we should make use of current infrastructure already in place in the Borough by building on previously-built (Brownfield) land (please refer 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 the public health,

environmental, ecological and economic reasons mentioned. The Council has a duty of care for the Green Belt, in accordance with the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan.

Thank you for taking my views into consideration on this important consultation.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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 particularly 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 National Planning Policy Framework, and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan.

I have recently moved to Enfield from an inner London borough specifically to live closer to green open spaces. I do not wish to see the Green Belt destroyed or removed for housing development thus depriving myself and future generations enjoying the benefits.

Thank you for taking my views into consideration on this important consultation.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options
Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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 particularly 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 National Planning Policy Framework, and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan.

Thank you for taking my views into consideration on this important consultation.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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 provide employment and are popular and well used facilities. Their closure would be a great loss for the thousands of local people (and those from further afield), young and old, who regularly visit and spend in the local area. In fact, 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

I am writing regarding the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation.

While I appreciate there is a need to meet Enfield's ambition housing target, 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. Once it is gone, it cannot be replaced.

I am concerned that Crews Hill has been singled out for release from the Green Belt. The garden centers and other businesses provide employment and a resource for people from Enfield and beyond. It is a thriving area all through the year.

Your ambitious housing targets can be accommodated on previously-built land. Have you seen the report, *Space to Build, Enfield* which was recently published by CPRE-London, Enfield RoadWatch and The Enfield Society? It shows 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 is responsible for protecting the Green Belt and should be taken out of the local plan.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan 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.

Enfield's ambitious housing targets can be accommodated on brownfield land. I have seen 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 am concerned that the Green Belt was reviewed only a few years ago and already it is under threat – things have not changed that much in Enfield in such a short space of time.

NO to developing on green belt

I live near Trent Park and enjoy being near a green tranquil space. In other areas in Enfield others can relax and be close to nature. Developing on green belt will destroy Enfield .

I want the green belt protected.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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 particularly 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 National Planning Policy Framework, and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan.

Thank you for taking my views into consideration on this important consultation.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Been visiting 35 years + would not like
to see housing here!

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Mrs S Elliott I AM NOT HAPPY ABOUT
CREW HILL BEING BUILT ON

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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. I consider that building on this area would constitute a dereliction of that Duty and would implore you to use the alternative suggested above.

Dear Enfield Council

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.

As someone who commutes on the train line that goes through Crews Hill I also think the additional passenger numbers that a new development will generate will make the capacity of trains even worse, it's already practically impossible to get a seat from Enfield Chase.

A better option for Enfield Council would be to consider the ever expanding population due to increased immigration and make that a priority. The answer is certainly not just to build more houses.

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

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to express my objection to the development of any Green belt land for housing before all other options have been ruled out - for example Meridian Way and the Colosseum Retail Park.

From speaking to employees at the many nurseries at Crew Hill this development is a foregone conclusion and Enfield Homes (I believe this is an arm of Enfield Council) have already purchased several areas in Crews Hill for development and this is likely to start at the end of this year. I would like to know that all of the essential infrastructure services will be in place before residential properties are sold. **Schools and GP surgeries** as well as the utilities seem to be an afterthought these days and whatever developers promise they seem to be able to squirm out of their commitments.

I attended a meeting at the Civic Centre on 7 Feb and asked why the promised school at the Chase Farm Hospital site, which was promised to be open for the September 2018 intake, had still not been started. It seems no-one at the Meeting could answer this question and as far as they were concerned it was up and running ! Needless to say I left my e-mail address for some clarification but have yet to hear what the new timeframe for the school is.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Hello

I am concerned about the new Enfield plan and the impact this could have on Hadley wood, as higher density housing is proposed. While the is fine for urban areas with infrastructure, thought is needed for more rural like areas such as Hadley Wood and the important protection of the surrounding Green Belt. Some key points in this regard;

- Hadley Wood does not have good public transport access (it is in the lowest Public Transport Access Level zones across the whole of Greater London as measured by TfL). Simply having a train station is not an adequate definition of accessibility.
 - o Hadley Wood is not an appropriate area to target housing growth. It should be explicitly excluded from the Council's growth strategy.
 - o Small site development within 800m of a station (including any presumption of approval), should not apply to Hadley Wood (or to other stations with limited services such as Crews Hill).
- Hadley Wood has poor infrastructure and poor public services. With no bank, NHS doctor, NHS dentist, secondary school, Post Office, Public House, supermarket, etc, it cannot accommodate significant growth.
 - o Hadley Wood does not meet the Councils criteria as a centre for growth (and should be explicitly excluded).
- Any small site development must protect the natural environment. Enfield policies need to be enhanced to meet the Mayor of London's target of 'no net loss of bio-diversity' and to include stronger flood mitigation measures.
- With almost 15,000 new homes targeted for small sites, policies are required to ensure that investment in transport, education and schools, health centres is strategically planned and delivered.
 - o Any presumption of planning approval for small sites should be dependent upon the existence and delivery of strategically planned investments in public services.
- Hadley Wood is fortunate to be surrounded by Green Belt on all sides. Any significant changes to Green Belt designations are not supported.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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. Crews Hill is a unique part of Enfield and there's probably nowhere else like it in London. It developed to provide London with vegetables, plants and flowers and over the years the many garden centres have grown up. 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. Most are family run businesses handed down the generations, both owned and tenanted, many of whom would find it difficult if not impossible to relocate.

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.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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 particularly 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

National Planning Policy Framework, and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan.

Thank you for taking my views into consideration on this important consultation. I am a London Borough resident and am very concerned that the Green Belt is under great threat. It must be protected and retained for future generations, and even more importantly for the vital environmental benefits it brings - wildlife, species preservation and biodiversity.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

I suffer from agoraphobia and have done for over 20 years, and the garden centres at Crews Hill are the only places that I am able to be taken to by car and am comfortable walking around to do my shopping and eat out. I leave the house on average once a fortnight and without Crews Hill I really don't know where I would be able to manage to visit, this would have a massive effect on my life as I will once again be completely housebound.

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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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. Crews Hill is a unique part of Enfield and there's probably nowhere else like it in London. It developed to provide London with vegetables, plants and flowers and over the years the many garden centres have grown up. 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. Most are family run businesses handed down the generations, both owned and tenanted, many of whom would find it difficult if not impossible to relocate.

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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Re. Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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. My responses to the consultation questions below reflect my beliefs 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.

Question 1 –

I have identified the following policies that are still Relevant because they highlight the importance of and/or protect the Green Belt:

Core Strategy: 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 20, 21, 25, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36.

Development Management Document: 59, 61-65, 72-75, 77, 82-91.

The following policies that relate to the Green Belt need to be Changed:

Core Strategy: 29 and 32 should be changed to reflect the importance of the Green Belt to these functions.

Development Management Document: 71, 78, 79 and 80 should remove the loopholes that make the stated protection dubious.

Several policies in both documents need to be changed to allow changes of land use [excluding the Green Belt] that would permit mixed use development.

Question 2 –

1. NO GREEN BELT SITES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED FOR RELEASE. GROWTH CAN BE ACCOMMODATED ON PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND/ BROWNFIELD.

2. Enfield RoadWatch and CPRE-London have compiled a comprehensive register of brownfield opportunities of all types and sizes which shows sufficient sites for housing and infrastructure during the plan period and beyond.

3. The A10 Retail Parks and Southbury area should be masterplanned before piecemeal development picks away at the prime sites. With increased train service, this area could provide a new mixed-use community of many more homes than Meridian Water.

4. Enfield's Strategic Industrial Locations [SIL] need to be masterplanned so that areas closest to public transport can be released for mixed use development, while other areas can be intensified through stacking or better land-use, with no loss of employment.

Question 3 –

a) All the options listed on page 9 are worth exploring, except for the final option which

suggests revisiting the Green Belt boundaries, which is unnecessary, given that a robust, thorough and professional boundary review was conducted, approved and adopted in 2013. To quote the Council itself: *The review's primary objective is to provide for a strong defensible Green Belt boundary that will endure and protect the openness and rural character of the surrounding countryside of Enfield from encroachment. The review provides an understanding of the current strengths and weaknesses of the existing Green Belt boundaries and has in turn recommended amending the boundary where appropriate to provide certainty **over the next 15 to 20 years**.* Another boundary review should not be needed until 2028 at the earliest.

b) The Council should explore the development opportunities offered by possible increased service on the Liverpool Street – Cheshunt line, which would allow some development and improvements on suitable sites at Southbury and Turkey Street Stations, in addition to Edmonton Green. It should also explore the possibility of reinstating the Carterhatch Lane Station on this line between Southbury and Turkey Street, to permit some development in that area.

c) The Local Plan revision should not be used as a reason to release Green Belt. It is unnecessary.

d) Please see my response to Q2.

e) The suggested options will definitely contribute to the accommodation of Enfield's growing population. However, these options need to be combined with creative masterplanning of several large sites, including the Southbury/A10 corridor, Brimsdown and Edmonton Green and its surrounds, and more estate regeneration, all in conjunction with transportation upgrades. All these solutions together will not only provide good homes for the borough's residents, but will create new vibrant communities and improvements in deprived areas. THERE IS NO NEED TO BUILD ON THE GREEN BELT!

Question 4 –

a) Yes!

b) The options are not clear, but I would support a policy that values and protects Enfield's heritage and culture.

d) Hard to answer without a definition of 'appropriate'.

Question 5 –

a) Yes

b) Depends on the location

c) Yes

Question 8 –

Please refer to my response to Q2 about the brownfield register.

Question 10 –

c) Please refer to my responses to Q2 and Q3.

d) Industry should not be moved into the Green Belt. Additional employment space can be achieved by mixed-use development and intensification of existing industrial sites.

Question 13 –

All of the above, plus leisure centres, Council offices, transport hubs and retail.

Question 14 –

c) The importance of open and blue spaces cannot be judged by their quality, accessibility or size. Open spaces serve a wide variety of purposes. In addition to the traditional five purposes of the Green Belt, a long list of environmental, economic and social benefits have now been identified including:

- Creating a sense-of-place and facilitating community cohesion;
- Increasing physical activity for adults and children;
- Adapting to climate change through CO2 absorption, shading or flood alleviation;
- Improving mental health;
- Creating more attractive places to work, live and visit;
- Encouraging active transport like walking and cycling;
- Improving air quality;
- Improving water quality by reducing harmful runoff into local rivers; and
- Enhancing biodiversity and opportunities for wildlife.

Therefore, open spaces, including Green Belt sites, which may appear inaccessible or of low quality, are in fact serving very important functions. For these reasons, all our Green Belt sites should be preserved and protected. I would also like to reinforce my response to Q2 that another Green Belt Boundary Review is unnecessary because the 2013 review is still valid.

d) and e) I refer you to my previous response. Open spaces, including the Green Belt, serve many functions and should be preserved and protected.

h) It can contribute a lot by not building on the Green Belt!

Question 16 –

c) Protect the Green Belt and don't suggest building on it.

I look forward to a Draft Local Plan that has creative solutions and does not target any sections of the Green Belt for de-designation.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Re. Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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. My responses to the consultation questions below reflect my beliefs 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.

Question 1 –

I have identified the following policies that are still Relevant because they highlight the importance of and/or protect the Green Belt:

Core Strategy: 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 20, 21, 25, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36.

Development Management Document: 59, 61-65, 72-75, 77, 82-91.

The following policies that relate to the Green Belt need to be Changed:

Core Strategy: 29 and 32 should be changed to reflect the importance of the Green Belt to these functions.

Development Management Document: 71, 78, 79 and 80 should remove the loopholes that make the stated protection dubious.

Several policies in both documents need to be changed to allow changes of land use [excluding the Green Belt] that would permit mixed use development.

Question 2 –

1. NO GREEN BELT SITES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED FOR RELEASE. GROWTH CAN BE ACCOMMODATED ON PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND/ BROWNFIELD.
2. Enfield RoadWatch and CPRE-London have compiled a comprehensive register of brownfield opportunities of all types and sizes which shows sufficient sites for housing and infrastructure during the plan period and beyond.
3. The A10 Retail Parks and Southbury area should be masterplanned before piecemeal development picks away at the prime sites. With increased train service, this area could provide a new mixed-use community of many more homes than Meridian Water.

4. Enfield's Strategic Industrial Locations [SIL] need to be masterplanned so that areas closest to public transport can be released for mixed use development, while other areas can be intensified through stacking or better land-use, with no loss of employment.

Question 3 –

a) All the options listed on page 9 are worth exploring, except for the final option which suggests revisiting the Green Belt boundaries, which is unnecessary, given that a robust, thorough and professional boundary review was conducted, approved and adopted in 2013. To quote the Council itself: *The review's primary objective is to provide for a strong defensible Green Belt boundary that will endure and protect the openness and rural character of the surrounding countryside of Enfield from encroachment. The review provides an understanding of the current strengths and weaknesses of the existing Green Belt boundaries and has in turn recommended amending the boundary where appropriate to provide certainty **over the next 15 to 20 years.*** Another boundary review should not be needed until 2028 at the earliest.

b) The Council should explore the development opportunities offered by possible increased service on the Liverpool Street – Cheshunt line, which would allow some development and improvements on suitable sites at Southbury and Turkey Street Stations, in addition to Edmonton Green. It should also explore the possibility of reinstating the Carterhatch Lane Station on this line between Southbury and Turkey Street, to permit some development in that area.

c) The Local Plan revision should not be used as a reason to release Green Belt. It is unnecessary.

d) Please see my response to Q2.

e) The suggested options will definitely contribute to the accommodation of Enfield's growing population. However, these options need to be combined with creative masterplanning of several large sites, including the Southbury/A10 corridor, Brimsdown and Edmonton Green and its surrounds, and more estate regeneration, all in conjunction with transportation upgrades. All these solutions together will not only provide good homes for the borough's residents, but will create new vibrant communities and improvements in deprived areas. **THERE IS NO NEED TO BUILD ON THE GREEN BELT!**

Question 4 –

a) Yes!

b) The options are not clear, but I would support a policy that values and protects Enfield's heritage and culture.

d) Hard to answer without a definition of 'appropriate'.

Question 5 –

- a) Yes
- b) Depends on the location
- c) Yes

Question 8 –

Please refer to my response to Q2 about the brownfield register.

Question 10 –

- c) Please refer to my responses to Q2 and Q3.
- d) Industry should not be moved into the Green Belt. Additional employment space can be achieved by mixed-use development and intensification of existing industrial sites.

Question 13 –

All of the above, plus leisure centres, Council offices, transport hubs and retail.

Question 14 –

c) The importance of open and blue spaces cannot be judged by their quality, accessibility or size. Open spaces serve a wide variety of purposes. In addition to the traditional five purposes of the Green Belt, a long list of environmental, economic and social benefits have now been identified including:

- Creating a sense-of-place and facilitating community cohesion;
- Increasing physical activity for adults and children;
- Adapting to climate change through CO2 absorption, shading or flood alleviation;
- Improving mental health;
- Creating more attractive places to work, live and visit;
- Encouraging active transport like walking and cycling;
- Improving air quality;
- Improving water quality by reducing harmful runoff into local rivers; and
- Enhancing biodiversity and opportunities for wildlife.

Therefore, open spaces, including Green Belt sites, which may appear inaccessible or of low quality, are in fact serving very important functions. For these reasons, all our Green Belt sites should be preserved and protected. I would also like to reinforce my response to Q2 that another Green Belt Boundary Review is unnecessary because the 2013 review is still valid.

d) and e) I refer you to my previous response. Open spaces, including the Green Belt, serve many functions and should be preserved and protected.

h) It can contribute a lot by not building on the Green Belt!

Question 16 –

- c) Protect the Green Belt and don't suggest building on it.

I look forward to a Draft Local Plan that has creative solutions and does not target any sections of the Green Belt for de-designation.

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

To whom it may concern:

I have had time to look over the proposal for the local plan and I have some huge concerns with regard to how it would affect the area where I live.

Hadley Wood is connected to central London by a train service. However, there are only 4 trains per hour, and fewer at the weekend. In order to get to a supermarket, doctors or hospital one has no option but to go by car or taxi. The train service does not link into the bus network in a meaningful way. (there are 3 buses a day to Barnet High Street! Not even to the hospital!)

I therefore consider it unreasonable to say that Hadley Wood should be a centre for growth on the basis of it having good public transport. It is extremely poorly served by public transport, despite being in Oyster zone 6.

I strongly believe that Hadley Wood is not an appropriate area to target housing growth and should be explicitly excluded from the council's growth strategy due to limited public transport as well as poor public services: it has no bank, pharmacy, NHS doctor, NHS dentist, secondary school, post office, public house, supermarket etc.

The proposal suggests that in future there might be a presumption of planning approval for small sites. I urge you to state that this is only in areas with adequate public services (transport, schools, NHS services) or planned investment in such services.

Hadley Wood is in effect a semi-rural area, surrounded by Green Belt on all sides. I understand that the plan does not allow for significant changes to Green Belt. This means that there are limited areas for new housing development in Hadley Wood.

I trust you will give due consideration to my comments.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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 particularly 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 National Planning Policy Framework, and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan.

Thank you for taking my views into consideration on this important consultation.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Housing is obviously important, and I understand the Council's need to serve Enfield's requirements in that respect. However, I strongly object to its proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other development whilst brown field sites are available. The Green Belt is a precious resource that should be protected and preserved for future generations.

I am particularly concerned that Crews Hill has been singled out for release from the Green Belt. The businesses there provide employment and a resource for people from Enfield and beyond. Instead of losing Crews Hill to additional 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. 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 far 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.

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

Dear Sirs,

Having been born and lived in the borough over nearly 75 years I find these plans for so much development very upsetting and worrying.

Crews Hill and Enfield Road are very special places in the borough and should not be used for property development.

The population of this small island is growing at a unsustainable level.

Please carefully look again over the whole borough and find areas that are more acceptable to the residents of Enfield for the building of new developments.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

No building on Greenbelt Land.

Dear Enfield Council,

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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 particularly 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 National Planning Policy Framework, and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan.

Personally my family and I enjoy spending time in our beautiful local environment and it would be heart-breaking to lose that.

Thank you for taking my views into consideration on this important consultation.

Dear Sirs

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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 primarily concerned about future development of the land alongside Bramley Road. The area is already very developed and the road frequently very congested. The infrastructure just manages to serve the existing population: doctors' surgeries are full and it is difficult to get appointments as it is. This land should remain as a green resource beneficial to people's enjoyment of the environment and their enhanced mental health.

I am also 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. It is a great asset to the community. 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 National Planning Policy Framework, and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan.

Thank you for taking my views into consideration on this important consultation.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

My family have lived & breathed Crews Hill since 1969. We regularly use the garden centres & oppose any other housing/building on these sites. ☺

Dear Enfield Council

Re. Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Public Consultation (Regulation 18)

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

I have chosen to respond by email because of the disparity between the online and printed versions of the questionnaire and the difficulty in addressing some issues using either. My response is based on the questions in the printed version with additional comments.

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. My responses to the consultation questions below reflect my beliefs 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.

Question 1 – Current Local Plan

I have identified the following policies that are still **R**elevant because they highlight the Importance of and/or protect the Green Belt:

Core Strategy: 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 20, 21, 25, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36.

Development Management Document: 59, 61-65, 72-75, 77, 82-91.

The following policies that relate to the Green Belt need to be **C**hanged:

Core Strategy: 29 and 32 should be changed to reflect the importance of the Green Belt to

these functions.

Development Management Document: 71, 78, 79 and 80 should remove the loopholes that make the stated protection dubious.

Several policies in both documents need to be changed to allow changes of land use [excluding the Green Belt] that would permit mixed use development.

Question 2 – Key Priorities - sites

1. NO GREEN BELT SITES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED FOR RELEASE. GROWTH CAN BE ACCOMMODATED ON PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND/ BROWNFIELD.
2. Enfield RoadWatch CPRE-London and The Enfield Society have compiled a comprehensive register of brownfield opportunities of all types and sizes, *Space to Build, Enfield*, which shows sufficient sites for housing and infrastructure during the plan period and beyond.
3. The A10 Retail Parks and Southbury area should be masterplanned before piecemeal development picks away at the prime sites. With increased train service, this

area could provide a new mixed-use community of many more homes than Meridian Water.

4. Enfield's Strategic Industrial Locations [SIL] need to be masterplanned so that areas closest to public transport can be released for mixed use development, while other areas can be intensified through stacking or better land-use, with no loss or or even increase in employment.

Question 3 – Key Priorities – growth options

a) All the options listed on page 9 are worth exploring, **except** for the final option which suggests revisiting the Green Belt boundaries, which is unnecessary, given that a robust, thorough and professional boundary review was conducted, approved and adopted in 2013. To quote the Council itself: *The review's primary objective is to provide for a strong defensible Green Belt boundary that will endure and protect the openness and rural character of the surrounding countryside of Enfield from encroachment. The review provides an understanding of the current strengths and weaknesses of the existing Green Belt boundaries and has in turn recommended amending the boundary where appropriate to provide certainty over the next 15 to 20 years.* Another boundary review should not be needed until 2028 at the earliest.

In relation to the Green Belt I am disappointed that the full Regulation 18 document makes no provision for protecting or promoting agriculture in the borough. This is a direct departure from the 2014 DMD which makes special mention of its historic and current importance. Growing food locally is becoming increasingly relevant for environmental and economic reasons and its importance is recognised in the GLA's *Farming in London's Green Belt* report of Dec 2018. The emerging Local Plan should include policies to encourage, promote and protect agriculture and productive use of agricultural land in the borough.

One of the options in the consultation document is to look at development in the Crews Hill area due to the railway link, the fact the Green Belt is already partly developed in this area and its strategic location on the London-Stansed-Cambridge Innovation Corridor. I believe that the Green Belt needs to remain a complete circle around London to provide essential open space, cleaner air and a wildlife corridor; it has protected London since the mid-20th century. Once you erode the Green Belt that erosion is likely to continue due to pressures on adjacent land. It is also noted that although Crews Hill Railway Station provides a railway service, there are no other public facilities (schools, medical facilities, etc.) and non- railway links are very poor. There is only a very limited bus service between Crews Hill and Enfield Town. Crews Hill is not a sustainable location given the very limited services available within that settlement. If a settlement is going to provide appropriate services then there would have to be a huge expansion which would fly in the face of Green Belt policy. Housing development in Crews Hill would also displace many successful small tenant businesses that have been there for decades.

b) The Council should explore the development opportunities offered by possible increased service on the Liverpool Street – Cheshunt line, which would allow some development and improvements on suitable sites at Southbury and Turkey Street Stations, in addition to Edmonton Green. It should also explore the possibility of reinstating the Carterhatch Lane Station on this line between Southbury and Turkey

Street, to permit some development in that area.

- c) The Local Plan revision should not be used as a reason to release Green Belt. It is unnecessary.
- d) Please see my response to Q2.
- e) The suggested options will definitely contribute to the accommodation of Enfield's growing population. However, these options need to be combined with creative masterplanning of several large sites, including the Southbury/A10 corridor, Brimsdown and Edmonton Green and its surrounds, and more estate regeneration, all in conjunction with transportation upgrades. All these solutions together will not only provide good homes for the borough's residents, but will create new vibrant communities and improvements in deprived areas. THERE IS NO NEED TO BUILD ON THE GREEN BELT!

Question 4 – Enhancing Heritage and Culture

- a) Yes!
- b) I would support a policy that values and protects Enfield's heritage and culture and such a policy should be incorporated in the emerging Local Plan.
- d) Hard to answer without a definition of 'appropriate'.

Question 5 – Design excellence

- a) Yes
- b) Depends on the location
- c) Yes

Question 8 – Self-build sites

Please refer to my response to Q2 about the *Space to Build, Enfield* report.

Question 10 – Promoting a competitive economy

- c) Please refer to my responses to Q2 and Q3.
- d) Industry should **not** be moved into the Green Belt. Additional employment space can be achieved by mixed-use development and intensification of existing industrial sites.

Question 13 – Community and Social infrastructure

All of the above, plus leisure centres, Council offices, transport hubs and retail.

Question 14 – Enfield's Green and Blue Spaces

c) The importance of open and blue spaces cannot be judged by their quality, accessibility or size. Open spaces serve a wide variety of purposes. In addition to the traditional five purposes of the Green Belt, a long list of environmental, economic and social benefits have now been identified including:

- Creating a sense-of-place and facilitating community cohesion;
- Increasing physical activity for adults and children;
- Adapting to climate change through CO2 absorption, shading or flood alleviation;
- Improving mental health;
- Creating more attractive places to work, live and visit;
- Encouraging active transport like walking and cycling;
- Improving air quality;
- Improving water quality by reducing harmful runoff into local rivers; and
- Enhancing biodiversity and opportunities for wildlife.

Therefore, open spaces, including Green Belt sites, which may appear inaccessible or of low quality, are in fact serving very important functions. For these reasons, all our Green Belt sites should be preserved and protected. I would also like to reinforce my response to Q2 that another Green Belt Boundary Review is unnecessary because the 2013 review is still valid.

d) and e) I refer you to my previous response. Open spaces, including the Green Belt, serve many functions and should be preserved and protected.

h) It can contribute a lot by not building on the Green Belt!

Question 16 – Environmental impact

c) Protect the Green Belt and don't suggest building on it.

I look forward to a Draft Local Plan that has creative solutions and does not target any sections of the Green Belt for de-designation.

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

Dear Sir or Madam

I am responding to your call for comments on future development of Enfield having read through your alternative proposals.

I agree that it is important to retain local control of the development of the area and appreciate the need to be ready for the predicted growth over the next few years. There will be a need for good quality, affordable housing and the associated employment and infrastructure to cater for this growth so it is important that the council reviews and updates the existing plan.

I would favour the development, as far as possible, of existing "brownfield" sites. I understand the CPRE/Enfield Society paper "Space to build" identifies areas suitable for sustainable development without the need to build on areas currently protected. Existing town centres should be enhanced. There are already plenty of empty retail units in our towns and thought should be given to supporting these centres and Enfield market.

I would be opposed to building on green belt areas. I feel that this would be the thin edge of the wedge once development is allowed there. It is not clear from your plan but I understand Crews Hill is at high risk of becoming a potential area for development and cannot see why. This appears to be thriving area, always busy and the concentration of nurseries offer a "niche" service which people from a wide area use.

I am sorry I have not had time to read all the supporting reports referred to in your proposals but hope that my comments are of assistance. I look forward to the next stage of the process.

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

lovely area,
no need for renovation.

To Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

The previous proposals to allow a school along Enfield Road indicates a failure to look at proposals in the round. A school in that location would have drawn considerable extra traffic in concentrated times of the day to a road that already struggles to cope at peak times of the day.

Careful use of previously developed land must be a more sensible way forward.

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

Enfield Council; Strategic Planning and Design
Consultation Responses

Local Plan Team

I attach two consultation responses

1. The Draft Enfield Heritage Strategy which is largely a summary of facts influencing the future Planning of the Borough.

2. Statements and Questions regarding the Direction and Growth of new Development and Studies for the New Local Plan.

While I represent the Winchmore Hill Green and Vicars Moor Lane Conservation Area on the Conservation Advisory Group the attached comments are personal and not necessarily an opinion of the Group.

ENFIELD LOCAL PLAN

Q.1 Current Local Plan

Now out of date.

Q.2 Key Priorities

Site availability is not a key element in influencing Strategy

Q.3 Key Strategies to meet Key Priorities

Clearly the principle strategy for the new Plan is the provision of substantially more Housing. This should not be located where currently there is spare or underused land as this is unlikely to satisfy the new occupants requirements. They should be placed where people want to live, be close to facilities and work and close to lines of communication.

This tends to suggest that this growth be located where growth has happened before and where development had previously been concentrated, again along lines of communication.

While existing vacant land or brownfield sites might enable some development this is highly unlikely to meet the space demands. Many small vacant sites have a value which meets and maintains the Heritage Character of the Borough where open space and low density is an essential part.

This outlines a Borough which will result in contrasting areas of high density, low density and open space which should hopefully reflect the pattern of Conservation.

Q.4 Heritage and Culture

The areas of High Density Development should be along the current lines of major routes of communication to maintain the geography of the area and previous investment

The plan should be quite specific in the design principles and uses within them and any structures of historic or cultural value will need to be treated with care.

In the areas of quality heritage there should be a strict control of design especially the maintenance of period detailing and the enlargement or expansion of historic structures should be discouraged.

Q.5 Design Excellence

In areas of growth (Development Areas) clear instructions must be given or agreed concerning the massing, size, shape and correlation particularly of high buildings and the inclusion of open space. No limits should be given on the height of point blocks.

In areas where the existing buildings and their character are to be maintained buildings in gardens should be discouraged.

Q.6 Affordable Homes

Clearly the current ratio of affordable homes to the overall "mix" is wrong and is a result of the introduction of the policy of selling affordable rented housing at a discount to the existing tenants. The pool of properly affordable housing has still not recovered. This should now be addressed by the higher provision of subsidised rented housing managed by the local authority or housing associations.

The standards of space and quality should be no different between low-cost rented accommodation and low-cost part ownership. Ideally these standards should also apply as a minimum to private housing.

The mix of house sizes and types should be stated in the Plan for all private development.

Q.7 Housing Needs

Housing for the Elderly should be provided with, as a minimum, wardens permanently on site. This housing should be located close to shops and community facilities

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation.

I am opposed to building in Enfield's Green Belt. Enfield is special because of its Green Belt and open spaces. Local wildlife, recreation and food production would be negatively affected if the Green Belt is built on.

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.

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

Dear Enfield Council

Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important 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.

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

Get rid of councillors who are paid too much.