

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.

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

---

## 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 and I would ask that the future of our 'green and pleasant Enfield' is given very serious consideration to protect and ensure that Enfield remains green and pleasant, for its wildlife, for us and our future generations.

---

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 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 have the following comments on Enfield's Draft Local Plan for which consultation closes on 28th February 2019. I support much of what is proposed but have specific comments on the following:

Enfield's Green and Blue Spaces (Q14 in your questionnaire)

I understand the temptation to use the Green Belt to meet Enfield's housing targets, but 5% of the Green Belt is too large a proportion, The danger is that once a proportion of this size is given up there will be a request for further slices as a precedent will have been set. However, if portions of the Green Belt which have been used for Agricultural, Horticultural or similar purposes become available because such uses are no longer viable they should be considered for small scale housing. I estimate that a 5% portion would mean an area double the size of the Rosewood Estate at Crews Hill which in turn would need its own infrastructure (enhanced sewers, gas, electricity and water mains), social facilities such as a doctor's surgery, bus route and possibly a new or enlarged primary school. Providing these to an enclave in the middle of the Green Belt would be costly and very disruptive to the Green Belt surrounding the development as the linking roads are narrow and unsuited to heavy or sustained vehicular traffic. Much greater use of private vehicles is also likely to arise if residents of these new houses have to travel to work or education from remoter localities. This is counter to the aims of the Plan for the environment and sustainable movement and transport.

Sustainable Movement and Transport (Q15 in your questionnaire)

Private vehicle use will only be discouraged if there is frequent and affordable public transport to the places residents want to travel to ie places of work, schools, medical facilities, shops. Chase Farm Hospital has inadequate transport connectons to the West of the Borough and to the hospital facilities it does not provide but are available at Barnet. Enhanced cycling facilities are no use to parents with young children, the elderly, and anyone shopping for bulky items or doing a weekly grocery shop. Crossrail2 is unlikely to materialise within the timescale of this local plan and does not address the current poor frequency of rail services from the Centre and East of the Borough into Central London.

Housing and Retail (Q11 in your questionnaire)

The plan should include a process for identifying redundant retail facilities which are likely to increase in number in the future. Unwanted large retail "warehouses" in retail parks should be considered for housing development.

---

I have tried to locate the consultation document online without success. Have you any idea why this is? Also it remains impossible to get through to the council by telephone. I would like to put my strongly held view that there is no way green belt land should be built upon. For the first time I find myself in agreement with the Tory party in Enfield there is indeed enough brownfield land that can be used.

---

Dear Councillors

**Objections 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.

Alternatives available to meet housing targets. The Green Belt is a precious resource that should be protected and preserved for future generations.

It is very concerning that Crews Hill has now 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]. The council should consider brownfield land before any proposals regarding Green belt land are even considered. 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 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 have lived and grown up in Enfield all my life and have had the pleasure of experiencing the joy of the Green Belt, to see this resource lost when other areas are available will damage Enfield for ever, my children and their children will never know how beautiful it was.

The same has happened already with the awful eye sore of excessive high rise house building in Enfield, particularly Enfield Town the "market town " look is lost forever.

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.

It's our responsibility to ensure our children and theirs will still have the chance to live in a green area where they can still connect to the nature. I strongly believe there are alternative housing solutions, like decentralising jobs from London for people to consider to less intensively populated cities.

---

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.

## Local Plan Issues & Options Consultation

I would like to express my views on the above Plan.

I support the Local Plan in its aim to make the borough a better place for all.

I appreciate the need for the continued increase in new housing in an expanding borough. I hope these increases can be secured by giving priority to the use of brown field sites and that sufficient attention is given to identifying these sites rather than destroying parts of the Green Belt surrounding the borough. Once the Green Belt is eroded further incursions will occur from time to time.

The Green Belt provides an area of good health both physically and mental for not only those who live

and work in Enfield but far  
beyond, and once lost can never be  
replaced. Enfield is fortunate to  
have such a facility and every care  
should be taken to preserve such a  
precious area for us all before it is  
lost forever.



---

Dear Enfield Council

**Re. Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation**

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation. I am forwarding you this message to include my address at the end of my response.

While I support some housing development and support the ambition to meet Enfield's housing needs, I question with Brexit and the reduction in immigration from continental Europe whether 1800 plus houses per year let alone 3500 need to be built as proposed by the Government Planning Policy Framework Plan. 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 totally precious resource that should be protected and preserved for future generations, including wildlife and insects. **In addition, by using Greenbelt land this will weaken the resolve to build on brownfield sites as Green Belt land is much cheaper to develop. Once you erode the Green Belt the erosion continues due to pressures on adjacent land and increase need for more infrastructure.**

**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 and must BE ACCOMMODATED ON PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND/ BROWNFIELD. build an extension or allow loftspace to be converted; renovate flats above shops.

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 completely unnecessary and counterproductive.

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. You should build on inner borough brown field sites and Golf courses before contemplating renegading on the Green Belt. THERE IS NO NEED TO BUILD ON THE GREEN BELT!

**Some moderate high rise near public transport hubs could be considered in certain allocated planned areas that do not infringe on the existing character or heritage, using safe materials and more than one fire exit route; Higher end attractive apartments mixed with smaller affordable ones with plenty of green spaces and trees and perhaps water with employment opportunities nearby; these could be developed on shabby retail parks that are outdated and failing for example.**

**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 6 - vibrant town centres- Enfield town centre would be more vibrant and revitalised if car parking was charged at other retail parks off Southbury road, for example to make Enfield Town as accessible as the cheaper retail parks and**

continue to wean people off their fossil fuelled cars and onto public transport or an electric bike. Night time economy should be measured to ensure that residents are not disturbed by undue noise and ASB after hours. More early evening theatre/cafe/cabaret would be agreeable and if it were positioned off Enfield town square, it would be welcome instead of yet another bank. An arts festival such as the one held in Greenwich each year would also be a welcome addition attracting families and increasing well-being. Alternative use for the empty shops would be welcomed or lower the business rates to attract viable small businesses in main retail hub but keeping the character of the agreed conservation areas is essential to keep the Enfield heritage in tact.

**Question 8 –**

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

**Question 9 - mini holland scheme should be finished to make a complete network and could be extended to incorporate and promote young adult and adult electric scooter travel, the upcoming craze or other sustainable small vehicles.**

**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; this must be taken as an absolute plus as people are realigned with nature.
- 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. Green areas keep biodiversity up and provide homes for the declining insect population on which our ecosystem survives.

In addition, more of the Green Belt could be used to support sustainable organic farming and local produce for city dwellers to help the people of Enfield and other boroughs reengage with nature and relearn about where the food comes from - rather like at Forty Hall farm. Woodland Kindergartens could be introduced- perhaps in Trent Park.

Crewshill acts a a good centre for nurseries to help people interact with nature through gardening, growing vegetables and tending flowers helping to optimise mental health. If Crewshill were turned into houses then this asset would be lost forever. No doubt soon another junction with the M25 will be sought to accommodate the influx of road traffic. CrewsHill should develop as a resource for recreation, learning and experiencing nature such as through nurseries which is vital for every city dweller to maintain a well-balanced sustainable life style.

We will possibly need it for allotments to grow food if the economy collapses with the pending mooted disasters such as climate change! The post second WW policy was to make sure Britain could be self-sufficient in food. We may be grateful for the Green Belt for this in the future.

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. However, the use of the green belt as an area for recreation could be promoted by a public health campaign throughout the London transport network as well as the borough for example. 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. Leave our priceless Green Belt protected. The longer it lasts the higher its value to the people of Enfield and London as a whole and I do not only mean in monetary value.

The comments provided in my response to this consultation are my own views and some from my late Dr Chris Jephcott, former President of the Enfield Society. He will be spinning in his grave over the border in New Southgate at the idea of building on the Green Belt. Do not be shortsighted. Solve the regeneration issues by creative sustainable redevelopment on brownfield sites and existing built up areas, in keeping with the heritage plan. Simple.

---

Dear Enfield Council

**Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation (and response to Heritage Plan)**

Thank you for your efforts to generate a large response to this important consultation.

While I support the overall ambition to meet Enfield's housing needs, in particular to prioritise affordable housing, I strongly object to any proposal to release Green Belt land for housing or other purposes. The whole purpose of the Green Belt is to provide an absolute constraint and protection for our precious and limited open countryside and green open spaces from development for present and future generations.

All future development needs to be shaped by this requirement. If the Green Belt is nibbled away at once, more will follow, propelled by the relative cheapness of green field development compared to brown field. This line must NOT be crossed. And there is no need - there is adequate space to use brown field sites and poorly utilised, low density shopping and light industrial sites near the A10 in particular to accommodate higher density, high quality housing units.

**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. Brown field sites and existing sites can meet all the borough's needs.
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. Any visit to the shopping areas east of the A10 shows that these sites involve a lot of land, with poorly designed low density parking and much land wastage. The master plan for this area needs to evaluate the cost and potential of multi-storey or underground car parks to release further space for development, to maximise effective use of space. Instead of low density single storey shops of poor quality scattered about, the potential exists for consolidating retail space more effectively on more than one storey. American-style spread out retail parks are incompatible with the space constraints in a London borough. Developments could be of much higher density and incorporate well-designed residential apartments and community facilities to increase revenue, security and a sense of community.
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. The Borough must not give the impression that the Green Belt should be anything other than inviolable and permanent.

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 railway 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 master plans, founded on best practice in other boroughs and cities, for 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. High quality, high density medium-rise development could be considered near existing public transport hubs distant from the green belt and conservation areas. High end, attractive apartments mixed with smaller affordable units and social housing with improved transport links could be developed as a way of improving the space utilisation and functionality of the shabby retail parks near the A10 in particular. High rise buildings next to the conservation area of Enfield town for example would not be appropriate. Only moderate sized buildings would fit the local character and heritage.

### 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) What do you mean in this instance by 'appropriate'?

### Question 5 –

a) Yes

b) Depends on the location

c) Yes

**Question 6 - Vibrant town centres:** Enfield town centre would be more vibrant and revitalised if car parking was charged at other retail parks off Southbury road, for example. Further efforts should be made to encourage travel by bus or bike, though additional cycle lanes should not follow the controversial design used on Green Lanes etc.

The Night time economy should be balanced to ensure that town centre residents are not disturbed by undue noise and ASB at night in particular. More early evening theatre/cafe/cabaret premises in Enfield Town may with care have a role to play to offset the decline in overall retail space which is likely to continue due to the switch to online shopping. Long term vacant units should be transitioned into carefully designed residential units to stop derelict shop fronts damaging the perception of town centres as vibrant or attractive places to visit. A policy of encouraging entertainment or eateries rather than banks would help the role of the Square to act as a cultural and community hub.

A small number of well-managed, small to medium size late night music venues can contribute to a vibrant town centre, but it is vital that licence conditions are adhered to.

The Borough should also join campaigns for lower business rates, as are typical in most European towns and cities, to help the growth and viability of small retail businesses in main retail hub. It is essential that the unique character of conservation areas in Enfield Town and other town centres is maintained, not only to preserve our heritage but to promote a diverse and vibrant local economy. Good design can draw in visitors and customers.

**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) There is no case to move industrial development to green belt sites. Additional employment space can be achieved through well designed, mixed-use development and intensification of existing industrial sites. Working with the Mayor on transport solutions can allow density to rise, in both residential and industrial applications.

**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 have many purposes. In addition to the traditional five purposes of the Green Belt, other environmental, economic and social benefits include:

- Creating a sense-of-place and space 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 and the maintenance of a healthy insect population in particular.

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

Crews Hill: I would like to stress the importance of Crews Hill as a successful centre for nurseries to help people interact with nature through gardening, growing vegetables and tending flowers, a vital role both to improve the Borough's environment and to support mental health. It also draws in visitors and customers from well outside the Borough's boundaries, and is a key part of the Borough's local retail offer and economy. If Crews Hill nurseries are scrapped and turned into housing, this key economic, social and environmental asset would be lost forever. It would also not be in keeping with the constraints of the Green Belt. Crews Hill should continue as a hub for nurseries and garden centres, building on best practice to encourage good design and better public transport access.

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.

## B Heritage Plan: Comments

The heritage plan should include the green belt as a core part of Enfield's heritage to be protected. This includes Crews Hill as a historically important market gardening area which should not be changed to a residential area.

The borough's 'Vision' sounds like a contradiction in terms. The Council needs to be clear what the scope of change will be and be more robust in explaining how it will conserve the heritage and character of the borough, oppose bad design, and keep historic place names and pub names (such as the George in Church Street) as far as possible. There should be an explicit policy to protect the character (and name) of historic pubs.

The heritage plan should also include the commitment to design quality underpinning place-making through conservation of the historic environment. Good design in new build is also imperative to keep "place-making" in Enfield and keep it an attractive place to live.

I am concerned that the management of conservation areas may be reviewed every five years - does this mean the boundaries will be reviewed every 5 years (something I would not support) or would the management mean overseeing that conservation areas meet article 4 Direction every 5 years? This needs to be clarified in order that the landscape heritage is not put at risk from developer pressures.

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 (and response to Heritage Plan)

I would like to give a considered response to your consultation. I visit Enfield frequently as my husband grew up there and many members of his family still live in the Borough.

While I support the overall ambition to meet Enfield's housing needs, in particular to prioritise affordable housing, I strongly object to any proposal to release Green Belt land for housing or other purposes. The whole purpose of the Green Belt is to provide an absolute constraint and protection for our precious and limited open countryside and green open spaces from development for present and future generations.

All future development needs to be shaped by this requirement. If the Green Belt is nibbled away at once, more will follow, propelled by the relative cheapness of green field development compared to brown field. This line must NOT be crossed. And there is no need - there is adequate space to use brown field sites and poorly utilised, low density shopping and light industrial sites near the A10 in particular to accommodate higher density, high quality housing units.

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. Brown field sites and existing sites can meet all the borough's needs.

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. I support their approach.

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. Any visit to the shopping areas east of the A10 shows that these sites involve a lot of land, with poorly designed low density parking and much land wastage. The master plan for this area needs to evaluate the cost and potential of multi-storey or underground car parks to release further space for development, to maximise effective use of space. Instead of low density

single storey shops of poor quality scattered about, the potential exists for consolidating retail space more effectively on more than one storey.

American-style spread out retail parks are incompatible with the space constraints in a London borough. Developments could be of much higher density and incorporate well-designed residential apartments and community facilities to increase revenue, security and a sense of community.

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. The Borough must not give the impression that the Green Belt should be anything other than inviolable and permanent.

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 railway 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 master plans, founded on best practice in other boroughs and cities, for 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.

High quality, high density medium-rise development could be considered near existing public transport hubs distant from the green belt and conservation areas. High end, attractive apartments mixed with smaller affordable units and social housing with improved transport links could be developed as a way of improving the space utilisation and functionality of the shabby retail parks near the A10 in particular. High rise buildings next to the conservation area of Enfield town for example would not be appropriate. Only moderate sized buildings would fit the local character and heritage.

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) What do you mean in this instance by 'appropriate'?

Question 5 –

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

Question 6 - Vibrant town centres: Enfield town centre would be more vibrant and revitalised if car parking was charged at other retail parks off Southbury road, for example. Further efforts should be made to encourage travel by bus or bike, though additional cycle lanes should not follow the controversial design used on Green Lanes etc.

The Night time economy should be balanced to ensure that town centre residents are not disturbed by undue noise and ASB at night in particular. More early evening theatre/cafe/cabaret premises in Enfield Town may with care have a role to play to offset the decline in overall retail space which is likely to continue due to the switch to online shopping. Long term vacant units should be transitioned into carefully designed residential units to stop derelict shop fronts damaging the perception of town centres as vibrant or attractive places to visit. A policy of encouraging entertainment or eateries rather than banks would help the role of the Square to act as a cultural and community hub.

A small number of well-managed, small to medium size late night music venues can contribute to a vibrant town centre, but it is vital that licence conditions are adhered to.

The Borough should also join campaigns for lower business rates, as are typical in most European towns and cities, to help the growth and viability of small retail businesses in main retail hub. It is essential that the unique character of conservation areas in Enfield Town and other town centres is maintained, not only to preserve our heritage but to promote a diverse and vibrant local economy. Good design can draw in visitors and customers.

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) There is no case to move industrial development to green belt sites. Additional employment space can be achieved through well designed, mixed-use development and intensification of existing industrial sites. Working with the Mayor on transport solutions can allow density to rise, in both residential and industrial applications.

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 have many purposes. In addition to the traditional five purposes of the Green Belt, other environmental, economic and social benefits include:

- Creating a sense-of-place and space 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 and the maintenance of a healthy insect population in particular.

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

Crews Hill: I would like to stress the importance of Crews Hill as a successful centre for nurseries to help people interact with nature through gardening, growing vegetables and tending flowers, a vital role both to improve the Borough's environment and to support mental health. It also draws in visitors and customers from well outside the Borough's boundaries, and is a key part of the Borough's local retail offer and economy. If Crews Hill nurseries are scrapped and turned into housing, this key economic, social and environmental asset would be lost forever. It would also not be in keeping with the constraints of the Green Belt. Crews Hill should continue as a hub for nurseries and garden centres, building on best practice to encourage good design and better public transport access.

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.

#### B Heritage Plan: Comments

The heritage plan should include the green belt as a core part of Enfield's heritage to be protected. This includes Crews Hill as a historically important market gardening area which should not be changed to a residential area.

The borough's 'Vision' sounds like a contradiction in terms. The Council needs to be clear what the scope of change will be and be more robust in explaining how it will conserve the heritage and character of the borough, oppose bad design, and keep historic place names and pub names (such as the George in Church Street) as far as possible. There should be an explicit policy to protect the character (and name) of historic pubs.

The heritage plan should also include the commitment to design quality underpinning place-making through conservation of the historic environment. Good design in new build is also imperative to keep "place-making" in Enfield and keep it an attractive place to live.

I am concerned that the management of conservation areas may be reviewed every five years - does this mean the boundaries will be reviewed every 5 years (something I would not support) or would the management mean overseeing that conservation areas meet article 4 Direction every 5 years? This needs to be clarified in order that the landscape heritage is not put at risk from developer pressures.

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



---

Dear Enfield Council

**Re. A Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation and**

**B response to heritage plan.**

Thank you for the opportunity to respond.

While I support some housing development and support the ambition to meet Enfield's housing needs, I question with Brexit and the reduction in immigration from continental Europe whether 1800 plus houses per year let alone 3500 need to be built as proposed by the Government Planning Policy Framework Plan. 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 totally precious resource that should be protected and preserved for future generations, including wildlife and insects. **In addition, by using Greenbelt land this will weaken the resolve to build on brownfield sites as Green Belt land is much cheaper to develop. Once you erode the Green Belt the erosion continues due to pressures on adjacent land and increase need for more infrastructure.**

**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 and must BE ACCOMMODATED ON PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND/ BROWNFIELD.

build extensions to current buildings or allow loftspace to be converted; renovate flats above shops. Change the use of some shops to residential.

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 completely unnecessary and counterproductive.

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. You should build on inner borough brown field sites and Golf courses before contemplating renegading on the Green Belt. **THERE IS NO NEED TO BUILD ON THE GREEN BELT!**

**Some moderate high rise near existing public transport hubs not near the green belt could be considered in certain allocated planned areas that do not infringe on the existing character or heritage, using safe materials and more than one fire exit route; Higher end attractive apartments mixed with smaller affordable ones and social housing with transport links; these could be developed on shabby retail parks that are outdated and failing for example. High rise buildings next to the conservation area of Enfield town for example would not be appropriate. Only moderate sized buildings would fit the local character and heritage.**

**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 6 - vibrant town centres-** Enfield town centre would be more vibrant and revitalised if car parking was charged at other retail parks off Southbury road, for example to make Enfield Town as accessible and attractive to car drivers as the cheaper retail parks and also continue to wean people off polluting cars and onto public transport or an electric bike. Night time economy should be measured to ensure that residents are not disturbed by undue noise and ASB after hours. More early evening theatre/cafe/cabaret would be agreeable and if it were positioned off Enfield Town square, it would be welcome instead of yet another bank. Alternative use for the empty shops would be welcomed or lower the business rates to attract viable small businesses in main retail hub but keeping the character of the agreed conservation areas is essential to keep the Enfield heritage in tact.

**Question 8 –**

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

**Question 9 - .**

**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; this must be taken as an absolute plus as people are realigned with nature.
- 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. Green areas keep biodiversity up and provide homes for the declining insect population on which our ecosystem survives.

Crews Hill acts a historic and good centre for nurseries to help people interact with nature through gardening, growing vegetables and tending flowers helping to optimise mental health. If Crews Hill were turned into houses then this asset would be lost forever. No doubt soon further roads widening will be sought to link with the M25 will be sought to accommodate the influx of road traffic. This is not in keeping with the Green Belt. Crews Hill should continue to be a resource for recreation, learning and experiencing nature such as through nurseries which is vital for every city dweller to maintain a well-balanced sustainable life style. More could be done with Crews Hill and the Greenbelt to achieve the above aims.( For example, children's woodland Kindergartens could be supported.)

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. However, the use of the green belt as an area for recreation could be promoted by a public health campaign throughout the London transport network as well as the borough for example. **I would also like again 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 considerably now and in the future by not building on the Green Belt!

#### **Question 16 –**

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

#### B Heritage Plan Comments

The heritage plan should include the green belt as Enfield heritage to be protected. This includes Crews hill as historically important market gardening that should not be changed to residential area.

Your vision sounds like a contradiction- Heritage for change- engaged, cherished, conserved and enjoyed. On the one hand change - on the other conservation. Though if you mean you will conserve the heritage and character of Enfield, protected from poor cheap design, and keep historic place names and pub names such as the George in Church Street, then I would support it ; ( Why has this been changed to solely O'Neills - the name The George was an important part of Enfield heritage?)

Furthermore, other historic pubs should be sought to be protected. There seems to be no policy to protect pubs anymore in your local plan.

The heritage plan should include the commitment to design quality underpinning placemaking through conservation of the historic environment. Good design in new build is also imperative to keep "place-making" in Enfield and keep it an attractive place to live.

I am concerned that the management of conservation areas may be reviewed every five years- does this mean the boundaries will be reviewed every 5 years- ( something I would not support) or would the management mean overseeing that conservation areas meet article 4 Direction every 5 years. This needs to be clarified in order that the landscape heritage is not put at risk from developers' pressures.

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. Leave our priceless Green Belt protected. The longer it lasts the higher its value to the people of Enfield and London as a whole and I do not only mean in monetary value.

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.

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.

---

To Whom It May Concern

I feel very strongly that destroying the Crews Hill area of Enfield by adding housing would be a loss of a very special area, especially when there are so many brownfield sites to build on.

Please think again.

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.

Have been coming here for years - lovely day out - Please reconsider.

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.

*Do not build on the Green Belt*

---

Dear Sirs

### Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this consultation, albeit given your complete disregard for the public's view on the recent bin collection proposals, I may be wasting my time.

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.

The opportunities to develop on brownfield sites and other areas in the borough are numerous, and there is no reason whatsoever to build on land designated as Green Belt.

The Green Belt is there for a reason - to protect the land around larger urban centres from urban sprawl, and maintain the designated area for forestry and agriculture as well as to provide habitat to wildlife.

Any proposal would be in direct conflict with the Council's own commitments to a healthier environment, and indeed against the Mayor of London's draft London Plan.

The proposals, if progressed, will face fierce resistance from the community. Drop them now and save yourself a lot of time and tax payers' money.

---

Dear Enfield Council,

### **Local Plan For Green Belt**

I understand more than most about the need to build affordable housing, I am a 30 year old teacher and Enfield resident who in the next two years will be looking to buy a house to start a family in. I am sad knowing that I will never be able to afford to live near my parents. I also understand why Crews Hill has been chosen as the prime location for new housing -due to the train station etc .

**But even still - I think that the environment needs to be protected!!**

Crews Hill is an institution, it is famous across London and beyond! Instead of generating an income through building homes, council tax etc (which is ultimately what you want) focus on developing it! Make Enfield famous for it! Run a garden festival - become the next Chelsea Flower Show, get Alan Titchmarsh to do some talks or something. Instead be smart - **invest** in an area that has developed organically. Extend the cycle path to somewhere people actually want to go and lead it to Crews Hill - particularly from Forty Hill. Encourage family days out, get the National Trust involved, build walk ways, coffee shops and restaurants, hold summer festivals and attract families and the grey pound. It is literally all we are famous for anyway - that and the London riots in 2012.

I was born in Chase Farm Hospital (which is shut down), I grew up in an idyllic part of Enfield Lock but had to move once you built a massive estate and now that area is crime ridden and dirty. I went to school in Enfield and I have taught in schools in Enfield (which are all now poor, teachers are leaving because of funding cuts - I taught in a school where parents had to volunteered their time to fix holes in the walls because the school couldn't afford a builder!). I cant even afford to go to Palmers Green my new local high street because parking is too expensive!! I am the prime target audience for your new homes and even I am devastated to think of Crews Hill, a London institution falling by the wayside too.

Turn run down shops into flats to revive the local community. The industrial estates can be improved - I would love to see a map of the brownfield sites in Enfield. Be creative with those! Be known for being innovative with space - don't be lazy and just attack the areas that are green. Don't relax greenbelt laws to build new houses - make the building companies who make million work for their money! Get them to come up with innovative new ideas!

In addition, I wont be able to afford those houses that you're going to build anyway - so I am loosing out both ways. Don't ruin what is left of the nice parts of Enfield.

---

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.

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**

I am writing to let you know that I strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes.

The Green Belt is a precious resource that should be protected and preserved for future generations.

While I support necessary housing development in Enfield, I believe that there are alternatives available to meet the housing targets, for example 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 am alarmed that Crews Hill has been singled out for release from the Green Belt as I believe that 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 must not be lost because of all the many environmental, ecological, economic, public health and other reasons that have been identified.

Enfield 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.

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. We are already choking with fumes in Enfield and heading out to our precious green spaces gives us, and particularly our children, a welcome breath of fresh(er) air. If only for the sake of Londoners' health, we cannot afford to lose these areas.

I live in Crews Hill so am particularly concerned that Crews Hill has been singled out for release from the Green Belt. The garden centres and other businesses 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. Crews Hill was once famous for its plants and nurseries and people came from far and wide. We should be working to build that up again.

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.

---

The London Borough of Enfield

Dear Sir or Madam

**Response to the Local Plan - Issues and Options Consultation**

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation. Whilst I have used some words suggested by others in my reply, I have added my own opinions and carefully considered every last word in this response and so wholeheartedly stand by its content.

I support considered and high quality housing development and the ambition to meet Enfield's housing needs, provided that high standards are maintained and the supporting infrastructure grows with that increase. I also believe that, more strategically, there should be better and more affordable transport links to the surrounding Home Counties. This will enable people to build lives close to and outside of London, and to have a realistic and manageable commute into the city to provide the labour force that our city needs to thrive.

I strongly support the retention of all our green belt land and

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, at all costs. The green belt provides the 'lungs' of our ever growing city and we need to preserve every last acre to help dissipate and absorb the ever growing levels of pollution generated by the growing population. The open land that we benefit from makes living in a city more acceptable and we cannot afford to lose this priceless asset. More housing at any cost is not an option and self defeating.

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. Much of this land is currently an eyesore and left unkempt and to progressively deteriorate over many years. Such land acts as a magnet for fly-tippers; becomes a place where rowdy youths gather and disturb a neighbourhood, often engaging in anti-social behaviour; hoarding is often unsightly too, used for fly-posting and often is not properly maintained and in a state of dangerous mis-repair. One such site, typical of this description, is situated in Enfield Road adjacent to Foxmead Close (EN2) and is one of many examples across the borough.

Owners of such land should be pursued to properly maintain the land and encouraged to develop the land for a meaningful purpose. I believe I may be correct in believing that

there is some legislation that can be brought to bear to stimulate landowners to build homes. If the current legislation is not 'fit for purpose' I believe we should precipitate the debate on this subject.

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 (NPPF). I strongly support the maintenance of the green belt in its entirety and object to the release of any green belt land either in the plan or otherwise.

The comments provided in this response to the consultation are, of course my own, sincerely held views as a resident and supporter of the borough for the best part of my life.

---

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to strongly object to Enfield's plans to build on the green belt. It is extremely important to preserve our green spaces- for our children's health, our air quality and for the environment. There are many brownfield sites throughout the borough which could be utilised.

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.

AS a resident of crews hill we wish to preserve  
the green open spaces.

---

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.

#### **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.

I am very happy to shop here, It is part of my life before Christmas, EASTER, Children are very happy here! please don't destroyed this place! AS we are need it! Thank you.

---

### **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.

---

To: Enfield Council With regard to the above. 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 and appalled 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 the local area 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.

Let's keep Enfield a Green and pleasant place to live! 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 present and 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. I love my garden and these centres throughout the year provide enjoyment for me, my family, friends and neighbours.

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, pleasure 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 Enfield a green and pleasant place to live and grow.

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.

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.

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.

*We must Keep Crews Hill  
for our Health. and our grandchildren.*

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 Crews Hill for the future  
of our kids

---

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

**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.

---

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.

---

We strongly oppose any development on Green Belt land. We do not wish to see this area becoming a concrete jungle with its problems of causing more congestion on our overcrowded roads, not to mention extra burdens on medical services, schools etc. and utilities. We wish to be able to go to the garden centres at Crews Hill so would not want to see these disappear. Green Belt land must be preserved for the health and enjoyment of future generations as well as ourselves.

We hope this will be given very thoughtful consideration.

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.

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.

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

---

**Dear Sirs/Madam**

**I strongly oppose and quite frankly astonished that you are even thinking on building on Green Belt land around Crew Hill .**

**This is a last the last bit of countryside that's left in the Borough of Enfield and building on it will make this just another concrete jungle ,when I first moved here it was purely for the fact that this is a little piece of rural life and just 10 minutes' drive to the hustle and bustle of the town centre. Why on earth would you be thinking of building on it when there are many other sites available and some brownfield sites that would make better use where roads and utilities are already in place.**

**Many days I wake up to see Wildlife on the fields and in the garden which makes this area so different. It forms a break in the urban sprawl and separates the Borough from neighboring areas/Borough of Hertsmere and Broxbourne etc. do you want this connected.**

**Don't you believe in saving the Countryside ,Wildlife or did you just want concrete jungles everywhere ,somewhere where greedy people are just making lots of money.**

**There is no public money to build so this will go to developers building houses at affordable prices (thats a joke) .**

**We have no shops in the Area within walking distance (Local convenience shops need to drive to local shops )no proper roads well not that cope with any more traffic on it a railway station that trains stop twice every hour and sometimes once which are regularly cancelled ,no more room in a very tiny village like school and in some places no pavement what are you thinking of.**

**I have lived here for 5 years and had 2 or 3 water cuts for more than**

**2 or 3 days and electricity loss frequently how will this stand the pressure of more dwellings.**

**The roads are slowly slowly getting busier and busier due to illegal sites (Builders, skips, metal merchants) and their vehicles that are in the area that you Planning do nothing about.**

**When the roads A10 or M25 has a problem it makes our area and road a pollution hellhole with standstill traffic it could take 1 or 2 hours to do a 5 minute journey on Theobalds due to the sheer volume of cars.**

**We have 1 school that is already full and when in use causes serious tailbacks and dropping of and picking up time as we have 2 lanes and when Parents park on one that means a serious volume of cars using one lane so that's cars, Vans and very very often big articulated lorries ,how will this road cope, are you also thinking of widening the roads to accommodate all this nonsense.**

**Save the environment save the Green belt.**

**You are asking us on one hand not to pollute the environment ,get rid of pollution cars etc. yet on the other when it suits you want to add congestion to the one of the only parts of Enfield that still has some fresh air.**

**The area of Crews Hill and its Nurseries that you are planning on changing is used and heard of throughout Europe as the largest congestions of greenhouses in England and maybe throughout the whole of Europe why would you want to change this ? Where will they go? why do you prefer people to go and spend hard earned monies in different areas or different Boroughs.**

**Where will this end, build 10 now ,then 20, then 50, then 100s and in the end we will have an A road cut right through this beautiful part of the borough.**

**I urge you to save wildlife ,save the environment and mostly save the Borough from becoming just another urban sprawl no different to any other borough.**



---

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.

**On a personal level, the Green Belt in and around Enfield is especially important for my autistic learning-disabled adult son, who lives in a Council Flat in Enfield, and whose main activity is walking with his paid Support Workers and myself in the green parks and woods and public gardens in the London Borough of Enfield.**

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.

**On a personal level, the Green Belt in and around Enfield is especially important for my autistic learning-disabled adult son, who lives in a Council Flat in Enfield, and whose main activity is walking with his paid Support Workers and myself in the green parks and woods and public gardens in the London Borough of Enfield.**

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. I am particularly interested in retaining all of Enfield's green spaces. I visit Crews Hill and other green areas in Enfield with my adult autistic son and his Support Workers. We enjoy the plant nurseries and cafes there. My son is physically active and his staff have instructions to take him out walking in green areas as much as possible to keep him physically fit and to improve his mood and concentration.



---

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.

Although I do support housing development and back 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. Once changes have been made to the Green Belt, the possibility of further incursions in the future is strengthened.

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 an important 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, health and other reasons that have been identified. The Council has a duty of care for the public 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.

*[Faint, illegible text and a signature are visible at the bottom of the page.]*

Dear Enfield Council

**Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation**

I am writing in connection to the draft Enfield Local Plan and in particular the option to build on the Green Belt.

While I understand that there is a need for more housing development within Enfield and understand that Enfield Council need to meet this need, I strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes. Having lived in the Borough for the last 9 years, 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 and should not be seen as the easy option to meet the Council's housing targets.

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. It is a benefit to the borough and should be kept and seen as such rather than dismissed and lost. Once this area has gone and been built on there is no getting this lovely area back.

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.

As stated, I have lived in the borough for a while and have seen flats and new housing going up especially around Chase Farm Hospital and Chaseside and more of these new housing developments should be given over to meet the borough's targets for housing the general feeling in the community is that this is not happening.

The Green Belt is too valuable to lose for all the many environmental, ecological, and 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 -please do not build in the green belt**

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important consultation. Whilst I support the need to meet Enfield's housing needs, I strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes.

**Once the green belt is lost it is lost for ever**

I believe 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 strongly held views.



---

### **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

**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

**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 coming here for years  
and will be a great loss for  
it to go.

---

Dear Enfield Council,  
Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation.

I strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes. I believe that there are other alternatives available to meet housing targets and that the Green Belt is a precious resource that should be protected and preserved for future generations.

Whilst I support housing development and support the ambition to meet Enfield's housing needs, 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. Rather than losing Crews Hill to 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, public health and other reasons 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 part 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 the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation.

I strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes. I believe that there are other alternatives available to meet housing targets and that the Green Belt is a precious resource that should be protected and preserved for future generations.

Whilst I support housing development and support the ambition to meet Enfield's housing needs, 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. Rather than losing Crews Hill to 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, public health and other reasons 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 part 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.

---

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.

You reject various planning applications in already developed areas and brownfield sites yet propose to build on Green Belt Land.

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.

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 am very much against building houses on the green belt. I want my children grand children & great grandchildren to enjoy the parks & open spaces. Enfield was a lovely place to live but not anymore between the council & government we are losing all our facilities. HOSPITALS - close farm in plantar when is it all going to end.

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 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**

-  
I am writing in response to the proposals of the Local Plan consultation and would like to take this opportunity to respond to some of the issues raised.

I very strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes. I understand The Council's need to meet Enfield's housing needs but I believe that there are other alternatives available to meet housing targets and that the Green Belt is an **invaluable** resource that should be fervently protected and preserved for future generations.

Enfield's housing targets can be accommodated on previously-built land [brownfield]. Please refer to the report, *Space to Build, Enfield* which was recently published by CPRE-London, Enfield RoadWatch and The Enfield Society which 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. 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.

Creative master planning of several large sites (before piecemeal development picks away at the prime sites) including the Southbury/A10 corridor, Brimsdown and Edmonton Green and its surrounds, all in conjunction with transportation upgrades, should provide good homes for the borough's residents. It would create new vibrant communities and provide a new mixed-use community of many more homes than Meridian Water resulting in improvements in deprived areas and more estate regeneration.

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 IS NO NEED TO BUILD ON THE GREEN BELT! The Green Belt is simply too precious to lose. Open and blue spaces serve an extensive range of purposes. In addition to the traditional five purposes of the Green Belt, a long list of environmental, ecological, public health, 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 and should be protected. Another Green Belt Boundary Review is unnecessary because a 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.

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

I am also concerned that Crews Hill has been singled out for release from the Green Belt. The many garden centres and other businesses in that area provide employment and a resource for people from Enfield and beyond. The horticultural activities at Crews Hill should be encouraged, promoted and enhanced so it can be a centre for food and plant production instead of sacrificing the site for housing.

I hope that the Draft Local Plan that does not target any areas of the Green Belt for de-designation.

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

Thank you.

---

Dear Enfield Council

**Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Public Consultation**

\_Dear sir/madam

we were totally unaware of this....however I want to express my dismay to all the development especially the green belt

Im particularly concerned and therefore oppose any such development on the green belt.

**From:** Zahia Lahouasnia  
**To:** [LocalPlan](#)  
**Subject:** Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation  
**Date:** 28 February 2019 16:43:59

---

Dear Enfield Council

**Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Public Consultation**

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this important public consultation – I understand the deadline for responses is due this afternoon.

Whilst I support housing development and the ambition of meeting 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 and other open spaces are a precious resource that should be protected and preserved for future generations and to maintain air quality and our physical and mental health.

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 i.e. brownfield sites. I refer you to the report, *Space to Build, Enfield* which was recently published by CPRE-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.

Regards

Zahia Lahouasnia 47 Slades Hill Enfield EN2 7dn

---

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

Having grown up in the Borough of Enfield my whole life and being fortunate enough to live in a green borough, I strongly object to the proposal of releasing Green Belt land for housing purposes. I agree that housing development and housing needs are a growing priority for Enfield but the Green Belt should not be sacrificed when other options can be explored.

I was horrified to discover that Crews Hill has been singled out for release from the Green Belt. My colleague who lives in Mill Hill visited Crews Hill last month. As a keen gardener she greatly appreciated the garden centres and was totally enamoured with the surrounding area. She is currently looking to buy another property and has decided to buy in Enfield for the "green spaces and protected landscapes". The garden centres and other businesses should not be overlooked as they are an attraction for people from Enfield and beyond. Local business within Crews Hill that provide local employment should be supported and not overlooked. Instead of losing Crews Hill to housing, its horticultural activities should be encouraged and enhanced so that it can once again be a hub for food and plant production.

I believe that brownfield sites can accommodate Enfield's housing targets and I 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.

Enfield's Green Belt must be protected for future generations and remain as areas of ecological environments for both flora and fauna alike. Yes, the Council has a duty to support the growth of housing needs but the Green belt should be taken out of the local plan to facilitate this growth.

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.

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.

---

Please leave our green belt alone. The pressures on it are all from the wrong people - developers, non residents, people who couldn't care less about Enfield and its residents. A start can be made by refusing to allow houses on the Crews Hill sites like Wyvale and making developers use brown field sites instead.

I applaud Enfield's use of such sites for social housing e.g. at Parsonage Lane and Forty Hill. Keep it up!

---

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.

Crews Hill is great for small business to start and grow and a hub for hobbies like Gardening and Pets.  
As a resident, I feel it shouldn't be changed.

---

The Green Belt was always known as the lungs of London.  
God knows we need it more than ever now.  
Increased traffic noise pollution & of course people.  
Once our countryside has gone its gone for good.  
Where are all these people that need homes coming from????  
There are plenty of so called Brownfield sites to build on.  
Why destroy our countryside?????  
I have lived in my house most of my life & BOY have I seen the quality of life  
diminished through Money Greed & Selfishness in my area alone  
Therefore I'm glad to have trees, grass & open space on my doorstep  
I'm not a NIMBY I care about the environment as whole  
If this destruction of Green Belt land goes ahead it will make GREEDY  
developers even richer  
Keep the green belt intact for our children & their Children & all future  
generations to enjoy  
Don't be so short sighted as to allow this,  
think in the long term & not just to the end of your noses  
Make a courageous decision KEEP THE GREEN BELT INTACT

---

Dear Enfield Council

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

I feel very strongly about the value of the Green Belt and the benefits it has for the local community.

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.

As an Enfield resident for over 40 years and community worker for over 20, I urge you to discount the option of building on such a precious and irreplaceable resource.

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



---

## 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,

We strongly urge you to preserve Enfield's Green Belt and Open Spaces. We have visited Crews Hill this afternoon and much appreciate it as an area where young, old and families can relax and enjoy quality time in relative peace and quiet away from the town centre.

We are particularly concerned about any new houses, property development being imposed on Crews Hill which would totally ruin the environment in that vicinity and suggest you definitely don't grant planning permission for housing development on Crews Hill for the following reasons:

People visit the area to escape pollution, to relax and enjoy the environment.

At present it's a sanctuary/peaceful area in which families can visit the nurseries, get a cup of tea etc and most importantly relax and unwind.

There would have to be more infrastructure to cope with the building of new homes which sadly is not always seen as a necessity, or even considered, by eager developers.

Has anyone really considered the impact of extra traffic on what is already a highly congested area in rush hour. These country lanes were never meant to cope with the volume of traffic that literally queues up to get from Enfield to Cuffley during rush hour....let alone the chaos that is caused when there is a breakdown on M25 and traffic tries to cut through these lanes.

Needless to say the impact of extra traffic would be neither convenient nor acceptable to the local community.

Enfield is special to us because of its Green Belt and Open Spaces and because it means people can enjoy a breath of fresh air once returning from work in the city etc. It is enjoyed by people of any age wishing to peruse a healthy lifestyle by having the chance to run etc in a reasonably healthy cleaner air environment.

We have lived in Enfield for the past 75 years and would be very upset to witness the shrinking of areas of open spaces and Green Belt when there are other options available to the Council.

---

Dear Sir,

Below is my response to the consultation for a New Local Plan for Enfield. The consultation is complex and difficult for most people to give a comprehensive answer that reflects their views accurately. I've therefore received some help from a group whose opinions are identical to mine. The Green Belt is such a precious resource which is becoming increasingly indispensable, I can't understand why any responsible person would even consider destroying it. There are alternatives available to meet housing targets and destroying Green Belt is quite unnecessary. From an ecological point of view there are many protected species that would be badly affected if the Green Belt was lost. There is a further consideration that I really hope will be taken whatever the decision is; trees, bushes, hedgerows must be carefully protected during the critical months of May and June. This is often overlooked but recent work in my neighbourhood has shown that it is all too easy to wipe out whole species of protected bird populations by thoughtless work being carried out at the wrong time of year. Preserving our wildlife is mentioned in the consultation but in my opinion it should be the primary consideration and I would give it an even stronger place than is mentioned in the consultation.

Here are my responses:

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 therefore to a Draft Local Plan that does not target any sections of the Green Belt and also contains consideration for the timing of any work so that it will protect local wildlife - including areas that are not designated as Green Belt.

The above comments are my own views plus my view on the importance of the timing of any construction work that may take place in the future.

---

Dear Enfield Council

Re: Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation

I 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, particularly from retail and ex-retail sites that are becoming available as the high street and outlying retail and other areas decline. 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.

I strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing or other purposes. 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.

In particular I object to developing any areas without a guarantee that schools will be open to all children regardless of their parents' wealth, their gender or their parents' religion or none. There are enough divisions in Enfield and the country, and these are growing from the proliferation of segregated schools, the empowerment that less enlightened parts of society feel after the Brexit vote, and the closure of central government programmes that were designed prevent divisions.

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, has alternatives available, and any intentions to release parts of it should be taken out of the local plan.

These are my own views.

---

## ENFIELD DRAFT LOCAL PLAN 2019

Comments on the draft local plan:

There is an acute **shortage of affordable housing** in Hadley Wood for first time buyers, small families and the elderly. The relentless extension of medium size houses into large mansions exacerbates this problem and should be severely restricted. New luxury apartment blocks do not address this need.

Most development in Hadley Wood is **individual house extensions and infill**. A mechanism is needed for these developments to contribute to the Mayor's target of 40-50% of new housing to be affordable and providing the necessary additional transport, infrastructure and facilities to support the increased population.

Existing **planning regulations are not enforced** to constrain house extensions, increase biodiversity, reduce flood risk, and prevent increased impermeable hardstanding. Enforcement needs to be rigorously applied.

**Public transport** in Hadley Wood is inadequate to support the existing population and has the lowest Public Transport Access Level in Greater London. The only dependable services are the railway and buses along Cockfosters Road. The hourly bus service to Barnet in the middle of the day only is inadequate. Regular all-day services to Barnet General and Chase Farm Hospitals and the shopping centres in High Barnet, Cockfosters and Enfield need to be put in place before further houses are built. This would also reduce private vehicle emissions.

**Infrastructure**, particularly **drainage** needs to be improved to substantially reduce the risk of fluvial and surface flooding in all the existing high and medium flood risk areas identified by the Environment Agency.

**The Hadley Wood Shopping** Centre is small and has recently been reduced by converting shopping space to residential, resulting in the loss of a dry cleaner that provided an essential local service. No further loss of shopping space should be permitted. The Post Office was closed some years ago against local opposition. There is no NHS doctor, bank, supermarket, secondary school, or public house. The existing community centre is aging and needs to be rebuilt and enlarged to provide a wider range of amenities to the neighbourhood. These services need upgrading with funding from the CIL.

The **lack of parking regulation** around the shopping centre and station makes short-term access to the shops difficult and should be resolved by introducing 'Potters Bar' type parking with a free period followed by a charge. This would improve the viability of the shops.

The character of Hadley Wood is based on its historical origins in Enfield Chase, replaced by Green Belt and tree-lined streets. The verdant nature of the area needs to be protected and any incursion into the Green Belt should be small and necessary for the common good, not commercial gain.

Please consider these comments in finalising 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 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 do not support any proposal which includes building on green belt land, or reviewing the green belt boundaries.

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 believe that the only alternatives available to release housing from 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.

24

je

M

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 love coming here it would be a great shame to build on this area and destroy the collection of garden centres

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.

*How much land does it take for you to stop!*

---

I should like to comment on the Draft Enfield local plan as follows:

In section 9.6 'Blue Ribbon Network' the Draft Plan refers to the importance of the waterways, including Pymmes, Salmon's and Turkey Brooks, in forming a valuable wildlife habitat, a relief from the built environment and leisure opportunities. Reference is made in section 9.6.3 to the series of projects with which the Council has been, or is, involved to improve water quality within these blue spaces.

I applaud the efforts the Council has made, and is continuing to make, and am proud to live in a borough which is in the forefront of national efforts to improve water quality.

However Pymmes and Salmon's Brooks remain heavily polluted with road run-off, sewage misconnections and overflows and to a lesser extent, agricultural pollution. While SUDS can treat the results of this pollution, I would like to see the Council explicitly adopting as a target, the reduction in pollution from sewage misconnections and overflows. This would of necessity be a multi-agency effort, involving Thames Water, the Environment Agency, as well as residents' groups. I feel not enough has yet been done to convince householders that misconnected drains are as anti-social as drink-driving or driving without a seatbelt.

---

Dear sir/madam,

I have read your recently published Enfield local plan 2036 and in particular note the position the paper lays out with regard to Hadley Wood.

To compare Hadley Wood to areas such as Southgate in terms of accessibility seems almost bizarre. 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, in my mind, does not appear to be an adequate definition of accessibility. We only have, at peak periods, 4 trains per hour, no real bus links and if you were to look at a poster on the station at Finsbury Park which lists how you can get to each GNR station in event the train service is not working you will note that Hadley Wood has the longest and most complex time for alternative travel options and it includes a 15 minutes walk after taking the underground and up to two buses!

Hadley Wood is not an appropriate area to target housing growth. It should be explicitly excluded from the Council's growth strategy.

- 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.

- Hadley Wood does not meet the Council's 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.

- 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.

I hope my views are of interest to you as you continue to develop the overall plan for Enfield. Whilst I recognise housing is an issue I see no real benefit from trying to have a one size fits all approach to any area that has a station!

---

I do not agree that THE GARDENS CENTRES ARE DEMOLISHED FOR HOUSING, IT IS A HISTORICAL ROAD FOR GARDENERS. BRINGS LOTS OF REVENUE, AND TAXES TO THE COUNCIL. EVERYBODY LOVES CREWS HILL. ALL GENERATIONS. BRINGS EMPLOYMENT AS WELL.

---

Crews Hill should have a preservation order. Generations have used the Garden Centres, not just for plants as there r now shops within garden Centres selling food, clothes, restaurants, etc. You meet people there who have travelled miles. It's very competitive. Hundreds employed. Revenue it brings in. There r other places to build.

---

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

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're responsible for future generation,  
if we destroy the nature ~~the~~ it will impact on us in future,  
we have to be responsible for our actions, as we all know  
anything will exist without nature.

---

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

**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 find it unbelievable that such an iconic institution can be under threat  
please reconsider and establish an alternative

---

Dear Enfield Council

### **Re. Response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation**

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

I support housing development & the ambition to meet Enfield's housing needs but strongly object to the proposal to release Green Belt for housing/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 which should be preserved and protected for both current and 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 relating 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 could be accommodated on previously developed land / brownfield sites.
2. I believe that 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. I believe the A10 Retail Parks and Southbury area should be masterplanned before piecemeal development picks away at the prime sites and that increased train service could provide this area with a new mixed-use community of many more homes than Meridian Water.
4. I believe that 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) I believe that all the options listed on page 9 are worth exploring, except for the final option which suggests revisiting the Green Belt boundaries, I believe this 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**. Therefore another boundary review should not be needed until 2028 at the earliest.*

b) I believe that the Council should explore the development opportunities offered by possible increased service on the Liverpool Street – Cheshunt line, This could allow 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 an excuse to release Green Belt. This is unnecessary.

d) Please see my response to Q2.

e) The suggested options would definitely contribute to the accommodation of Enfield's growing population.

These options however would need to be combined with creative masterplanning of several large sites, including;

Southbury/A10 corridor, Brimsdown & Edmonton Green & its surrounds, & more estate regeneration, all in conjunction with transportation upgrades. All these solutions together could not only provide good homes for the borough's residents, but could create new vibrant communities and improvements in deprived areas.

**I do not believe that there is any need to build on the green belt.**

#### **Question 4 –**

a) Affirmative.

b) I would support a policy that values & protects Enfield's heritage and culture but the Options are not clear.

d) Hard to answer, what is meant by appropriate?

#### **Question 5 –**

a) Affirmative.

b) Depending on location.

c) Affirmative.

#### **Question 8 –**

Please see my response to Q2 re brownfield register.

#### **Question 10 –**

c) Please see my responses to Q2 and Q3.

d) Industry should not be moved into Green Belt. Mixed-use development and intensification of existing industrial sites could result in Additional employment space.

#### **Question 13 –**

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

#### **Question 14 –**

c) The importance of open & blue spaces should not be judged by their size, quality or accessibility.

A variety of purposes are served by Open spaces. Along with the traditional "purposes" of Green Belt, there is a long list of social economic and environmental benefits that have been identified e.g:

- Improved air quality;
- Adapting to climate change e.g. CO2 absorption, shading & flood alleviation;

- Improvement of mental health;
- Improved water quality (reduced harmful runoff into local rivers); and
- Enhancing biodiversity and wildlife opportunities.
- Increased chances of physical activity for children and adults ;
- Encouraging active transport like walking and cycling;
- Creation of more attractive places to work, live & visit;
- Creating a sense-of-place and facilitating community spirit;

Open spaces, including Green Belt sites, which could appear inaccessible or of low quality, will in fact serve very important functions. Thus all our Green Belt sites should be preserved & protected.

I would like to reinforce my response to Q2 that another Green Belt Boundary Review is not required as the 2013 review is still valid.

d) and e) refer to my previous response. Open spaces, including Green Belt, serves many functions and should be protected & preserved.

h) Not building on the Green Belt can contribute a great deal.

**Question 16 –**

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

**Comments provided above by me in response to this consultation are my personal 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.

*Very important to have green space  
stop urban sprawl.*



---

Re:the above it would be very wrong to remove our green belt and garden nurseries . Both have been here for many years, not only does it keep our wild life thriving it also helps to keep the business going that are always busy what ever the time of the year. The garden nurseries also bring in coach trips which proves how popular they are. Older folk like myself who enjoy their gardens also enjoy their trips to the nurseries and enjoy to socialize with friends for coffee and lunch.

So please do not go ahead with the plans to take them away There are so many old buildings around that could be re built instead of leaving them to decay all the more.

Yours sincerely a concerned resident.

---

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

**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 Sir / Madam,

I am concerned about the suggestion that growth should be encouraged in the Hadley Wood area, with the station as one reason.

There already is a major problem with car parking from Monday to Friday, restricting all roads on both sides within 1/3 mile of the station.

Local shopping has suffered already for some considerable time due to the severely restricted parking available, during shopping hours.

There is now dangerous parking, especially in hours of darkness, in the main artery, Beech Hill Ave., due to flat developments permitted without adequate parking facilities for residents and visitors in the flat curtailment 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.

---

We strongly oppose Houses being built on the Garden Centre in Crews Hill.  
Teresa and John Lombard.

---

---

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.

---

To whom it concerns,

I am shocked by some of the developments proposed for Enfield. I am no longer an Enfield resident but spent all my childhood there. I live only minutes from the border and still have elderly parents and other family members there. We ALL use Enfield facilities-cinemas,shopping centres,Garden Centres ect.- & I have friends/family around the borough that will be affected by one or more of your proposals.

I have kept an eye on the North London Waste plans for years;clearly this affects Barnet residents too. It's good to see a waste plan and it's a not-in-my-back-yard issue;I can understand the dilemma. We all produce waste but for health and wealth issues we don't want facilities on our doorsteps;perfectly understandable especially since it always seems to be the less wealthy that end up with the facilities! The proposed development of Barrowell Green being a prime egs. For the sake of nearby neighbours I cannot support further development of that type there & hope you can find other options.

I can understand too the dilemmas of housing versus less-used land too but feel there is enough brown-field land in Enfield for our Green Belt to remain intact. We are on the edge of London Green Belt here is particularly important which is why I am opposed the development along Bramley Road!

The same goes for the sell-offs and proposed developments around Crewes Hill!! I would devastated if those garden Centres were all to go and the small units along the road. I know Wyevale have sold up although I don't know who too or for what purposes and as a gardener I will miss it. It always seems buzy there at weekends despite the fact that there are several garden centres selling similar stock. But whilst I can see a need for changes I cannot support housing there and certainly cannot support loosing many of the nurseries and retails units there.

We are short of affordable homes-for rent and purchase. Development in areas such as Crews Hill and Oakwood are NOT going to come into that category so housing development in those places can't be justified!....

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.

HAPPY + JACOB HUSE

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.

Green Belt land should be left ~~also~~ alone, we still need other areas apart from ~~houses~~ houses.

---

I object to using green belt land for housing as it will encroach on our open spaces and if the council are aloud to build on Crews Hill there will be no stopping them. There are plenty of other sites to build on especially along the A10.

---

I am writing to support the view that our green belt should not be developed. This is a precious resource that must be protected. There are numerous properties in Enfield that should be considered for residential use, these include shops that are boarded up due to changes in consumer choices.

Further, new homes must be social housing and not so called affordable housing. We have allowed housing associations to follow local authorities in the right to buy scheme which has decimated our housing stock for those in need of truly affordable housing.

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. It is a great advantage to Enfield that we have the green belt on our doorstep for our own well-being, and our children's as well as that of wildlife that it accommodates.

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.

Not only this, the green belts role is also to prevent the expansion of London into a massive urban sprawl. Where would it end? Greater thought needs to be given to this proposal and any others that impact the green belt and their long term impact on the area .

As mentioned above, there are numerous brownfield sites to redevelop, however , any development must give consideration to the available infrastructure in the area.

Enfield is one of the most populated boroughs of London , yet despite the constant increase in population from new housing, and proposals for the future such as this the main infrastructure remains unchanged, increased traffic and pollution is notable even now , and will only get worse in future as a detriment to our borough we live in.

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

Regards



---

Do not destroy Crewe's Hill by building houses. It has brought joy to so many people for many years. It is a special place that is visited by people of all ages from all over London, Hertfordshire and further afield. It is a wonderful community and provides employment for so many. It is a special meeting place for thousands of people with cafes, garden centres, shops, pet supplies, parking and many more. I implore you NOT to destroy Crewe's Hill.

---

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 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.

---

Sir/Madam I am writing to confirm my strong opposition to the proposed new redevelopment at Crews Hill Nurseries. I write as a long standing Enfield resident.

---

Our Green Belt and open areas are more important than ever, because of our increasing population and air pollution, we need the Greenbelt for our health and mental wellbeing and the very air we breathe. So emphatically No No No building on our Green Belt and Open Spaces.