

What type of homes will be built at Crews Hill and Chase Park?

Introduction and Summary

The Government's New Towns Taskforce (NTT) published its report in September 2025. It recommended that land at Crews Hill & Chase Park (CH&CP) be considered as a potential site for a new town, capable of delivering 21,000 new homes. The Government's response listed CH&CP as one of the three most promising locations for a new town.

Since the NTT report and the Government's response were published, speculation has grown about the types of homes that might be built at CH&CP.

This is difficult to answer.

As it stands, nobody knows for sure what types of homes will be built. The local community has not been properly involved yet, and the Government still hasn't published a decision on whether CH&CP will actually be selected as a site for a new town.

If it is, which seems likely, it will fall to the appointed delivery body to decide what gets built in practice.¹ And even if it happens, building a new town takes decades, so what's being talked about now could look very different in 10, 20 or 40 years.

What we **can** do is look at what the key players are already saying. That gives us a decent steer on the direction of travel, to get a sense of what lies ahead for CH&CP.

¹ This delivery body is likely to be some form of 'development corporation', with wide-ranging powers to allocate land for development, produce and adopt masterplans, set design codes, and decide planning applications, independently of Enfield Council.

Our review of what's currently available suggests:

1. There'll be a mix of housing. A **lot of it is likely to be in mid-rise blocks of around 5–6 storeys**, especially in areas closest to stations and shops. This is like a European-style approach, characterised as "gentle density" by some urban designers. Think mansion blocks and mid-rise streets, not towers, but also not car-dependent sprawl, which brings traffic, congestion, and air quality problems into surrounding neighbourhoods.
2. **We've seen no evidence of tower blocks being proposed.** Although some mid-rise buildings might just about meet the definition of 'high-rise,' which is 7 or more storeys, or above 18 metres tall.
3. There will be plenty of family-sized homes with 3-4 bedrooms. **But London-wide housing needs suggest there will be more 1–2-bedroom properties overall.**
4. **What looks very unlikely is the idea that most homes would be low-rise 3–4-bedroom houses with driveways and gardens**, as has been suggested by the Leader of Enfield Council. That simply doesn't square with what the key players are saying about the need for 'car-lite' and 'optimal' density development.
5. Using the Council's viability work and comparable local new-build prices, we can estimate that – in present-day prices – a 1-bedroom flat would cost around £360,000, a 2-bedroom flat would be £450,000 and a 3-bedroom terrace house would be £650,000. Assuming a 10% deposit and 4.5× income multiple for a mortgage, a **£650k 3-bed home would need a £65k deposit and an annual household income of around £130k.**
6. If the Government's stated aim for affordable housing is met, **it would mean that around 1 in 5 of the new homes will be available for social rent** i.e. traditional council-home-style tenancies. This would mean around **4,200 could be social rent homes** out of the 21,000, which is lower than the 6,000 council homes referred to by the Leader of Enfield Council.
7. The NTT report claims new towns delivered by development corporations have 'build-out' rates averaging 600+ homes per year, although the long-term average can be far lower.² Even

² The basis for the 600 figures comes from https://lichfields.uk/media/w3wjmws0/start-to-finish-3_how-quickly-do-large-scale-housing-sites-deliver.pdf. This report shows that the New Town at Ebbsfleet has recently achieved impressive peak build-out

at 600 homes a year, a **21,000-home new town implies roughly 35 years of build-out, and nearer 40 years once set-up and early planning are included.**

The remainder of this report is split into eight parts, examining what each of the key players has said and providing examples of relevant comments.

1. What has the New Towns Taskforce said?
2. What has the Deputy Mayor and the Greater London Authority said?
3. What has Transport for London said?
4. How many of the homes will have 3 or more bedrooms?
5. How much will the homes cost?
6. How many social rent affordable homes will there be?
7. When will the homes be built?
8. So, what does this mean?

A note on the images used: Most of the images used in this report are of developments in Enfield, which have been included as examples of mid-rise style density development.

rates averaging over 600 per year. The same report shows the total average delivery for Ebbsfleet across a longer period is 255 dwellings per year. On this basis, it will take around 70-years to complete the Crews Hill / Chase Park new town.

1. What has the New Towns Taskforce (NTT) said?

The NTT's 'Report to Government' made 44 recommendations. One of the big themes is building at higher densities (more like many European cities). In plain English, that usually means more mid-rise homes (like mansion blocks and mid-rise flats), not endless sprawl. The NTT report says:

"There are demonstrable economic and environmental benefits to higher density development. Compared to the UK, many European cities build at higher densities, and a future New Towns Programme presents an opportunity to adopt a similarly ambitious approach from the outset, recognising that density is difficult to increase retrospectively." ^[1]

"Higher density does not mean high rise development. It can be achieved through well-established and popular housing forms such as terraces and mansion blocks, which can maintain local character, and deliver attractive places and a high quality of life." ^[2]



Figure 1: Mid-rise housing in Enfield Town (currently under construction)

The Chair of the Government's New Towns Taskforce, Sir Michael Lyons, was asked specifically about Crews Hill by an MP on the Housing, Communities and Local Government Committee. He said:

"...a new generation of new towns must give a priority to public transport solutions. They simply cannot be the car-borne examples that you find on many recent larger developments, partly because of pressures on existing road networks and partly because of the environmental and health costs of continued growth in car-borne transport. Our model is very much one that is less dependent on car-borne travel than previous new towns." ^[3]

In other words, the NTT seems to be pushing a 'car-lite' approach: less parking, less car-dependence, and a lot more emphasis on public transport.

2. What has the Deputy Mayor and the Greater London Authority (GLA) said?

Jules Pipe, who is London's Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and the Fire Service, has said that if homes are built on the Green Belt, they should mostly be mid-rise (around 5-6 storeys), to make the best use of the land and avoid needing to release more Green Belt:

"We have spent two centuries building two-storey homes with gardens at back and front. If we were like Paris and had been consistently building six or seven-storeys all throughout, we would continue being a compact, dense city, but we have had a century and a half of sprawl and we have a limited amount left. In the limited amount we have left, we have to sweat it. That means five to six-storeys. Otherwise, you are advocating for more Green Belt being released." [1]



Figure 2 – New care home on The Ridgeway (currently under construction)

This approach is referred to by some urban planners as 'gentle density' and is popular in cities such as Copenhagen and Amsterdam. It keeps buildings at a more human scale while still creating enough homes to support local shops, parks, and decent public transport.



Figure 3 - Alma Estate — replacing taller blocks with more mid-rise homes.

In its emerging Local Plan, Enfield Council pushed for a low-density approach across much of Crews Hill and Chase Park. The GLA has repeatedly raised concerns about this approach, stressing that it risks generating car-dependent development. For example, the GLA has said that:

“...there are significant concerns about the ability of the rural placemaking areas at Crews Hill and Chase Park to deliver genuinely sustainable neighbourhoods that would not be car dependent.” [2]

“...there remain serious concerns over the suitability of the specific selected sites at Chase Park and Crews Hill. This is primarily around the ability of these sites to deliver the infrastructure needed for sustainable transport, the high levels of harm that releasing these sites would have on the function of the Green Belt and the low density of housing proposed.” [3]

This is not an abstract policy point. Car-dependent neighbourhoods usually mean more daily car trips because people have little choice. That quickly shows up as congestion on local roads, more pollution and poorer air quality, and extra noise, especially near main routes. It can also make buses slower and less dependable because they sit in the same traffic. And once that pattern is baked in, it is hard and expensive to fix later.

What the GLA and Mayor say matters as the government could decide that a Mayoral Development Corporation should deliver CH&CP. Even if it isn’t, the Mayor could still “call in” major schemes and potentially reject proposals that don’t line up with London Plan policy, including if they waste land or lock in car dependency.

3. What has Transport for London (TfL) said?

TfL has warned that a low-density approach at CH&CP, as proposed by Enfield Council in its emerging Local Plan, risks creating car-dependent development, exactly the opposite of a genuinely sustainable new neighbourhood. For example, TfL has said:

“There is a real risk that these areas, if developed, could become car-dependent, have poor access to essential local services and result in further pressure on the road network...” ^[1]

“Optimal densities and car parking restraint are critical to support sound place-making and ensure sufficient population density to enable cost-effective public transport infrastructure necessary for sustainable development.” ^[2]

TfL’s position is basically: if you build here, it needs to be at “optimal” density and it needs to be car-free or car-lite. In reality, that means most homes won’t come with a parking space. The “driveway and garden” vision put forward by the Leader of Enfield Council is hard to square with TfL’s requirements.

They also warn that Enfield’s initial approach would need major public transport investment, and it could pull investment away from improving transport in urban areas. TfL has said:

“Moreover, releasing greenfield areas at the same time as urban locations reduces the viability of urban locations and detracts from investment in transport there.” ^[3]



Figure 4 - Arnos Grove — mid-rise blocks (under construction)

What TfL says matters. It's both the strategic roads authority and the transport operator and it speaks for the Mayor's Transport Strategy in consultations. So, its views carry real weight.

There are signs that Enfield Council has recognised that it needs to move away from the low density and car-dependent approach it proposed in its Local Plan. In 2025, Enfield's Strategic Director of Planning, Growth and Infrastructure signed a Statement of Common Ground with TfL agreeing that development at Crews Hill and Chase Park should be informed by "optimal densities", minimum building heights, and maximum parking standards. ^[4]

Indeed, parts of the emerging Local Plan were already pointing the same way, requiring higher densities closest to rail/bus links and shops, and parking that leans towards on-street provision rather than everyone getting a driveway. ^[5]

Put together, this points to a lot of homes being in mid-rise blocks, with limited parking.



Figure 5 - Chase Farm plans — mid-rise blocks, with most homes not having car parking.

4. How many of the homes will have 3 or more bedrooms?

If CH&CP becomes a new town, the mix of homes will be set by whoever is responsible for delivering it, for example a development corporation.

Enfield's emerging Local Plan policies give a clue to the Council's preferred direction. Policy H3 ("Housing Mix and Type") targets at least 40% family-sized homes on Green Belt sites. In practice, "family-sized" usually means 3+ bedrooms, so a scheme with around 40% 3+ bedroom homes would broadly align with that approach. ^[1]

But the point of the new town idea is to help meet London-wide housing needs, not just Enfield's. [2] The GLA's 2017 London Strategic Housing Market Assessment suggests that, overall, around 71% of the *net* requirement for new homes is for 1–2-bedroom properties. [3] If the mix is driven by London-wide need, as well as by the expectation that land is used efficiently, it becomes hard to justify a development where "most" homes have 3–4 bedrooms.

In short, a considerable proportion of 3+ bedroom homes is possible. But a scheme dominated by them is unlikely, particularly if CH&CP is genuinely planned as a London-focused new town.

5. How much will the homes cost?

A mix of tenures would probably be delivered at CH&CP, including social rent, discounted rent, shared ownership, market rent, and market housing. However, the dominant tenure is likely to be market housing because this is typically what underpins scheme viability and helps cross-subsidise infrastructure and affordable housing costs.

We can only estimate prices, but you can get a sensible ballpark by combining (a) the Council's whole-plan viability work and (b) what similar new-build homes are selling for locally. ^[1]

On that basis, a typical 3-bed terrace house could be around **£650,000** (in today's prices).

Table 1: Indicative prices (based on viability work + local new-build prices)

Home type	Indicative price
1-bed flat	£360,000
2-bed flat	£450,000
3-bed terrace house	£650,000

Notes:

- This assumes homes meet (but don't massively exceed) minimum space standards.
- Prices exclude service charges, ground rents, and estate management fees (where applicable).
- These are rough, present-day estimates - prices will change.
- The analysis excludes premium/luxury pricing (for example, Trent Park apartments in the £700,000–£1.3m range and houses significantly above this).

What these prices mean in practice

Purchasing a home at the indicative prices above would require both a substantial deposit and a high household income. Using a simple affordability test (10% deposit and a 4.5× income-to-mortgage ratio), a £650,000 3-bedroom home would require a deposit of £65,000 and a household income of around £130,000.

Table 2: Rough affordability check (10% deposit; 4.5x income multiple)

Home type	Indicative price	Deposit (10%)	Mortgage needed	Approx. income required (4.5x)
1-bed flat	£360,000	£36,000	£324,000	£72,000
2-bed flat	£450,000	£45,000	£405,000	£90,000
3-bed terrace house	£650,000	£65,000	£585,000	£130,000



Figure 6 - Old Royal Chace, terraced 3-bedroom homes.

6. How many social rent affordable homes will there be?

The NTT report recommends that at least 40% of homes be affordable, and that at least half of these should be for social rent (i.e. council home-style tenancies). ^[1]

Social rent homes are central to tackling Enfield's housing emergency. Enfield has one of the highest rates of households in temporary accommodation in the country, and there are over 6,400 households waiting for a social rent home. ^[2, 3] For many, it's the only tenure that's affordable.



Figure 7 - New Avenue Estate, social rent alongside market homes.

The Government's initial response to the NTT's recommendations softened the 'minimum 40%' idea into an 'aim'. ^[4] And in January 2026, a Minister repeated the same message: they want 40%, but the final number will depend on viability and how much public funding is put in. Matthew Pennycook, Minister of State for Housing and Planning told a House of Commons Committee that:

"In terms of the 40%, it is an aspiration; it is an aim to deliver the 40% on each site, at least 20% that is social rented homes. That is important to the Government... There will be a role for viability and viability will bite on different sites in different ways, but we do want to ensure that we are trying to meet that 40% wherever possible." ^[5]

If that aim were achieved at CH&CP, social rent would be around **20% of all homes**. On a 21,000-home scenario, that's roughly **4,200** social rent homes.

Enfield Council has separately said it has an ambition for 50% affordable housing at CH&CP. However, neither the NTT's report site commentary, nor the Council's subsequent press release specifies what proportion of that affordable housing would be social rent. ^[6] This is a crucial omission as the headline affordable percentage alone does not indicate how far the scheme would meet the needs of households in the most acute housing need.

The Council's proposed Local Plan suggests 50% of affordable housing should be social rent (reduced from 70% in the current Local Plan). ^[7] Using that as an indicative guide, of 21,000-homes, around 5,250 could be social rent.

In short, depending on which benchmark is applied and how tenure split is defined, the likely range implied by current public statements is around 4,200 to 5,250 social rented homes at CH&CP. The key outstanding question is whether the Government will commit to a clear social rent proportion, rather than leaving it to be determined later through viability negotiations.



Figure 8 - Meridian Water — mid-rise social rent homes under construction.

7. When will the homes be built?

The NTT report cites research which suggests new towns delivered by development-corporations can build 600+ homes a year. But that looks like a *peak* rate for a few years, not the long-run average, which the same material suggests is closer to 300. ^[1, 2]

Even at 600 a year, 21,000 homes would still be **35 years of building**, and around **40 years** once you include things like set-up, land assembly, planning, and infrastructure.

In reality, delivery rates vary a lot by phase, market, and infrastructure timing. The 600-figure quoted in the NTT report relates to Ebbsfleet Garden City (a new town in north Kent built around Ebbsfleet International station, between Dartford and Gravesend). Ebbsfleet recently achieved impressive peak delivery of over 600 homes per year. However, Ebbsfleet's average delivery over a longer period is around 255 dwellings per year. At that pace, a 21,000-home programme would take roughly 80 years to complete.



Figure 9 - Ebbsfleet Garden City, mid-rise housing.

Given predicted 'build-out' rates, an average of between 50 and 100 social rent homes could be built each year. That said, depending on the funding and financing arrangements, social rented housing can be prioritised and built ahead of market rate housing. But without this type of financial support, it will be many many years before CH&CP has any meaningful impact on Enfield's council house waiting lists.

The point is that focussing on headline “peak” build-out rates risks giving a misleading impression of delivery in practice.



Figure 10 – Chase Farm, town-house style housing.

8. So, what does this mean?

Enfield's residents deserve an honest and grown-up conversation about Crews Hill and Chase Park. Even if CH&CP is chosen as a location for a new town, it will not be a quick fix for Enfield's housing crisis. New towns take decades to deliver, and a new town at CH&CP is likely to be focused on meeting London's housing needs, not solely Enfield's.

CH&CP cannot be allowed to distract from the other housing sites Enfield needs to get moving on, because those are essential to easing the housing crisis in the years ahead.

And care is needed with promises. A simple story about "mostly 3 to 4 bed houses with gardens and driveways" does not match what the key decision makers are saying about density, car-lite neighbourhoods, and the best use of scarce land. Over-promising leads to quick disappointment and long-term mistrust.

Levels of public scepticism are already high. A poll conducted on behalf of the Royal Town Planning Institute in 2025, found that only 1 in 4 Londoners are confident that the new generation of new towns will meet the needs of communities in 50 years' time.

And we know what broken promises look like in Enfield. The borough's current Local Plan, adopted in 2010, said 5,000 homes would be delivered at Meridian Water by 2026, and the masterplan suggested this could be done without significant public spending. Fifteen years on, what has actually been delivered is around 300 homes, and it has required hundreds of millions of pounds of public money. Nobody wants to see the mistakes of Meridian Water repeated, but there is little sign that the lessons have been learned.

References

What has the New Towns Taskforce said?

1. New Towns Taskforce. Report to Government (Sep 2025):
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/68d694b79cb44667f7a1cee7/New_Towns_Taskforce_Final_Report.pdf
2. New Towns Taskforce. Report to Government (Sep 2025):
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/68d694b79cb44667f7a1cee7/New_Towns_Taskforce_Final_Report.pdf
3. Housing, Communities and Local Government Committee. Oral evidence: New Towns, HC 1601. (Jan 2026): <https://committees.parliament.uk/oralevidence/17007/html/>

What has the Deputy Mayor and the Greater London Authority said?

1. London Assembly (Plenary), 4 December 2025. Agenda Item 3. Appendix 1. Transcript of Agenda Item 3. Question and Answer Session. Housing and Planning in London.
<https://gla.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=179&MId=7842>
2. London Assembly (Plenary), 4 December 2025. Agenda Item 3. Appendix 1. Transcript of Agenda Item 3. Question and Answer Session. Housing and Planning in London.
<https://gla.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=179&MId=7842>
3. The GLA. Local Plan consultation responses. (May 2024).
<https://www.london.gov.uk/programmes-strategies/planning/implementing-london-plan/local-plans-and-general-conformity-london-plan/local-plan-consultation-responses>

What has Transport for London said?

1. Transport for London. Enfield Regulation 19 Local Plan – TfL comments. (May 2024):
<https://www.enfield.gov.uk/file/PDFs/email/01891-3-1.pdf>
2. Transport for London. Written Statement Matter 5: Key diagram, spatial strategy and methodology for selecting site allocations. (Jan 2025):
https://www.enfield.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0022/88015/H61-TFL-Planning.pdf
3. Transport for London. Enfield Regulation 19 Local Plan – TfL comments. (May 2024):
<https://www.enfield.gov.uk/file/PDFs/email/01891-3-1.pdf>
4. Enfield Local Plan (Regulation 24) 2024 - Examination in Public. Statement of Common Ground Between London Borough of Enfield And Transport for London (Dated 31 March 2025): https://www.enfield.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0034/93796/SUB14j-Planning.pdf
5. Enfield Council. Enfield's New LOCAL PLAN 2019-2041. REGULATION 19 - for consultation (MARCH 2024): Policy PL10 and PL11
https://www.enfield.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0030/55668/ELP-REG19-Consult-Chapters-3-15-Planning.pdf

How many of the homes will have 3 or more bedrooms?

1. Enfield Council. Enfield's New LOCAL PLAN 2019-2041. REGULATION 19 - for consultation (MARCH 2024): Policy H3 https://www.enfield.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0030/55668/ELP-REG19-Consult-Chapters-3-15-Planning.pdf
2. New Towns Taskforce. Report to Government (Sep 2025):
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/68d694b79cb44667f7a1cee7/New_Towns_Taskforce_Final_Report.pdf
3. The GLA. The GLA's 2017 London Strategic Housing Market Assessment. (Nov 2017): Table 1: Net annualised requirement for new homes in London, 2016 to 2041).
https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/london_shma_2017.pdf

How much will the homes cost?

1. HDH Planning & Development. Enfield Viability update. (August 2023):
https://www.enfield.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0025/54952/Enfield-Viability-Update-Planning.pdf. Output from the 'viability Update' was then compared to market pricing of Old Royal Chase, Cassia House, *Oakridge Court, *Trent Park (open market), *Trent Park (shared ownership). (*excluded from final analysis as luxury developments).

How many social rent affordable homes will there be?

1. New Towns Taskforce. Report to Government (Sep 2025):
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/68d694b79cb44667f7a1cee7/New_Towns_Taskforce_Final_Report.pdf
2. Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government. Statutory Homelessness in England: January to March 2025 (Jul 2025): <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/statutory-homelessness-in-england-january-to-march-2025/statutory-homelessness-in-england-january-to-march-2025>
3. Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government. Local Authority Housing Statistics data returns for 2023 to 2024 (Jun 2025): <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/local-authority-housing-statistics-data-returns-for-2023-to-2024#full-publication-update-history>
4. Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government. Initial Government Response (Sep 2025): <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/new-towns-taskforce-report-to-government/initial-government-response-september-2025>
5. Housing, Communities and Local Government Committee. Oral evidence: New Towns, HC 1601. (Jan 2026): <https://committees.parliament.uk/oralevidence/17007/html/>
6. Enfield Council. Crews Hill and Chase Park shortlisted for potential New Town. (Sep 2025): <https://www.enfield.gov.uk/news-and-events/2025/09/crews-hill-and-chase-park-shortlisted-for-potential-new-town>

7. Enfield Council. Enfield's New LOCAL PLAN 2019-2041. REGULATION 19 - for consultation (MARCH 2024). Policy H2 enfield.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0030/55668/ELP-REG19-Consult-Chapters-3-15-Planning.pdf

When will the homes be built?

1. New Towns Taskforce, Report to Government (Sep 2025):
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/68d694b79cb44667f7a1cee7/New_Towns_Taskforce_Final_Report.pdf
2. Lichfields, Start to Finish-3 - How quickly do large scale housing sites deliver? Third Edition (Mar 2024): https://lichfields.uk/media/w3wjmws0/start-to-finish-3_how-quickly-do-large-scale-housing-sites-deliver.pdf