

## Cllr. Dino Lemonides

My constituents demand that I speak on this item. I trust I will be allowed to speak for the full allocated time. If I am heckled, I reserve my time to speak until I am heard.

I have a number of issues about this process.

- a) **As a chase ward councillor, it appears to me that the council seems to be determined to destroy the quality of life for the residents of Chase ward, following Whitewebbs and now proposals of building on green belt land.**
- b) This is not really a vote on a consultation. The paper makes it clear that there is only one option that is being considered by the council. The council risks being taken to court on a sham consultation.
- c) I understand that a full council is the highest body in the council. Better to also have had a EGM cabinet meeting (a full two to three hours could have been used to explore these options in a non-adversarial environment without other political parties being present). Portfolio holders could passionately **explained how density / traffic / health issues (still no GP or dentists in chase Ward) environmental issues, education and infrastructure needs would be impacted by these proposals.** (Although there are 800 plus pages on the local plan there is very little detail on what is being proposed and some of these policies contradict other council policies on environment / climate change traffic / pollution.  
  
Cabinet could have sanctioned the process of a consultation on all options and then the results of that consultation could have been discussed at a full council before someone pressed the button. As I said this is a *fait accompli*.
- d) I am constantly criticised by the Labour administration that I am not really Labour. So can someone explain to me whether the Labour London Mayor is now happy to build on green belt.
- e) It would also appear that this administration has turned its back on other socialist principles and is effectively asking for a “developer’s charter”. This goes further than investing in the borough for Meridian water or regeneration of our housing Estates.
- f) I accept the argument that Enfield is overpopulated, and we have 4,500 homeless families. I made this argument in the previous administration, i.e. Housing Gateway needs to be buying / building homes outside the borough using savings achieved from savings on Housing benefit.
- g) The pressures on land and resources are the crux of the argument. I see nothing from this administration saying to GLA / Central government (remember Central government’s targets on housing always exceed the Mayor’s targets (which in themselves are ambitious) that enough is enough. It is a simple argument to make – **50% of land in Enfield is either Green belt, metropolitan open space, or strategic industrial land (SIL alone is about 10% and is more than our six other neighbouring boroughs put together).** If the argument has been made it’s not been done forcibly enough or evidenced that it has been made.

So I would not be selling off the future of the borough over the next 30 to 40 years without due consideration. I will be voting against this paper which is a “**Whitewebbs / whitewash**”??!!

## **Cllr. Charith Gunawardena**

Thank you Mr Mayor. **Enfield does need far more genuinely affordable homes.**

But, because of the way affordable housing is funded, we are forced to allow developers to build *thousands* of unaffordable homes, just to generate the money required to build the affordable homes Enfield needs.

We must *all* lobby the government for additional funding for affordable housing, if we truly want to protect the Green Belt for future generations.

However, even within this context, I fail to see why we need to build on the Green Belt in the manner that is proposed by Cabinet.

**There are clearly alternative options which could deliver the homes Enfield needs, without building on the Green Belt.**

For example, there is an obvious option for at least 19,000 homes that is missing from the public consultation document. Why has this not been included?

We know this option exists because, in addition to building on the Green Belt, part of the Cabinet's Preferred Option includes 19,000 homes being built in urban areas, and we are told that this can be achieved without inappropriate tower blocks, and without harming the character of Enfield's towns.

Yet there is no option put forward in the consultation for building 19,000 homes in urban areas. Why not?

The consultation should not go ahead with options missing, because the public have a right to be presented with full and correct information.

**There are also blatant contradictions in the options being put forward to the public.**

On the one hand, we are told that building 17,000 homes in urban areas will require tall buildings and will have a negative impact on Enfield's towns.

On the other hand, we are told that building 19,000 homes - that is 2,000 more - can be built in urban areas without inappropriate tall buildings and without negatively impacting our towns.

How on earth is this possible? I can only assume that people have made mistakes when putting the consultation options together.

This simply isn't good enough, especially when the stakes are this high. The public consultation must not go ahead until these misleading inconsistencies are corrected.

I understand the housing, employment and environmental challenges we face, and I know we face some tough decisions which the public must be consulted on. This is why the public must be presented with all viable options and with the correct information. Anything less is simply unacceptable.

**To vote in favour of what is currently in front of us would be a vote to mislead the public and I simply will not vote for that.**

## **Cllr. Daniel Anderson**

Mr. Mayor, what we have before us tonight is an absolute travesty.

With less than one week's notice, Members have been presented with twelve hundred and forty pages of documentation, the contents of which will have substantial ramifications for the future of this Borough, and yet have received scant political oversight.

Mr Mayor, make no mistake, what Members are being asked to do this evening, is not merely to agree to a public consultation, but to effectively accept the Administration's pre-determined and contrived option for development as a given.

Mr. Mayor, this Labour Administration has adopted the Henry Ford school of consultation, reminiscent, of course, of the approach taken with the infamous bin consultation, namely you can have any option you like as long as it is the preferred council option!

Mr Mayor, they must think that the public are fools.

Worse still, this preferred option that is itself at variance with the Mayor of London's own London Plan.

Over the space of the next 18 years, this Administration intends to build more homes on the greenbelt [at Crews Hill and Chase Park] than on Meridian Water, the Council's own brownfield site!

And yet they have the audacity to claim that this draft local plan is both innovative and visionary. One must wonder what planet they are living on.

Mr. Mayor, the report claims that the draft local plan has been prepared in light of corporate priorities, a key theme being a levelling up between east and west.

But this is not a levelling up exercise, it's about levelling down.

This Labour Administration won't improve Edmonton – indeed how can they, when they are committed to building a huge new incinerator?!

No, Mr Mayor, they are committed to ruining the entire borough – east and west combined. And we can already see the chaos they have created with the LTNs in Bowes and Fox Lane.

But they want to go further and see high rise tower blocks across the west, decimating the greenbelt in the process.

In fact, Mr. Mayor, the intentions behind this local plan have been in gestation for sometime, I have an FOI from TfL from 2019 [on the proposed station car park developments in Arnos Grove and Cockfosters], which states that Cllr Caliskan is in favour of higher density on the west side of the borough and would be willing to potentially go higher.

Mr. Mayor, to paraphrase the band Genesis, this Draft Regulation 18 Plan is selling 'Selling Enfield by the Pound' and Members tonight should reject it in its entirety.

## **Cllr. Dinah Barry**

This is an important paper that will affect Enfield for a very long time.

And understandably the report is very long.

Although some important information is missing such as the methods used to select sites and where the roads to serve the new developments in the green belt are going to run.

And other pages are too fuzzy to read.

**Yet the time members have been given to read it has been very short,**

and residents were to be allowed only six weeks for the consultation.

Although looking at the questions residents are asked, they have no real choice on the overall approach since the paper says there is only one option that an inspector will accept.

Many of the questions on the details are complex and invite essays.

**I hope I'm wrong but it doesn't look like a way to encourage participation by a wide range of busy residents.**

Despite all that, some points stand out.

**The Mayor of London has set targets that ask Enfield to fit a quart into a pint pot.**

He asks us to deliver an unmanageable number of housing units, designate yet more land for strategic Industrial use and not to build on the green belt.

It's impossible - everyone but the Mayor gets that but instead of standing up for Enfield the current Administration proposes to go along with building lots of homes - yes we all know that Enfield people need more homes - but as my colleagues have pointed out, these homes won't be for Enfield people

And you can't fit a quart into a pint pot so they also plan to build on the Green Belt.

I can understand that there are arguments for re-designating some parts of the Green Belt that are currently not being used as they should so as to be better able to protect the rest

I would support that. But that's not what is being proposed.

This Plan proposes large areas of unsullied land are turned over for housing and industrial development.

**What I cannot understand is why the current Administration doesn't protect Enfield It won't stand up to the Mayor when he sets impossible targets for development** that will bring the people of Enfield little benefit.

**But it's happy to stand up to him over his commitment to protect the Green Belt** that our residents value.

**This council is elected to look after the interests of the people of Enfield. It's time the current Administration started doing that.**