

(1) Reason why decision is being called in:

see attached

(2) Outline of proposed alternative action:

Refer back to Cabinet Sub-Committee.

(3) Do you believe the decision is outside the policy framework?

No

(4) If Yes, give reasons: n/a

**FOR DST USE ONLY:**

Checked by Proper Officer for validation -

J. Middleton-Albooye

Name of Proper Officer:

Date: 5/11/18

J. C. MIDDLETON-ALBOOYE

(DEPUTY MONITORING OFFICER



## Reasons why decision is being called in

The Local Plan Cabinet Sub-Committee on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2018 approved the draft new Local plan 2036 for the purposes of public consultation. The covering report and the contents of the draft local plan itself raise several issues of concern.

The draft Local Plan is a large document so in order to keep the call-in manageable we have selected three issues only.

### The covering report

- 1) Great emphasis in the report is placed on the projected figure for population growth. Enfield's population projections indicate that the population will grow from 339,000 to 380,000 by 2036, compounding major housing and other pressures.

These latest government figures translate into a requirement for new homes of 1876 per annum according to the GLA but 3,500 per annum according to the Government. This large discrepancy is not explained within the covering report or the draft plan itself raising concerns that the statistical basis for the Local plan is questionable.

### The draft Local Plan document itself

- 2) The Mayor's London Plan strongly protects the green belt (see below) clearly stating that the de-designation of green belt land will not be supported. The Mayor is a major stakeholder in the consultation process yet the document openly declares that there is consideration for green belt release.

"London Plan Policy G2

*The extension of the Green Belt will be supported, where appropriate. Its de-designation will not."*

Local Plans must be in general conformity with the London Plan. The policies included in this draft local plan document would not be deemed in general conformity with the London Plan.

- 3) 9.3.7 states that there will be a Green Belt Boundary Review that will run in parallel with the local plan process – there is not a requirement to do this and the green belt has firm protections under the London Plan so why is it included?
- 4) With reference to 9.3.8, Crews Hill is located deep within the Green Belt yet the draft Local Plan states that there are strong arguments for housing growth in this area but fails to go into much detail. The document also fails to put forward why building on Crews Hill could be defined as coming under

exceptional circumstances. The National Planning Policy Framework says that altering green belt boundaries should only be done in exceptional circumstances – there are no exceptional circumstances in Enfield so why is this relaxation being proposed?

- 5) 4.3.2 of the draft Local plan states that “Tall buildings can make a crucial positive contribution to good urban design as well as enabling densities and supporting scheme viability”. 4.3.3 says that tall buildings can make a significant positive contribution in appropriate parts of the borough. The Leader of the Council has indicated that the Council wishes in future to allow tall residential buildings in town centres and adjacent to local Tube and rail way stations? If so, this should be made clear in the draft Local Plan going out to consultation, particularly in Section 7 – Planning for Vibrant Town Centres.