

Dear councillors,

Re the spatial strategy and related policies, I would like to register my objections as follows.

1) The fact that so many homes and commercial buildings are planned for green belt areas in the historically important Enfield Chase area, e.g. the 3,000 houses in countryside next to Trent Park, 3,000 at Crews Hill, the 11 hectares of storage/distribution near Junction 24 of the M25, etc. Rather, you should be honouring your commitment to preserving biodiversity and the environment and focusing much more attention on building affordable homes on brownfield sites where the regeneration will improve deprived areas.

2) There are not enough guarantees for affordable homes. I am deeply disturbed to read in the Enfield Dispatch that only 6,500 of the 25,000 homes planned for the next 20 years are to be affordable. This is unacceptable, given that Enfield is the 9th most deprived borough in London. How can normal families afford local housing if it is not affordable? Current planning policy states that 40% of homes on new developments should be affordable, but this is often not the case, so you are not adhering to your own policies. You claim local people should be able to remain in the borough and that the housing should meet everyone's needs regardless of income, age and ability, and yet this is blatantly not going to be the case in these developments.