

Policy Options for H1: Housing development sites

Policy options for H1 Housing development sites	Pros and cons of each option	Preferred Option
<p>A. Do nothing</p> <p>This option continues with the approach set out in the Core Strategy seeking to focus development in the urban area in order to maximise the use of brownfield land and promote a sustainable pattern of development. However, continuing with this approach without looking for additional growth options to accommodate the borough's future development needs could lead to adverse impacts for the borough and its residents.</p>	<p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ currently we are placed under the presumption in favour of “sustainable development”, which means planning permissions for development could be granted on appeal, leading to uncontrolled and sporadic development in the Green Belt against the wishes of the local community. ➤ this eventuality could also severely undermine the ability of the Council to plan for and deliver transformational change. ➤ the viability of many sites in the urban area for housing is constrained by their small size and high build costs ➤ the limited number of new homes that could be delivered under the current approach would fundamentally undermine economic growth in Enfield, and potentially lead to increased levels of in-commuting and congestion on local roads, or the loss of future investment due to a lack of high quality and affordable housing for the future workforce; ➤ the limited viability of sites in the urban area means that developer contributions for affordable housing and the provision of new community facilities will be difficult to achieve and deliver; ➤ additional housing development in the urban area could increase the strain on existing community facilities (schools and health) where there is already limited physical scope and capacity to meet existing needs. 	<p>For the reasons set out, continuing with the current spatial strategy alone is not considered a realistic or viable option.</p> <p>To do so would lead to production of a local plan which would ultimately be found unsound by an Inspector at Examination.</p> <p>Moreover, it would also constrain the future growth of the Borough and miss the significant opportunities to make Enfield a place of growing opportunity for future generations, the green heart of London where all our communities thrive.</p>
<p>B. Plan for the baseline growth of 17,000 homes over the plan period</p>	<p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ maintains existing Green Belt boundaries and reduces the need for development in the Green Belt 	<p>No</p>

Policy options for H1 Housing development sites	Pros and cons of each option	Preferred Option
<p>This option seeks to plan for 1,246 homes a year up to 2029 and around 500 homes from 2029 to 2039.</p> <p>It continues to support and facilitate redevelopment of urban sites and wider regeneration of urban areas, particularly in the town centres, areas around stations and large-scale regeneration and renewal areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ promotes a sustainable pattern of development which makes use of existing brownfield land ✓ enhances the viability and vitality of existing town centres as a focus for shopping, leisure and community/cultural activity ✓ supports regeneration and re-use of existing land and property in the urban area <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ delivers all the housing by concentrating development within the urban area by significantly increasing densities on all sites in the urban area more akin to those found in the most urbanised parts of the country such as central London. ➤ would require tall buildings not only in the town centres and areas around the stations, but across the borough. ➤ seeks to protect the Green Belt from redevelopment but would have a considerable impact on the character of the borough making it significantly more urbanised and adversely affecting the quality of the environment in which we live in. ➤ involves high density development would deliver smaller units such as studios and 1-2 bedroom flats, creating a significant risk to the deliverability of larger/family homes to meet local needs. ➤ could also affect the development viability of and the delivery of affordable housing due to the increasing costs associated with tall buildings. ➤ places pressure on those areas that have historically taken most development and will not deliver the desired mix of housing. ➤ potential to increase levels of housing delivery in existing town centres constrained by a lack of currently available sites and the time and costs associated with the land assembly process 	

Policy options for H1 Housing development sites	Pros and cons of each option	Preferred Option
<p>C. Plan to deliver 25,000 homes under the medium growth option</p> <p>This option seeks to deliver up to 25,000 homes over the plan period, equating to 1,246 homes per year up to 2039.</p> <p>As far as possible, it meets development needs whilst maintaining development at appropriate densities in the urban area by increasing densities on sites in the urban area where it is considered appropriate and does not impact significantly on character.</p> <p>Amends Green Belt boundaries where the areas are in sustainable locations and the areas are not, or are only partially affected by absolute constraints. Within these areas, new settlement and an urban extension have opportunities for accommodating the borough's housing needs taking into account site constraints, land ownership, the need to support</p>	<p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ seeks to balance the needs for housing whilst recognising there are constraints on development within the borough ✓ protects the character of the urban area ✓ protects the majority of the Green Belt ensuring boundaries can endure beyond the plan period ✓ delivers an increase in housing provision over previous Core Strategy ✓ larger sites enable infrastructure to be delivered alongside new development ✓ increases in the delivery of larger/family homes with gardens and delivery of affordable housing, by providing for a wider mix of housing units ✓ reduces reliance on small housing units in tall buildings ✓ supports the regeneration and re-use of urban areas ✓ opportunity to deliver a new settlement at Crews Hill of a significant scale on land around the station; there is a limited number of landowners potentially increasing the deliverability of the project; there is the potential to bid for Government funding to support the delivery of strategic infrastructure; and critical mass of development could help to secure the infrastructure needed to support development. ✓ an urban extension at Chase Park could provide a very wide range of housing needs can be met. This includes the ability to increase the financial viability of delivering much more affordable housing New development will deliver investment in new community infrastructure and services, for example, schools, health facilities, community buildings and recreation space. This can be achieved through a combination of investment within the new development and in existing facilities in the established settlement, especially those that have suffered from a lack of investment or lack capacity to meet existing needs. 	<p>Yes</p>

Policy options for H1 Housing development sites	Pros and cons of each option	Preferred Option
<p>sustainable development, and compliance with other planning policies.</p>	<p>✓ New settlement and extensions, can support the regeneration of existing urban areas. Services and facilities which may be struggling to remain viable, from shops and buses to sports clubs and community groups, benefit from a sizable influx of population.</p> <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ some loss of Green Belt and would be contrary to the London Plan. ➤ development of a new settlement at Crews Hill would require significant public and private sector investment in order to provide the supporting community infrastructure and upgrades; could further exacerbate the recognised capacity issues on the strategic road network; development of scale could have significant environmental implications in terms of impact on the Green Belt and landscape character and flood risk considerations. ➤ large scale urban extension and new settlement are complex to bring forward and take longer to deliver as they may require the provision and forward funding of critical elements of strategic infrastructure ➤ large scale urban extension and new settlement can change the nature/character of the existing settlement and have the most direct impact upon immediately adjoining communities 	
<p>D. Seek to deliver a higher number of new homes within the plan period</p> <p>Based on delivering 52,000 homes up to 2039.</p>	<p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ significant outward expansion of urban area to achieve 36,000 homes ➤ significant increase in densities in the urban and Green Belt areas ➤ requires significant upgrades to the strategic transport network ➤ loss of significant areas of Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land ➤ is unlikely to be achievable as there are significant infrastructure and delivery issues that would need to be overcome to free up all sites for 	<p>No</p>

Policy options for H1 Housing development sites	Pros and cons of each option	Preferred Option
	development within the plan period. Further information is set out in the Growth Topic Paper.	

DRAFT