

Enfield Labour's poor housing record

Ahead of the local election on May 7th, the Mayor of London has called for people to “... **vote on the track record of their local councils**, rather than using it as a referendum on the imperfections of a Labour government.”¹

Fair enough. So that is what we have done. We looked at Enfield Council's housing record since Labour took overall control in 2010.

This is not our data. It is the GLA's own housing data, with Enfield measured in the same way as every other London borough.

Our analysis, summarised below, shows that Enfield Council's track record for housing delivery since 2010 has been very poor and among the worst in London on multiple measures.

One of London's worst records for housing delivery

- Enfield is the **second worst performing borough in London** for meeting housing targets.
- According to the GLA's [Planning London Datahub](#), between 2010/11 and 2025/26, **Enfield met just 54.3% of its housing target**, despite being set a lower target than most other London boroughs.²
- This means **Enfield is more than 6,700 homes short of where it should be.**
- See Table 1 in Appendix for more information.

More social rent homes lost than built

- Enfield, like the rest of London, desperately needs new social rent homes. But **since 2010/11, the borough has gone backwards, with more social rent homes demolished than built.**
- On this measure, **Enfield ranks 29th out of 32 London boroughs.**
- **Enfield's performance lags far behind its neighbours.** Haringey delivered 965 additional social rent homes, Barnet 755 and Waltham Forest 520, compared to Enfield's **net loss of 295 homes.**
- See Table 2 in Appendix for more information.

Affordable housing delivery has fallen badly short

- Between 2010/11 and 2025/26, **Enfield should have delivered around 4,900 additional affordable homes, yet only around 1,557 were built.**
- Enfield's 1,557 affordable homes is **well below the London borough average** of 4,735 over the same period. It also **leaves Enfield far behind nearby boroughs** such as Haringey, which delivered 5,037, Barnet 4,391 and Waltham Forest 5,159.
- See Table 3 in Appendix for more information.

A poor record of holding housing developers to account

- In Enfield, **developers have too often been allowed to build well below affordable housing policy requirements.** As a result, only a maximum of 19% of new homes delivered since 2010/11 could be classified as affordable, **far below the London Plan's 50% strategic target.**³
- **Other London boroughs have generally done better.** Across London as a whole, 29% of new homes delivered over the same period were classified as affordable, 10 percentage points higher than in Enfield.
- See Table 4 in the Appendix for more information.

Too many poor-quality homes

- One of the worst types of new housing built in Enfield since 2010 has been office to flat conversions through permitted development rights, or PDR. This route allows developers to convert office buildings into flats without complying with normal planning policies. The result is often poor-quality housing.
- The Deputy Mayor for Housing in London has described such homes as the “**slums of the future.**”⁴ The negative impact of PDR has also been the subject of numerous documentaries, academic investigations, and press articles.⁵
- **Most other London boroughs took steps years ago to limit this kind of development. Enfield did not.**⁶ As a result, 877 of the new homes delivered in Enfield since 2010/11 have been PDR conversions.

Why this matters in real life

These failures have real-world consequences.

More than 3,000 Enfield households are currently living in temporary accommodation, a form of housing that has been linked to poor health outcomes. **Had the Council built more social rent homes over the past 15 years, fewer families would be stuck in temporary accommodation.**

The same applies to affordable housing. **Many first-time buyers in Enfield are struggling to get a foot on the housing ladder, and they would be in a better position if the Council had done more to secure genuinely affordable homes.**

What's gone wrong?

In short, talk is cheap. There's been an enormous gap between what Enfield's Labour politicians have said about housing delivery and what has actually been built under their watch.

Too often, the pattern has been the same: big announcements followed by weak delivery.

Take the Council's flagship development at Meridian Water. **In 2010, the plan was to deliver 5,000 homes there by 2026.**⁷ As things stand, only around 300 have been built, with a further 274 due this year. In other words, **roughly 90% of the homes once promised have not been delivered.**

Meridian Water is not a one-off. **There are multiple council-led schemes in Enfield which have also underperformed.**

Yes, there have been challenges. Construction costs have risen and sales of new flats have been weak. But those pressures have not just affected Enfield. **Other boroughs have faced the same problems and have done much better.**

Enfield Council has also been asleep at the wheel. Anyone reading its housing reports or attending its scrutiny meetings could easily come away thinking that performance is broadly on track. But the GLA's own data shows that it is not. **Serious scrutiny of underperformance has been weak, and if the council does not even recognise what is going wrong, it is unlikely to be able to put it right.**

Taken together, these figures make a strong case that Enfield has one of the worst housing records in London overall. Other poor performers at least have something to point to, whether that is more homes built overall, more affordable homes delivered, or a better record on social rent. **Enfield stands out because it has performed so badly across so many of the measures that matter most.**

The Mayor of London has asked people to vote on the track record of their local councils. On housing, his colleagues in Enfield Labour may not thank him for that challenge.

APPENDIX: Tables

Housing targets and delivery (2010/11 – 2025/26)

Table 1: Housing delivery vs targets (2010/11 to 2025/26)

Rank	Borough	Homes delivered	% of target met
28	Greenwich	22,643	52.1%
29	Barking and Dagenham	12,854	53.8%
30	Redbridge	8,080	44.5%
31	Enfield	7,990	54.3%
32	Kensington and Chelsea	3,705	41.2%

Source: [Planning London Datahub](#) (accessed April 2026).

Notes: Ranking is our own comparison, based on both total homes delivered and percentage of target met using Planning London Datahub figures. Rank is out of 32 (32 being the lowest).

Housing shortfall calculation: Target (14,714) – Delivered (7,990) = **6,724**

Social Rent housing

Table 2: Net change in Social Rent housing delivered (2010/11 to 2025/26)

Rank	Borough	Net Change in Social Rent homes delivered
11	Haringey	965
13	Barnet	755
20	Waltham Forest	520
29	Enfield	- 295
30	Southwark	-380
31	Bexley	- 470
32	Ealing	- 3,488

Source: [Planning London Datahub](#) (accessed April 2026).

Notes: Ranking on number of additional Social Rent homes. Rank is out of 32 (32 being the lowest). Haringey, Barnet, and Waltham Forest shown as boroughs neighbouring Enfield.

Affordable housing

Table 3: Net change in affordable housing delivered (2010/11 to 2025/26)

Rank	Borough	Net Change in affordable homes delivered
14	Waltham Forest	5,159
15	Haringey	5,037
18	Barnet	4,391
27	Enfield	1,557
28	Merton	1,330
29	Bromley	1,185
30	Richmond	718
31	Westminster	564
32	Kensington and Chelsea	271

Source: [Planning London Datahub](#) (accessed April 2026).

Notes: Ranking on number of additional affordable homes. Affordable homes are estimated as total delivered minus market homes. This means the figure includes homes recorded in the Datahub as tenure unknown, so the true affordable total may be lower. Haringey, Barnet, and Waltham Forest shown as they are boroughs neighbouring Enfield.

Affordable housing requirement calculation: Target (**14,714**) x London Plan affordable housing requirement (50% for major projects), assuming 67% major projects = **4,929** affordable homes. This is an indicative benchmark only. Affordable housing policy requirements have changed since 2010/11, and different requirements apply to different schemes and development types.

Holding housing developers to account

Table 4: % of newly built homes that were affordable (2010/11 to 2025/26)

Rank	Borough	% affordable homes delivered
27	Enfield	19%
28	Merton	19%
29	Richmond	16%
30	Bromley	13%
31	Kensington & Chelsea	7%
32	Westminster	5%

Source: [Planning London Datahub](#) (accessed April 2026).

Notes: Ranking on % of affordable homes delivered. Affordable homes are estimated as total delivered minus market homes. This means the figure includes homes recorded in the Datahub as tenure unknown, so the true affordable % may be lower.

References

- ¹ <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2026/apr/08/londoners-may-regret-protest-votes-for-reform-or-greens-in-local-elections-says-sadiq-khan>
- ² <https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/residential-completions-dashboard-e196j/>
- ³ See Core Policy H4: <https://www.london.gov.uk/programmes-strategies/planning/london-plan/the-london-plan-2021-online/chapter-4-housing>
- ⁴ https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/slums_of_the_future_-_permitted_development_conversions_in_london_by_tom_copley_am.pdf
- ⁵ For example see: <https://www.facebook.com/bbcpanorama/posts/converted-office-blocks-used-to-house-homeless-people-are-ghettos-that-should-be/1665573823583104/>; <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/av/uk-51363012>; <https://bartlett-review.ucl.ac.uk/can-people-live-in-commercial-spaces/index.html>
- ⁶ <https://www.planninginsight.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Article-4-Directions-for-Conversions-to-Residential-Use-2021.pdf>
- ⁷ See Core Policy 38 https://www.enfield.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0015/4623/planning-policy-information-the-enfield-plan-core-strategy-november-2010.pdf