

THE LONDON BOROUGH OF SOUTHWARK

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
AND ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT 1981**

Revised Inquiry into

**THE LONDON BOROUGH OF SOUTHWARK
(AYLESBURY ESTATE SITES 1B-1C)**

COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2014

PINS REFERENCE: NPCU/CPO/A5840/74092

Objection by

**Victoria Briden
of
Taplow
Phase 3, Aylesbury estate,
Thurlow street, London
SE17 2UJ**

30 October 2017

Introduction

My name is **Victoria Briden** and I am writing to object to the above compulsory purchase order.

1. I have lived in my flat in Taplow (phase 3) on the Aylesbury estate since 1997 - twenty years. I made the decision to buy my home, because I was very happy living in it and I planned to spend many more years there. I bought the flat so that I would have a secure home from where I wouldn't need to move again.
2. I love to live in my flat because it's close to the West End where I work, and because my Latin community is here. I have family living close by and we help each other a lot with the kids and shopping and company. It's important for me to be close to a community I know well and be part of. It makes me feel secure and safe.
3. I love my flat because it is really spacious, it's full of sunlight and I enjoy the beautiful view of the London skyline every day.
4. Southwark Council spent a lot of money to refurbish Taplow, the block I live in. Since 2012 many major works were done on the building, such as Warm Safe and Dry (Decent Homes Standard) and Fire Safety. The whole building has new Fire Doors, there are 4 stairwells in the building, and every flat has fire alarms in all rooms.
5. I have attached a list at **(VB1)** of all the work that has been done on Taplow and Aylesbury in this time. As a leaseholder I have spent a lot of money on these works: for example I paid £4,000 just for external refurbishment. This is just one list of many major works bills. All this work that has been done has brought my home up to decent home standard.

6. I see no good reason why should I be forced to move when my home is safe to live in and has already been refurbished. I will not be able to afford to live in the new development because the rehousing options are not available to me: I am on a low income and I will not be able to get a mortgage because of my age and income, neither would I be able to afford the service charges on the new flats.
7. I went to a viewing of the London Quadrant development, across the road from where I live (site 7): they didn't let me view the flats because they told me that my income is too low. I was very disappointed and sad, and it made me realise that I need to convince the Secretary of State not to allow our estate to be demolished. This is the only way I will be able to remain in the area with the ongoing security of home ownership. I would like to invite the inspector to come and visit my flat, so that he can see for himself how it is spacious, well-built and well-designed home.
8. Earlier this year I took part in an art project which explored the inside of several flats on the estate. My flat also appears in the video of the project which can be viewed here: https://youtu.be/Zfk_KIE4xr8.
9. I have also attached 2 photos of the internal view of my home (Living Room) at **VB2 and VB3**.
10. The Council claims in its statement of case (paragraph 7.39) that its demolition plans have the support of 82% of residents. Ms Kabuto has shown in her evidence that this is 82% of just 54 people – and there is no guarantee that any of these were Aylesbury residents.
11. This is a dubious mandate, especially given that 70% of residents had rejected demolition plans in the (only) ballot held several years prior (**VB4**). I note that the Council's 2005 Executive report in (**CD8**) puts forward one of the reasons for the failed ballot as *"Many of the residents were happy with the internal accommodation"*. (Paragraph 6.1[d])
12. Notwithstanding the lack of resident support for it, the Area Action Plan relied on the leaseholder rehousing policy at the time (**SC2;SC3**), which included the 'like-for-like' property swap option. This would have enabled leaseholders to remain homeowners

in the area. But this was subsequently withdrawn by the Council – without consultation - shortly after the AAAP was adopted.

13.As a result, leaseholders are being left with no other option than to move out of the area to places further out where properties are more affordable (see Professor Lee's evidence).

14. This is not compliant with the Area Action Plan which said that 50% of residents would be rehoused on the estate.

15.The scheme is not proceeding according to the action plan, it does not have the support of residents and is not in the public interest. I submit that the order should not be confirmed.

Signed

Victoria Briden

Date: 30-10-17