



Consultation Report for the Aylesbury Area Action Plan

Distribution Record Sheet:	
Name	Company
Annabel Sidney	LBS
Tim Cutts	LBS

Rev	Originator	Approved	Date
1	Preeti Gulati	Dan Hill	9 Aug 2008
2	Cora Barrett	Preeti Gulati/Dan Hill	13 Feb 2008
3	Cora Barrett	Preeti Gulati/Dan Hill	9 Oct 2008
4	Cora Barrett	Preeti Gulati/Dan Hill	1 December 2008

Contents

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Purpose of this document	4
1.2	The objectives of consultation.....	4
1.3	Background.....	5
2	Who and how we consulted	5
2.1	Who was consulted?	5
2.2	Methods of consultation	6
3	Summary of Representations made and how these have been taken into account	9
4	Monitoring the consultation	16
5	Appendix 1: Stage 2 Consultation Plan	25
6	Appendix 2: Stage 3 Consultation Plan	35
7	Appendix 3: Revised Preferred Options Re-Consultation Plan.....	44
8	Appendix 4: Breakdown of Consultees	54
9	Appendix 5: Summary of Consultation Events	55
10	Appendix 6: Issues and options questionnaire	74
11	Appendix 7: Preferred Options Questionnaire.....	75
12	Appendix 8: Revised Preferred Option Questionnaire	76
13	Appendix 9: Public notification of consultation.....	77
13.1	Letter to residents for the Issues and Options report.....	77
13.2	Letter to residents for the Preferred Options report	80
13.3	Letter to residents for the Revised Preferred Options report	84
	Appendix 10: Newspaper Adverts	89
13.4	Advert for the Issues and Options report	90
13.5	Advert for the Preferred Options report.....	93
13.6	Advert for the Revised Preferred Options report.....	95
14	Appendix 11: Report Locations	96

15	Appendix 12: Charter	98
16	Appendix 13: Report on Building Futures	108
17	Appendix 14: Report on Aylesbury Future Roadshow	108
18	Appendix 15: Report on the Revised Preferred Options Consultation	108
19	Appendix 16: TABLE OF REPRESENTATIONS ON THE ISSUES AND OPTIONS REPORT, THE PREFERRED OPTIONS REPORT AND THE REVISED PREFERRED OPTIONS REPORT AND RESPONSES FROM THE COUNCIL	108

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

- 1.1.1 The purpose of this document is to demonstrate the consultation undertaken in developing the submission draft of the Aylesbury Area Action Plan (AAP). This document is prepared under Regulation 30 of the Town and Country (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (amended 2008). This report shows who has been consulted, how they were consulted and a summary of the main issues raised during the consultation. The report will demonstrate compliance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).
- 1.1.2 This report is structured as follows:
- This first introductory section sets out the purpose of the report, the objectives for consultation and outlines the background to the AAP.
 - The second section identifies who and how we consulted, in compliance with Regulation 25 of the Town and Country (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (amended 2008).
 - The third section sets out a summary of the consultations made to date and explains how these were taken into account in the development of the AAP.
 - Finally, the last section sets out how the consultation was monitored and how this has been taken into account.

1.2 THE OBJECTIVES OF CONSULTATION

- 1.2.1 The consultation undertaken during the course of developing the submission draft of the Aylesbury AAP meets and exceeds the government requirements under the Planning Regulations¹. It has also been carried out in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which was adopted on January 29th 2008.
- 1.2.2 During the initial stages of preparing the Aylesbury AAP a Consultation Strategy (June 2007) was prepared to guide consultation through the course of plan preparation. The consultation strategy was based upon a thorough understanding of stakeholders and previous consultation that had been undertaken in the area. The strategy recognises that the methods of consultation need to respond to and effectively involve the diverse local population. The strategy sets out consultation principles which are:
- The need to focus the level and frequency of consultation in accordance with the expected level of change within the Aylesbury area;
 - The need to communicate both clearly and openly;
 - The need to overcome barriers to successful consultation by ensuring that all underrepresented groups are actively engaged in the plan preparation process; and
 - The need to avoid consultation fatigue through ensuring buy-in and involvement in the design and planning process and demonstrating that tangible change is already happening.

¹ Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (amended 2008)

- 1.2.3 The consultation strategy makes a commitment that in preparing the AAP the consultation undertaken will go above and beyond the statutory requirements to engage more continuously and intensively with the general public. Additional means have included the 'Neighbourhood Team' and consultation with key community groups, an 'Information Station', publications in Southwark Council's Regeneration Magazine, a joint Council/NDC regeneration newsletter, a 'Show Homes Exhibition' and three public events. These additional consultation techniques have ensured that those with a stake in the regeneration of the Aylesbury area have been actively involved at all stages of the process and that they support and feel a sense of ownership over the emerging proposals.
- 1.2.4 The consultation strategy sets out that a Consultation Plan would be prepared for each stage of plan making. The Consultation Plans for the Issues and Options, Preferred Options and Revised Preferred Options are set out in Appendices 1, 2 and 3 respectively. These Plans elaborate on the overarching Consultation Strategy, providing more detail with regards to the planned consultation events.

1.3 BACKGROUND

- 1.3.1 The preparation of Aylesbury AAP started in March 2007. The following reports have been produced to develop the submission draft of the Aylesbury AAP.
- Evidence gathering: A baseline report which identified the key issues was published in October 2007. In addition a Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report was subject to consultation for five weeks starting 21st May 2007
 - Issues and Options: An issues and options report was published in October 2007 setting out a number of options for development. The Interim Sustainability Appraisal assessed these options against sustainable objectives.
 - Preferred Options: A Preferred Options Report was published in April 2008, as was the Sustainability Appraisal Report which assessed the options against the sustainable development objectives. An Equalities Impact Assessment set out how the options would be measured in relation to equality target groups.
 - Revised Preferred Options: The Revised Preferred Options Report was published in November 2008 as a response to concerns over family housing provision. The Equalities Impact Assessment and the Sustainability Appraisal Report were updated to reflect this.

2 WHO AND HOW WE CONSULTED

2.1 WHO WAS CONSULTED?

- 2.1.1 Regulation 25 of the Town and Country (Local Development)(England) Regulations 2004 (amended 2008) states that local planning authorities must notify appropriate organisations ("specific and general consultation bodies") which may be affected by or have an interest in development plan documents (DPDs), which include AAPs, and invite them to make representations. In addition, the Regulations state that the local planning authority must also consider whether it is appropriate to invite representations from local residents or businesses in the area. Southwark's SCI sets out a list of statutory and non-statutory consultees for DPDs (Appendix E of the SCI).

- 2.1.2 Specific Consultation Bodies: All the statutory organisations set out in Appendix E of the SCI were notified at each stage of the AAP preparation process.
- 2.1.3 General Consultation Bodies: Notification letters were sent to 2233 individuals and organisations at preferred options and at revised preferred options stages. These included all the local and other consultees set out in Appendix E of the SCI. A breakdown of these consultees is set out in Appendix 4. At issues and options stage, notification was limited to those general consultation bodies which have a direct interest in the AAP area. This included 19 tenants and residents associations, 97 community and voluntary groups, 12 schools, 2 libraries, 5 local authorities and 9 health related organisations. A list of the organisations consulted at issues and options stage is available on request.
- 2.1.4 Local residents and businesses: Notification letters were sent to 234 residents and 493 businesses at preferred options and at revised preferred options stages (see Appendix 4). At the issues and options stage, notification was targeted towards residents and businesses living and operating in and around the AAP area. This included 39 residents and 53 businesses. A list of consultees is available on request.
- 2.1.5 Aylesbury Steering Group and Re-housing Sub-Group: The Aylesbury Steering Group and Re-housing Sub-Group consist of a partnership of residents and Councillor's including tenants and residents associations representatives and leaseholder groups. Regular meetings have been held with both these groups in order to ensure they are involved at each stage of the AAP process.
- 2.1.6 In addition, consultation was carried out with the "Neighbourhood Team". The neighbourhood team was established at the beginning of the AAP process to help develop and champion the Aylesbury AAP. It comprises 40 members representing a wide range of interests, ages, cultures and includes residents, those working with the young, old and vulnerable, transport groups and local businesses and traders. The Neighbourhood Team has participated at each stage in the process, from preparing a charter for the redevelopment and new neighbourhood to taking part in workshops and planning for real events.
- 2.1.7 Local residents and businesses have also been invited to participate in consultation through other means such as exhibitions, website updates and quarterly newsletters sent to every household on the estate. Details of these are set out in Section 2.2.
- 2.1.8 By consulting the specific and general consultation bodies, as well as local residents and businesses, we have met the requirements of Regulation 25 and the council's Statement of Community Involvement.

2.2 METHODS OF CONSULTATION

- 2.2.1 This section summarises the methods of consultation which we used at each stage of the process in order to meet the objectives of the Consultation Strategy and comply with the Regulations and the SCI. Appendix 5 contains a table with a full summary of the consultation which took place.

Evidence gathering

- 2.2.2 The consultation which took place at the first stage in preparing the AAP is set out below:

- Pre AAP consultation: Results of previous consultation undertaken on the estate were reviewed. This included the tenant ballot of 2001-002, Project Placecheck,

August/September 2002, the Options Appraisal for the south west corner, June to November 2004, the Aylesbury Tenants Survey 2005, and three Visioning Workshops held in 2006 and attended by residents and key stakeholders to discuss objectives for the redevelopment of the Aylesbury estate and inform the brief for the masterplanners.

- Sustainability appraisal scoping report: Consultation on the SA scoping report took place over a 5 week period in April and May 2007. It was publicised on the council's website, in local libraries and council offices and by means of an advert in the press. Notification letters were sent to statutory consultees.
- Events and exhibitions: A large public event, the Show Homes Exhibition, was held in June 2007. This event focused on a show home exhibition for phase 1a of the redevelopment in the south-west corner and was also used to help raise awareness of the emerging AAP.
- Stakeholder meetings: The Neighbourhood Team prepared a charter setting out its objectives for the redevelopment of the estate. These objectives formed the basis for the AAP objectives. The team also participated in a series of planning for real events, looking at issues surrounding design, density and value. Consultation on the emerging issues and options also took place with the Aylesbury Estate Steering Group, as well as the Re-housing Subgroup and the overarching consultation strategy and emerging issues and options were presented to Walworth Community Council.

Issues and options

2.2.3 The consultation that took place at issues and options stage is set out below:

- Publicity: Consultation on the AAP issues and options report was widely publicised over a 4 month period beginning on August 28 2007. Formal consultation took place over a 6 week period between October 5 and November 16. However this period was further extended until December 24 to allow residents living around Surrey square to comment. Notification was undertaken by means of a mailout to contacts on Southwark's Planning Policy database (see Appendix 9 for a copy of the letter) , Southwark's website, a newspaper advert (see Appendix 10) and by ensuring that information was available in libraries and council offices (see Appendix 11 for a full list of locations).
- Events and exhibitions: An exhibition entitled Building Futures took place in October 2007 (see Appendix 13 for details). This sought feedback on the issues and options and was combined with a family fun-day, on-site surgeries, and special viewings for particular community groups. In addition, regular surgeries were held in Thurlow Lodge and officers staffed an AAP stall at the Walworth festival.
- Stakeholder meetings: The Neighbourhood Team visited other 4 other cities, Dublin, Paris, Amsterdam and Glasgow, to look at good practice examples of redevelopment elsewhere. Workshops with the Neighbourhood team were held to help inform the preferred options. Continuous consultation also took place with the Aylesbury Estate Steering Group, as well as the Re-housing Subgroup and Walworth Community Council.

Preferred options

2.2.4 The consultation which took place at preferred options stage is set out below:

- **Publicity:** Consultation on the AAP preferred options report was widely publicised over a period commencing on February 19 2008. Formal consultation took place in a 6 week period between April 17 and May 29. Notification was undertaken through a mailout (Appendix 9), Southwark's website, a newspaper advert (Appendix 10), and by ensuring that information was available in libraries and council offices.
- **Events and exhibitions:** The Aylesbury Future Roadshow was held in April 2008 (see Appendix 14 for details). This sought residents' opinions on the preferred options. In addition, regular surgeries were held in Thurlow Lodge.
- **Stakeholder meetings:** As with previous stages, consultation on the preferred options took place with the Aylesbury Estate Steering Group, the Re-housing Subgroup and Walworth Community Council.

Revised preferred options

2.2.5 In response to comments received at the previous stages of consultation, a number of the Preferred Options were changed in order to make the development more family friendly. While not a statutory requirement, the council decided to consult on revised preferred options in order to ensure transparency. The consultation which took place at revised preferred options stage is set out below:

- **Publicity:** Consultation on the revised preferred options report was publicised over a period commencing on October 8. Formal consultation took place over a 6 week period between 21st November and 2nd January 2009. Notification was undertaken by means of a mailout (Appendix 9), website, advertisement in the press (Appendix 10) and through ensuring that the document was available in local libraries and council offices.
- **Events and exhibitions:** A public exhibition was held from 30th October to 2nd November 2008 to help inform local people of the changes to the preferred options and get their views on the revised preferred options (see Appendix 15 for details).
- **Stakeholder meetings:** Revised preferred options were presented to Walworth Community Council and together with the publication draft of the AAP, were discussed by the Aylesbury Estate Steering Group and Re-housing Subgroup.

2.2.6 This section together with Appendix 5 demonstrates how we have met and gone beyond the minimum requirements for consultation set out in Regulation 25 and the SCI.

2.2.7 The council have used a variety of means in involving local residents and other stakeholders in the preparation of the AAP. The Neighbourhood Team played a particularly important role in establishing consensus around the aspirations and objectives of the AAP. It enabled a number of local residents, businesses and representatives of community groups and other service providers to be actively involved in the preparation of options and preferred options. In doing this, it helped build up support for the project and establish confidence in the fairness and

transparency of the process. At each stage, the team was made aware of the key challenges and trade-offs to be made. Workshops on design, density and value, together with visits to other cities helped give the team the tools and confidence to make a balanced judgement on the options.

- 2.2.8 With regard to wider participation, by far the most effective means of engagement occurred through the exhibitions and drop in sessions. These enabled a large number of people to give their views in a way which was fun, accessible and un-intimidating. At each stage, consultation was monitored and results fed into the planning of the following phases of consultation. The outcome of this process is described in Section 4 of this report.

3 SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS MADE AND HOW THESE HAVE BEEN TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT

- 3.1.1 The following section presents a summary of the main issues arising from the consultation which has been carried out and a brief explanation about how these issues have been considered in preparing the publication version of the AAP.

- 3.1.2 Further information on the issues which arise in this section can be found in the appendices. These include:

- An analysis of the Building Futures Exhibition in Appendix 13;
- An analysis of the Aylesbury Roadshow exhibition in Appendix 14;
- An analysis of the revised preferred options consultation in Appendix 15; and
- A table of all the comments received and the council's response to them in Appendix 16.

Issues and Options Consultation

- 3.1.3 In total, 33 written representations were received in response to the issues and options report, as well as a petition with 415 signatures relating specifically to Surrey Square. The representations consisted of:

- 13 questionnaires
- 6 emails
- 14 letters

- 3.1.4 The main issues raised in response to this formal consultation were:

- Tenure mix: Preferences about the tenure mix were split fairly evenly. 4 people agreed with minimum private housing (Tenure Mix Option 1), 5 people agreed with medium private housing provision (Tenure Mix Option 2) and 6 people agreed with maximum private housing provision (Tenure Mix Option 3).
- Size of homes: 11 respondents stated that they agreed with the option set out for a mix of different size homes, including approximately 35% with three or more bedrooms, while 2 respondents stated that there should be more larger homes.

- Demolition and refurbishment: There was support for both the demolition and refurbishment (New Homes Options 1: Demolish and redevelop the entire Aylesbury Estate – 5 people and Option 2: Refurbish Selected Buildings – 9 people);
- Street layout: There was broad support for Street Layout Option 2: Putting back the Traditional Connections and Creating Green Fingers (11 preferences against 3 for option 1).
- Density: With regard to density, support was evenly split across the three options. It is important to remember that all options were based around building 5000 units.
- Burgess park: There was no support for the minimum intervention option. Preferences for options 2-5 were evenly split.
- Building heights: Responses were split across the 4 options. 5 respondents stated that building would be too high and 3 respondents questioned the location of the taller buildings.
- Transport and car parking: There was broad support for the three transport options and proposed level of car parking.
- Non-residential uses: There was a clear preference favouring clustering non-residential uses in order to enable them to support one another and benefit from co-location.
- Employment: There was strong support for providing new employment space within the masterplan area and also for ensuring that jobs and training generated by development would be targeted towards local people.
- Health: There was also strong support for providing new health facilities and ensuring that health considerations were taken into account in the design of the new neighbourhoods and parks.
- Education: Strong support was voiced for the options set out around improving educational opportunities.
- Shopping: The majority of respondents favoured providing some convenience shopping space within the masterplan area.

3.1.5 The responses received from statutory consultees were largely detailed in the form of letters and emails. They may be summarised as follows:

3.1.6 GLA: The GLA noted that all three options around affordable housing were compliant with London plan policy. Support was also expressed for the bedroom split, densities and the proposed street layout. TfL strongly supported proposed car parking levels and wished to see more detail on planning obligations and transport assessments as the AAP progressed. The LDA were supportive of the consideration given to skills and business space.

3.1.7 GOL: GOL indicated that the overall approach was welcomed and appeared to embrace the principles of the new planning system. It was noted that the four place making themes were locally specific and address key issues relating to the estate and areas around and the linkages between them.

3.1.8 Natural England: Natural England welcomed the place making objectives in the report. Their chief concern was to ensure that adequate levels of green space were provided within the new neighbourhood.

3.1.9 English Heritage: English Heritage wished to see more consideration given to the historic environment within the sustainability appraisal and also within the place-making objectives. Allied to this, concern was also raised about building heights and in particular their impacts on the adjacent conservation area and listed buildings on Portland Street and Liverpool Grove.

3.1.10 Environment Agency: Environment Agency raised no objections to the options set out and acknowledged that the report had given consideration to issues of flood risk management, sustainable use of water resources, biodiversity and renewable energy.

3.1.11 As noted previously a petition was submitted which set out a strong objection to the option to build on a part of Surrey Square. In addition to this, several letters were received which reiterated many of the points made in the petition.

3.1.12 As part of the Issues and Options consultation the Building Futures Exhibition was held over three days from Thursday 18 October until Saturday 20 October 2007. Over the course of the three days the exhibition was seen by 274 people and 199 questionnaires were completed and analysed. Responses to the key points of the preferred options were as follows:

- Preferences over the three tram routes presented were split, however the highest percentage (38%) favoured routing the tram along Thurlow Street and Wells Way.
- 62% favoured clustering non-residential facilities in key locations rather than dispersing them throughout the masterplan area.
- The majority (62%) showed a preference for locating children's play space facilities both in the masterplan area and in Burgess Park.
- 37% favoured providing some tall buildings (Options 3 and 4), while 27% favoured a range of heights (Option 2) and 27% preferred medium rise heights through the area (Option 1);
- The vast majority of respondents favoured taking action to improve Burgess Park (options two to five). Only 7% favour minimum intervention in the park.
- 45% of respondents favoured tenure mix option two (medium private provision), while 16% backed option three (maximum private provision);

Preferred Options Consultation

3.1.13 As part of the formal consultation for the preferred options a total of 72 representations were received, along with a petition with 143 signatures. The 72 representations broke down as follows:

- 18 questionnaires
- 14 letters/emails
- 40 representations made on the public exhibition questionnaire submitted after the exhibition had closed, but before the overall consultation period had closed

3.1.14 The main issues raised in response to this formal consultation were:

- Dwelling sizes: Most respondents considered that more homes with three or more bedrooms should be provided;
- Demolition/retention: Many of the representations supported the preferred options approach, although a significant number rejected it. Some people

believed that further consideration should be given to refurbishment, particularly of the red-brick blocks;

- Affordable homes: Many of the representations supported the preferred options approach, although a significant number disagreed on the basis that the council should respect the outcome of the 2001 ballot and that there should be no loss of council-owned homes;
- Density and building heights: Respondee generally considered the proposed building heights to be too tall and thought more open spaces should be provided;
- Street layout: Proposed street layouts were generally supported. The green fingers and proposals to alter the character of Albany Road were mentioned specifically;
- Open space and Burgess Park: Many of the respondents supported the idea of improving Burgess Park. Many however felt that further work needed to be done with the community to work up proposals for Burgess Park. A number of respondents mentioned that consultation on issues affecting Burgess Park should not be confined to residents in the Aylesbury area;
- Transport: the preferred options were generally supported, although some considered that more work needed to be done to help bring about the delivery of the tram and improvements to the bus network;
- Social and community facilities: the preferred options were generally supported. The need for shops and other facilities for the community was recognised
- Around 60% the respondents rejected all the preferred options on the basis that the estate should not be demolished and the council should respect the 2001 ballot

3.1.15 GLA: The GLA considered that proposed densities and provision of affordable housing were in line with London Plan policy. The Mayor's main concern was that more family housing should be provided and that further consideration should be given to the implications of a situation where the Cross River Tram is not delivered.

3.1.16 GOL: GOL highlighted a number of issues regarding process. In particular they cautioned that the council would need to be able to demonstrate that the proposals were founded on a sound evidence base. They wished to see the relation between the AAP and the Southwark Plan made more apparent. The need to be able to ensure that proposals were implementable was also emphasised.

3.1.17 CABE: CABE welcomed the proposed masterplan, stating that the calm, simple structure of the plan is to be commended. It was noted that the next stages of the masterplanning process would present many challenges. These included the need to "future-proof" the masterplan, secure a variety of plot sizes and densities in order to give character to the area, give further definition to the distinction between private and public space, and develop a robust business plan.

3.1.18 Natural England and English Heritage: Both organisations generally welcomed the preferred options and in particular those areas relating to open spaces and transport. Natural England encouraged the council to adopt their open space standards for the AAP. English Heritage considered that further thought should be given to the impact of the proposals on conservation areas and listed buildings and

recommended that the council's design and conservation team be closely involved in preparing the submission draft.

3.1.19 The petition asks the council to accept the 2001 ballot, raises concerns about the loss of affordable housing, in particular the net loss of family homes for social renting, and rejects demolition.

3.1.20 The Aylesbury Future Roadshow was held on 19 April. 445 visitors were recorded at the Roadshow, though actual attendance was probably higher. 305 exhibition questionnaires were completed and 149 people made written comments. Responses to the key points of the preferred options were as follows:

- 74% supported the tenure split. The desire for more social rented housing was evident in some of the comments;
- 90% agreed the emphasis should be on providing a variety of homes of different sizes and types, although many felt that more family sized homes should be provided;
- 83% supported demolition. A few comments suggested keeping the red brick buildings or refurbishment of the grey concrete blocks.
- 71% supported building heights, although some dislike of tall buildings was evident;
- 90% supported improvements to Burgess Park and 71% agreed with the location of play spaces;
- 65% supported the proposed car parking provision, although some felt that more spaces should be provided;
- 90% supported the proposals for employment
- 85% supported the provision of retail and community facilities hubs

Revised Preferred Options Consultation

3.1.21 In total, 11 written representations were received in response to formal consultation on the revised preferred options. These were broadly supportive of the options. The Head of Surrey Square Junior School expressed concern that the impact of the regeneration on local schools had not been taken sufficiently into account. The council's response to representations on the revised preferred options are set out in Appendix 16.

3.1.22 GLA: The Deputy Mayor considered that the principle of the development of the AAP is supported from a strategic planning perspective. The design concept and level of affordable housing was also thought to be acceptable. The revised housing mix, family focus and increased number of houses were welcomed. It was noted that further work needs to be undertaken on the viability of the plans.

3.1.23 TfL: TfL considered that notwithstanding the Mayor's recent announcement on the cross river tram, Southwark should continue to safeguard the tram route while alternative public transport improvements were considered.

3.1.24 GOL: GOL highlighted a number of issues regarding process. In particular they cautioned that the council would need to be able to demonstrate that the proposals were founded on a sound evidence base and are implementable. With regard to consultation, GOL expressed concern that it would be difficult to take the response to the revised preferred options consultation fully into account in view of the turn

around time between revised preferred options and preparation of the publication draft AAP.

3.1.25 Natural England and the Coal Authority: No comments at this stage.

3.1.26 English Heritage: English Heritage welcomed the revised proposals.

3.1.27 Thames Water: Thames Water stated that it was unclear from the revised preferred options what the net increase in demand for their infrastructure will be.

3.1.28 The Revised Preferred Options Exhibition took place in three locations throughout the AAP boundary area over three days from the 30th October to the 2nd November 2008. During this time 54 people visited the exhibition and 46 filled in questionnaires. The responses to the revised preferred options were as follows:

- 89% agreed with revised tenure mix, however one comment supported prioritising private-sales while another was concerned with the percentage of socially-rented houses;
- 89% agreed with the revised types of homes, comments promoted the need for new homes to have a good layout, and one response showed concern in the overall reduction in numbers of homes compromising the economic viability of the scheme;
- 85% agreed with the revised sizes of homes, however some comments showed concern for the accommodation of older residents in view of the increase in family homes and there was some disagreement over the decrease in two-bed homes;
- 96% agreed with reducing the density of the scheme, although two comments suggested density should be further reduced;
- 94% agreed with the changes to building heights, however some comments suggested the revised building heights were still too high;
- 89% agreed with the revised preferred options overall, though some in support felt that the changes should be integrated with more communal public green / open space and there should be good cycling paths to the area; and
- Further comments referred to the need for implementation / actions and the timescale of the redevelopment and one comment expressed concern over secured parking spaces / garages for residents.

How have these issues been taken into account

Tenure mix and affordable housing:

3.1.29 In response to the preferred options, many respondents objected to the proposals on the basis that the council should not demolish the estate and should respect the 2001 ballot by ensuring that there would be no loss of homes owned and managed by the council.

3.1.30 Under current financial arrangements the council is not able to build new council homes. The revised preferred option will continue to ensure that we meet the re-housing needs of existing tenants through maximising affordable housing provision. However, evidence from other schemes shows that not everyone who is an existing tenant wants to come back. In addition, the revised preferred option also seeks to provide intermediate housing in order to increase choice and provide a significant element of private housing to create a more mixed and balanced community. The introduction of some private homes in the masterplan area will also help broaden

housing choice. At the time of the 2001 census, 69% of all homes in East Walworth Ward were social rented. In Faraday ward, 79% of all homes were social rented. This approach reflects the thrust of our emerging core strategy which is exploring a more area based approach to the provision of affordable housing.

- 3.1.31 There will be some loss of affordable housing, which is necessary in order to ensure that the redevelopment of the estate is viable and can be delivered. However, this loss is likely to be very small, particularly when measured in habitable rooms, and it will be off set by the significant benefits to be gained by redevelopment. The Mayor has stated in response to the revised preferred options that he considers the mix to be in line with the London Plan.

Bedroom split:

- 3.1.32 In response to consultation on the preferred options, a number of consultees considered that a higher proportion of family units should be provided. This was also raised by the Mayor as the GLA's main concern. The revised preferred option addresses this issue by increasing the proportion of homes which have three or more bedrooms. We consider that our revised preferred option will help create an area which is much more attractive for families.

Building heights and density:

- 3.1.33 Our approach to density was initially developed in collaboration with the Neighbourhood Team and through the use of planning for real events. As consultation progressed, it became clearer that residents and stakeholders wished the new neighbourhood to be more family friendly. In response we increased the proportion of family sized homes, including houses, and gave more homes access to private gardens or courtyards. This resulted in lower densities, lowering the heights of some of the buildings, particularly in those areas adjacent to conservation areas and the existing development in Walworth, and cutting down the total number of homes.

Demolition and retention:

- 3.1.34 Detailed studies on the cases for both the demolition and retention of the buildings on the estate presented very strong arguments for demolishing and rebuilding all the buildings. This represents a more cost-effective approach and in addition the 'clean slate' approach will also allow more of the sustainable development objectives to be achieved and enable the creation of a more mixed community and a transformation of the design and layout of the area.

Open spaces:

- 3.1.35 All the options for Burgess Park which were identified in the Preferred Options Report will be incorporated in the publication draft as there is scope to develop them all within the park. The AAP is not the appropriate vehicle for setting out detailed proposals on the design and management of the park; rather, it will briefly set out the principles and themes for improvement. Further design work for the park will be carried out later. This will be consulted upon separately, and will involve residents both within and outside of the AAP area.
- 3.1.36 At the issues and options stage there were strong objections to building on Surrey Square. We carried out further work which showed that the benefits of building on the square were not sufficient to justify the loss of open space valued by the local community, so the idea of building on the square was not taken forward in the preferred options.

Cross River Tram:

3.1.37 In November 2008 the Mayor took the decision not to progress with the Cross River Tram. However, the space originally allocated for the tram has been retained within the plan to provide the opportunity to develop high capacity quality public transport routes, with the mode as yet undefined, in the future. At Transport for London's request the council will continue to safeguard these routes.

Delivery and implementation:

3.1.38 We have continued to develop a business plan as the AAP has progressed and we have produced a financial model for the lifetime of the project. More details are set out in section 7 and Appendix 7 of the AAP, Delivery and Implementation.

4 MONITORING THE CONSULTATION

- 4.1.1 The Consultation Strategy states that throughout the consultation programme monitoring will take place to ensure that the objectives of the Strategy are being met. This includes an assessment of event attendance, as well as the monitoring of attendees' age, gender and ethnicity. The following table examines how Equalities Target Groups were consulted, sets out the results of consultation and shows how these results influenced our approach as we progressed through the AAP preparation process.
- 4.1.2 Our Statement of Community Involvement indicates that the success of consultation will be measured by the numbers and diversity of consultees and respondents. Table 3 demonstrates that the most successful forms of engagement at each stage of the consultation process have been the public exhibitions, as they led to the return of the most questionnaires from a more diverse range of people, in comparison to responses to the formal questionnaire. The exhibitions presented information on the AAP clearly and succinctly on boards with large print writing. The questionnaires at these events were also shorter and simpler, in order to ensure participation was simple and accessible for all attendees.
- 4.1.3 At each stage of the consultation process, the public exhibition questionnaires have been returned by an ethnically diverse range of people. This may have been due to the provision of translation services and the targeting of particular cultural groups.
- 4.1.4 It was evident at the issues and options stage that young people, particularly 16 to 24 year olds, were under represented in the responses. In order to resolve this issue, special events targeted at young people, and particularly this age groups, were organised as part of the preferred options consultation. This approach significantly increased the proportion of responses from this age group, from just 6% at the issues and options stage, to 11% for the preferred options.
- 4.1.5 At the revised preferred options stage, the consultation exhibition was much smaller and there were no events targeted for younger people. This was evident in the lack of responses from young people, but a separate young person's workshop on the AAP including the Revisions to the Preferred Options is planned for later in the consultation period to communicate the plans to Aylesbury's young people.

- 4.1.6 Many of the Equalities Target Groups, including disabled people, sexuality and faith groups, have not been monitored. However, local organisations representing each of these groups have been contacted during the consultation process in order to encourage them to participate.

Table 1: Monitoring the consultation

Group	How Consulted	Actions
<p>Gender i.e</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Women ▪ Men ▪ Transgender 	<p>No specific action was taken to target gender groups in consultation. However, special viewings for women's groups from certain ethnic groups were arranged at the Building Futures event, including the Aylesbury Turkish Women's Group, the Aylesbury Every Women's Group and the Aylesbury Somali Women's Group. In general there was an equal divide between the number of male and female respondents, however no information is available on the number of transgender respondents.</p> <p>43% of respondents to the questionnaires received from the Building Futures event were male and 57% were female.</p> <p>However responses to the Issues and Options Consultation Questionnaire were male dominated. 69% of respondents were male compared to only 23% female respondents (8% did not respond).</p> <p>In contrast, 44% of people who stated their gender on the formal Preferred Options questionnaire were female, compared to just 31% who were male. 25% did not respond on this point.</p> <p>Responses to the formal questionnaire for the revised</p>	<p>The Building Futures event provided a balance between the number of male and female responses, which proved the success of such forms of consultation in attracting a balanced audience. At the next stage we continued to engage with people in this way with a shorter and more accessible questionnaire and with information more succinctly presented on boards. Gender was not monitored in responses to the Aylesbury Future Roadshow.</p> <p>Responses to the formal questionnaires show a more unbalanced set of respondents. The gender profile of the Issues and Options and Revised Preferred Options questionnaires received were male dominated, whereas there were a greater number of replies to the Preferred Options questionnaire from women. However since almost a third of people who replied did not answer this question at this stage it is difficult to judge whether or not there was real difference in the trend for the preferred options stage.</p>

	preferred options were the least balanced with three of the four responses from men (75%) and only one from a woman (25%).	
Race <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ White groups ▪ African ▪ Indian ▪ Pakistani ▪ Bangladeshi ▪ Chinese ▪ Others 	<p>Respondents to consultation have been from a diverse range of ethnic groups. In order to encourage participation from minority groups consultation events have included special events for target groups including a translator where necessary.</p> <p>For example the Show Homes Exhibition included special viewings for the Bagladeshi, Somali and Latin American Groups. The Building Futures event included viewings from the Aylesbury Turkish Women's Group, the Latin American Multi-Cultural Group, the Southwark Cyprus Turkish Group, the Latin American Art Group, the Aylesbury Bengali Group, the Southwark Refugee Communities Group and the Aylesbury Somali Women's Group.</p> <p>The ethnic diversity profile of respondents to the questionnaires received at the Building Futures event were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 35% White British ▪ 33% Black/Black British ▪ 10% Asian/Asian British ▪ 8% Mixed ▪ 6% White other ▪ 6% Latin American ▪ 1% Chinese/other SE Asian 	<p>At the issues and options stage responses to the questionnaire at the Building Futures Event were from a diverse group of people. Due to the success of this, another public event was planned for the preferred options stage and the revised preferred options stage, which also included services to target specific ethnic groups including translation services and provided information succinctly presented on boards with a shorter and more accessible questionnaire.</p> <p>However responses to the formal questionnaire was significantly less diverse at all stages.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1% Other <p>56 respondents (28%) did not fill in the ethnic diversity monitoring section of the questionnaire.</p> <p>The ethnicity of respondents to the Aylesbury Future Roadshow questionnaire were fairly similar to those received at the Building Futures exhibition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 46% White British ▪ 31% Black/Black British ▪ 4% Asian/Asian British ▪ 9% Mixed ▪ 4% White other ▪ 3% Latin American ▪ 3% Chinese/other SE Asian <p>A further 64 respondents (21%) did not answer this question.</p> <p>However responses to the formal consultation questionnaires were much less diverse. 69% of respondents to the issues and options questionnaire were white British and the remaining 31% did not specify their ethnicity. Similarly, 69% of respondents to the preferred options were white British, and in addition 13% stated they were Asian/ Asian British and 6% said they were white other.</p> <p>Again the respondees to the exhibition questionnaire for the revised preferred options were from a range of ethnic</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>groups, comprising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 61% White British/ Irish • 15% Black/Black British • 10% Asian/Asian British • 8% White other • 3% Latin American • 3% Chinese/other SE Asian <p>Only four responses were received for the revised preferred options formal questionnaire; of these, 3 of the respondents (75%) listed their nationality as White British and the other stated they were White other (25%).</p>	
<p>Disabled People</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Physical, Sensory and Neurological disability ▪ Learning disability ▪ Mental Health 	<p>Special viewing events were organised at the exhibitions for people with disabilities from the Aylesbury Day Care Centre. Care was also taken to ensure that all venues were fully accessible. The Disabilities Forum were also contacted to participate in consultation.</p> <p>No information is available on the number of respondents with disabilities.</p>	<p>This category has not been monitored. Local disability groups have been consulted in the process and will continue to be encouraged to participate.</p>
<p>Sexuality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Gay ▪ Lesbian ▪ Bisexual ▪ Transgender 	<p>The Southwark Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans Network were contacted to participate in consultations.</p> <p>No information on the number of respondents from these groups are available.</p>	<p>Further consultation with local LGBT groups will be encouraged, though this category is not currently monitored.</p>
<p>Age</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pre-school ▪ School Age 	<p>Consultation events have been targeted at attracting groups of all ages. The Show Homes Exhibition and the Building Futures Event both included youth events and Family</p>	<p>During the issues and options consultation there was a notable low response rate from 16-24 year olds, therefore this group were</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adult ▪ Older persons 	<p>Fundays to encourage participation from younger people. The Show Homes Exhibition also included special viewing times for people over 50.</p> <p>Furthermore, local youth groups, such as North West Quadrant Youth Providers Network, and local schools were contacted in order to encourage participation from young people. The Pensioners Forum were also contacted to invite elderly people to attend consultation events.</p> <p>Respondents to questionnaires at the Building Futures Event were of a diverse range of age groups, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 27% under 16 year olds • 6% 16-24 year olds • 13% 25-35 year olds • 35% 36-55 year olds • 19% over 56 years old <p>Again responses to the Issues and Options formal Consultation Questionnaire were much less diverse:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15% 25-35 year olds • 56% 36-55 year olds • 23% over 56 year olds <p>Due to previously low responses from young people, the Aylesbury Future Roadshow provided events specifically targeted at young people, such as a young people's day and a family fun day. This proved successful, generating</p>	<p>targeted for consultation at the preferred options stage.</p> <p>The Aylesbury Future Roadshow increased responses from this group by 5% through the provision of events specifically targeted at this age group. While responses from this age group were still low at the preferred options stage at only 6%, it was a significant improvement from the issues and options stage. This highlights the importance of continuing to engage with this age group in order to promote responses.</p> <p>There were very few responses from young people at the revised preferred options stage, perhaps due to the lack of events targeted at them at this stage. However a separate young person's workshop on the AAP including the Revisions to the Preferred Options is planned for later in the consultation period to directly communicate the plans to Aylesbury's young people.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>5% more responses from 16-24 year olds. The age profile of respondents was as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 27% under 16 year olds • 11% 16-24 year olds • 14% 25-35 year olds • 29% 36-55 year olds • 18% over 56 years old <p>The responses to the formal questionnaire were also more diverse at this stage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6% 16-24 year olds • 13% 25-35 year olds • 38% 36-55 year olds • 25% over 56 years old <p>During the Revised Preferred Options Exhibition there were no events targeted at young people, and the effect of this is evident in the significant reduction in responses from younger people at this stage, with the age distribution of respondents being as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8% 16-24 year olds • 13% 25-35 year olds • 43% 36-55 year olds • 33% over 56 years old 	
Faith Groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Christian ▪ Muslim ▪ Hindu 	<p>The Southwark Multi Faith Forum and the Southwark Muslim Forum were contacted to participate in consultation events.</p>	<p>This category has not been monitored, however these groups have been targeted for consultation.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Buddhist ▪ Sikh ▪ Jewish ▪ Other 	<p>No information is available on the number of representations from people of different faiths.</p>	
---	--	--