

**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**

**John Wesley Evans**

**of**

**Wendover, Thurlow Street SE17 2UG**

---

**28<sup>th</sup> October 2017**

## **Introduction**

I **John Wesley Evans, owner of [REDACTED] Wendover, Thurlow Street SE17 2UG**, object to the CPO that's being put forward by Southwark Council regarding the regeneration of the Aylesbury Estate.

Whilst I am not a resident on the order land, I am a resident in (the next phase2) and am conscious that confirmation of this order will be relied upon by the Council both in its approach to negotiations and for compulsory purchase orders for later phases.

I have lived on the estate and have a leasehold interest in 220 Wendover, Thurlow Street, SE17 2UG, a 2-bed flat with a balcony with sweeping views of London.

I am writing to object to the above compulsory purchase order. The reasons I object to the CPO are as below:

I am very happy with my home and where I live. It is very spacious and we enjoy the green space, play areas and local amenities with Burgess Park just a few minutes walk away.

## **Breaking up of the Community**

1. The regeneration will break up the community here in which I belong, socially cleansing the area with no viable proposal for remaining in the area and community to which I am interwoven.
2. As someone who regularly engages in sporting activity in Burgess Park it is important for me to stay fit and healthy in my community. Moving away from this could negatively affect my well-being.
3. I wish to live somewhere that is equally close to the centre of London, where I conduct the majority of my business.
4. I have my Church community in Peckham, a move will break up the community, connections and support network that I have living in the area.
5. I have my friendship network here in the Peckham area. Current proposals will break up my network and could cause me to be isolated if I have to move away.

## **Introduction**

I **John Wesley Evans, owner of 220 Wendover, Thurlow Street SE17 2UG**, object to the CPO that's being put forward by Southwark Council regarding the regeneration of the Aylesbury Estate.

Whilst I am not a resident on the order land, I am a resident in (the next phase2) and am conscious that confirmation of this order will be relied upon by the Council both in its approach to negotiations and for compulsory purchase orders for later phases.

I have lived on the estate and have a leasehold interest in 220 Wendover, Thurlow Street, SE17 2UG, a 2-bed flat with a balcony with sweeping views of London.

I am writing to object to the above compulsory purchase order. The reasons I object to the CPO are as below:

I am very happy with my home and where I live. It is very spacious and we enjoy the green space, play areas and local amenities with Burgess Park just a few minutes walk away.

## **Breaking up of the Community**

1. The regeneration will break up the community here in which I belong, socially cleansing the area with no viable proposal for remaining in the area and community to which I am interwoven.
2. As someone who regularly engages in sporting activity in Burgess Park it is important for me to stay fit and healthy in my community. Moving away from this could negatively affect my well-being.
3. I wish to live somewhere that is equally close to the centre of London, where I conduct the majority of my business.
4. I have my Church community in Peckham, a move will break up the community, connections and support network that I have living in the area.
5. I have my friendship network here in the Peckham area. Current proposals will break up my network and could cause me to be isolated if I have to move away.

### **Breach of my Human Rights**

1. As Sadij Javid understood, the CPO is in violation of my Human Rights as the proposed compensation does not allow me to purchase any comparable property within the borough.
2. The vicinity is well located for shops and amenities. I wish to stay in the area and being forced out against will with no alternative viable option is against my Human Rights.
3. I am an active member in the Conservative party for Peckham and Camberwell and wish to remain and time in my community.

### **No suitable alternative package of “like for like” put forward**

1. Notwithstanding the package of rehousing measures and assurances referred to in the Council’s Statement of Case, we have not been offered or seen any alternative accommodation which would be suitable and offer the same advantages as our present home. Indeed it is unlikely that we will be able to similarly spacious apartments or apartments with similar gardens or such large balconies as we currently own. It is very unlikely that I will be placed in an equivalent position.
2. When I decided to buy my home it was because we wanted to benefit from the main advantage of home ownership – the freedom to do as I please and pass it onto my family in the future. None of the rehousing options currently on offer will place me in an equivalent position.
3. The rehousing offer that would have placed me in an equivalent position has been withdrawn by the Council – the ‘like for like’ property swap option.

### **There is no problem with the current properties, no need to move!**

1. I question whether it is necessary to demolish our homes. We understand that they are structurally sound and comply with building regulations. The Council’s evidence to the inquiry is based largely on a subjective argument that the public realm is poorly designed. As long term end users of the estate we disagree – the

green spaces are well used and the walkways are a useful way of getting around and crucially keep children safe away from busy roads.

2. The properties in our block are easily accessed via a lift.
3. The block could benefit from a "face lift" or refurbishment, as has happened elsewhere, but there is no reason to destroy buildings which are only 40 years old. The Council's argument that the estate is a 'monolithic', 'brutalist', 'concrete fortress' and that the fabric of the estate is 'dated' is itself based on dated logic. There is a growing appreciation for modernist architecture and the healthy sales market for homes on the estate despite being earmarked for demolition attests to this.
4. Destroying communities and demolishing perfectly good homes because they are concrete or dated is not environmentally or socially sustainable. I submit that the Council should give further consideration to the option of refurbishment.

### **Negotiations and compensation have been minimal**

1. The emphasis on the part of the Council so far in negotiations has been to press the relocation opportunities, which so far have turned out to be unaffordable or contain restrictions in the small print. Liaison between different Council departments has been poor; there is a complete lack of continuity, whereby different officers from different departments continually ask the same questions.
2. There is little discussion about the level of compensation. We appointed a surveyor who valued our home considerably higher than the Council's valuation. The Council refused to negotiate and said that if we don't agree with its valuation then we can take it to court (Upper Tribunal). For people like myself on a modest income, the prospect of litigation and associated risk is simply unthinkable.

3. The Council's use of compulsory purchase powers without having a package in place to ensure that leaseholders are placed in equivalent position is oppressive and a breach of human rights. I urge the Secretary of State to reject the Council's application for compulsory purchase powers.

**Signed:**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J Evans', with a stylized, cursive script.

John Wesley Evans

**Date:**

28.10.17