

**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**

---

**Proof of Evidence of  
Professor Loretta Lees (FACSS, FRSA)  
BA (Hons), PhD  
For the Aylesbury Leaseholders Group**

---

**12 December 2017**

## **Summary of evidence**

FOI requests and research from my ESRC funded project 'Gentrification, Displacement, and the Impacts of Council Estate Renewal in C21st London' form the evidence base in my witness statement. The findings are as follows:

1. FOI data shows that to date Southwark has decanted 1,310 households from the active phases of the Aylesbury Estate regeneration, and only 112 former secure tenanted households and 6 leaseholders have been rehoused back on the redeveloped footprint of the Estate (about 10%). This fails to comply with the Local Plan for the area which envisaged 50% of tenants being rehoused on the redeveloped estate. The knock on effects are seen in the 1,143 tenanted Southwark households relocated outside the borough over the past 5 years, increased homelessness, and increased spend on temporary housing.
2. In terms of leaseholders, by 10<sup>th</sup> Oct 2017, of the 148 leasehold and freehold properties recorded as being physically resident on the Aylesbury Estate, only 16 (about 11%) have managed to remain in SE17 on or near the footprint of the estate (see LL1 maps). In-depth interviews from my ESRC funded research (see LL2 and LL3) show the psychological and other impacts of being decanted from one's long term home and community. Notting Hill's own research (see LL4) backs this ESRC research up.
3. The proposed tenure mix/distribution in the individual development blocks in the FDS does not comply with the AAP's requirements. The AAP requires the tenure mix of each individual block to mirror the tenure mix required of the respective phase. The tenure mix required on the FDS is 59% affordable/41% private and each development block should reflect this. However, ten of the blocks proposed for the FDS are entirely mono tenure. By this I mean that they are either 100% social housing or 100% private housing. It is little surprise that the two large two tower blocks overlooking Burgess park will be entirely private housing, with the social housing blocks cowering in their shadow.

4. My evidence shows that the scheme underlying the order is failing to meet the AAAP's requirement of housing 50% of tenants in new homes on the estate footprint. This is having a knock on effect which negatively impacts on the well-being of the residents in the borough, particularly those on the housing waiting list.

5. My evidence shows that the scheme is in breach of the AAAP's tenure distribution requirements and that the small number of tenants that are being rehoused on the estate, are not being rehoused in mixed tenure housing as the development plan requires.

6. In summary, the scheme underlying the order is not achieving the mixed community that the AAAP not only envisaged but relies upon as one of the primary justifications for redevelopment; i.e. the need to create a more mixed community. The scheme underlying the order is clearly failing in this regard and I submit that the order should therefore not be confirmed.