

**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**

---

**Summary of Proof of Evidence of  
Peter Raynham  
For the Aylesbury Leaseholders Group**

---

**11 December 2017**

## **Statement Summary by Peter Raynham**

1. I have reviewed issues associated with daylight and sunlight for the proposed Aylesbury development by studying the documents that cover the previous proposal (14/AP/3843), and the current proposal (17/AP/3885).
2. In the previous proposal (14/AP/3843) there were two main issues:-
  - i. Some of the dwellings did not receive sufficient daylight.
  - ii. Some open spaces did not receive enough sunlight.
3. In point 1 the key problem was that about 19% of the dwellings did not receive sufficient daylight, whilst it could be argued that 19% is a small fraction of the development, for the people living in the affected dwellings it would be 100% of their dwelling.
4. Point 2 about lack of sun in open spaces is also important as it means that the spaces will be less pleasant to use. Also, many of the spaces were designated as gardens, and with limited sunlight the range of plants that could grow in the areas will be significantly reduced.
5. The issues of poor daylight and sunlight were mentioned by the planning inspector in her decision not to allow the development. Moreover, in the decision letter from the Secretary of State it also mentions the problems of poor daylight and sunlight. From this it may be concluded that the poor daylight and sunlight contributed to the decision to reject the previous proposal.
6. In the current scheme (17/AP/3885) the shape and form of the buildings are very similar to what was proposed in the previous proposal. In fact, in the supporting addendum to the application it actually states in section 4.3.1 that there has been no material

change. As part of the new application there was a very detailed analysis of the daylight in the dwellings and this found that 20% of rooms do not have sufficient daylight.

7. Thus if in the previous application daylight and sunlight were issues that contributed to its rejection, then as there has been no real change it would be expected that the same issues could contribute to the rejection of the current proposal.