

**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**

---

**Statutory Objection of  
Piers Corbyn**

---

**12 December 2017**

1. My name is Piers Corbyn. I am a local resident on the Alvey estate which is just a few hundred yards from the Aylesbury estate.
2. I object to the compulsory purchase order on the grounds that the scheme underlying it fails to comply with the requirements of the development plan policies governing it.
3. Part of the development plan includes emerging London Plan policies including the draft 'Good Practice Guide to Estate Regeneration' (**CD74**). The guide says this about consultation:

*"The Mayor believes that for estate regeneration to be a success, there must be resident support for proposals, based on full and transparent consultation."*

*"Once adopted, the Guide is intended to reassure Londoners that they will be given real opportunities to shape estate regeneration, that engagement and consultation will be meaningful."*

*"Where estate regeneration takes place there should always be full and transparent consultation."*

*"Responsive - consultation should result in clear actions that arise directly as a result of the views expressed by respondents." (**CD74**;para 20)*

4. I submit that the consultation process for the scheme underlying the order does not comply with these requirements. The consultation has not been 'responsive' - it has not resulted *"in clear actions that arise directly as a result of the views expressed by respondents."*
5. This is evidenced in the fact that the Council has ignored the only ballot held on the scheme to date. The ballot saw demolition plans overwhelmingly rejected by residents on a high turn out (over 70%).

6. The Council's own consultation report for the Area Action Plan (**SC4**) said the following about the findings of the formal consultation for the AAAP preferred options version:

*"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." (SC4; 3.1.14)*

*"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." (SC4; 3.1.14)*

*"Around 60% the respondees rejected all the preferred options on the basis that the estate should not be demolished and the council should respect the 2001 ballot." (SC4; 3.1.14)*

7. The decision to progress the demolition plans in spite of the views expressed by the estate's residents during both the ballot and the subsequent AAAP formal consultation, is therefore in conflict with the Estate Regeneration Guidance's requirement that *"there must be resident support for proposals"* and that the actions of the Council must *"arise directly as a result of the views expressed by respondents."*
8. I note that in paragraph 7.39 of its statement of case, the Council claims that the Area Action Plan's demolition plans were *"supported by 82% of the residents who attended the final exhibition of the plans"*.
9. However, paragraph 3.1.20 of the Area Action Plan consultation report (**SC4**) shows that this was 82% of only 149 people who made a written comment at the exhibition. This is an extremely dubious mandate given that the Aylesbury estate is home to over 7,000 people.
10. Further, the report doesn't say how many of the 149 'consultees' were actually Aylesbury estate residents. This in conflict with the Estate Regeneration Guidance

which says that consultation should target “*primarily the residents of an estate*”.  
(paragraph 20)

11. I submit that the compulsory purchase order should be rejected on the grounds that the scheme underlying it does not comply with the consultation requirements of the development plan and does not have resident support.