

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

Angela Aikins-Andoh

Of

Phase 2 - Wendover, Thurlow Street, London SE17 2UG

26 October 2017

Introduction

1. My name is **Angela Aikins-Andoh** and I am writing to object to the above compulsory purchase order.
2. Whilst I am not resident on the order land, I am resident in (the next phase 2) and I 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.
3. I have lived on the estate with my family for 25 years and have a leasehold interest in **Flat in Wendover, Thurlow Street, London, SE17 2UG**, a 3-bed flat with balcony which we have occupied for 25 years. I initially occupied the property as a tenant in 1992 and became a leaseholder in 2005, through the right to buy scheme.
4. My daughter and I are happy with our home and where we live, even though over the years we have noticed a deterioration of services provided and amenities which I guess is to be expected of a property of this age.
5. However, I find the property to be very spacious, safe and comfortable to abide in. I like the fact that both my daughter and myself can easily catch a bus to school or work respectively, as there is a bus stop just outside the property and another one on the opposite side. There is plenty of green space, play areas and local amenities, with Burgess Park and East Street market just a few minutes' walk away.
6. A forced move at this stage would be devastating for my daughter and myself as she has just started Secondary School in Central London and has now mastered her commute to school, which is forty minutes away. This has boosted her confidence considerably, especially after being used to me walking her to her local Primary school in the lower years, which was ten minutes walking distance away.

7. A forced move at this stage would affect us greatly because, we have established roots here and most of our friends and my daughter's childminder is within walking distance of us. We also attend a local church, go to Southwark Leisure centre for my daughter's swimming lessons, frequent East Street market and the local supermarkets such as Asda, Tesco and Morrison's for our weekly shop, all of which is convenient to us.

8. 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 secure a similar flat with a spacious balcony as we currently own.

9. When I decided to buy my home, it was because I wanted to climb the property ladder and benefit from the main advantage of home ownership – the freedom to do as I please with my home and pass it on to my child. None of the rehousing options currently on offer will place me in an equivalent position, especially as the 'like for like' property swap option has been withdrawn by the Council.

10. I question whether it is necessary to demolish our homes. I 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 I 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.

11. The properties in our block are easily accessed via four staircases, three lifts and external walkways.

12. The blocks could benefit from a "face lift", as has happened elsewhere, but there is no reason to destroy buildings which are only 40 years old.

13. 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. For instance, the Creation team arranged for me to view

some properties behind Burgess Park which looked nice, but which provided parking slots for tenants and none for leaseholders. I was informed that the leaseholders would have to take part in a car pool scheme, which I thought was ridiculous.

14. 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.

15. 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:

Angela Aikins-Andoh

Date:

26/10/2017