

Witness Statement of Jane Rendell

23 April 2015

I, Jane Rendell, of The Bartlett School of Architecture, University College London (UCL), 140 Hampstead Road, London, NW1 2BX, say as follows:

Professional Role

I am Professor of Architecture and Art at the Bartlett School of Architecture at University College London (UCL). I have a BA (Hons) Architecture (University of Sheffield, 1988) and a Dip. Arch. (University of Edinburgh, 1992), which gives me exemption from RIBA Parts 1 and 2. I have an MSc in Architectural History from UCL (1994), and a PhD in architectural history and gendered space in London in the 1820s awarded by Birkbeck College, University of London (1998). As an architectural historian/theorist and art/cultural/urban critic, I have recently worked on the history of welfare state housing in London, publishing 5 articles on the topic, with 1 book forthcoming in 2015/6 to be published by IB Tauris. Since 1996 I have also published 10 other books (3 authored) and over 150 articles, and given over 200 talks internationally (including over 30 keynotes) on topics related to architectural history/theory and art/cultural/urban criticism. I have been a Professor at UCL since 2008, where I was also Director of Architectural Research 2004–10, and Vice Dean of Research for the Bartlett Faculty of the Built Environment 2010–13. I have currently been asked to lead a UCL initiative on the current London Housing Crisis, and I supervise a PhD student who has been working on this topic since 2010, funded by UCL. I am not a lawyer, statistician or engineer, my interest and expertise is in questions of culture and spatial experience related to public and private space; my forthcoming book looks at the destruction of 1950s/1960s welfare state housing designed and built by the London County Council (LCC), and how the ideals of the post war period to provide housing for working and middle class Londoners based on need has been replaced by a market-based housing model based on what people can pay.

Methodology

(1) Literature Review

My statement is made based on information gathered through the following sources: (i) reading relevant academic literature held in the public domain on housing, regeneration and the current London Housing Crisis, including specific evidence-based analyses of the Aylesbury Estate made by Professor Loretta Lees and Dr Richard Baxter;¹ (ii) reading summaries of the on-going Aylesbury demolition on three key websites – 35%, Southwark Notes, and Better Elephant;² (iii) reading material on the redevelopment of the Aylesbury Estate over the last 10 years downloaded from the Southwark Council website or accessed through FOI requests.

(2) Situated Knowledge

My academic and published research is often based on my own personal experience, on what is described as 'situated knowledge'.³ This is relevant to this statement in two ways: (i) I wrote my current book on the destruction of welfare state public housing in London from a two bedroom flat in Southwark, on the eighteenth floor of Crossmount House, on the Wyndham Estate, Bowyer St, London, SE50XB, half a mile to the west of the Aylesbury Estate and the 'Order Land'.⁴ I have been a resident leaseholder of this flat since 2010; and (ii) since being a Aylesbury Leaseholders Action Group Strategic Member since November 2014, I have got to know and understand the experiences of various Aylesbury leaseholders.

Overall Argument

This statement questions the decision taken by Southwark Council to demolish rather than refurbish the Aylesbury Estate, and in particular – as part of phase 1b/1c of intended demolition, as described in planning applications ref: 14/AP/3843 and ref: 14/AP/3844 – to compulsory purchase order (CPO) leaseholder properties on the 'Order Land'. I argue that there is not a 'compelling case in the public interest',⁵ to 'sufficiently justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected',⁶ by the use of CPOs on the 'Order Land' and as such this action would go against Protocol 1, Art. 1 of the European Convention of Human Rights, which states:⁷

(1) Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions. No one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law.

(2) The preceding provisions shall not, however, in any way impair the right of a state to enforce such laws as it deems necessary to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest or to secure the payment of taxes or other contributions or penalties.

The Government Circular 06/2004, Compulsory Purchase and the Crichel Down Rules, states that 'CPOs can only be taken when 'there is clear evidence that the public benefit will outweigh the private loss'.⁸ Since out of the 830 new units replacing the existing 566 units (of which 511 are social rented and 55 leasehold), only 406 are affordable,⁹ there is a net loss of 160 affordable units. Of the affordable units 255 are rented, and these are described as at 'target rent',¹⁰ a term defined in the *Agreement between the London Borough of Southwark and Notting Hill Housing Trust*: 'set by reference to the formula provided by or on behalf of the Government of England and Wales from time to time'.¹¹ The addition of 424 units for sale on the private market against the loss of 511 social rented units is evidence not that public benefit outweigh private loss, but of the reverse: that private benefit outweighs public loss.

The Statement of Case made by the London Borough of Southwark under Rule 7 of the Compulsory Purchase Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2007 states:¹²

5.2 The Council recognises that s226 (1A) of the 1990 Act provides that a local authority must not exercise its compulsory purchase power under paragraph (a) of subsection 226(1) unless it thinks that the development, re-development or improvement is likely to contribute to the achievement of any one or more of the following objects:

(a) The promotion or improvement of the economic well-being of their area;

Page 8

(b) The promotion or improvement of the social well-being of their area;

(c) The promotion or improvement of the environmental well-being of their area.

If existing residents – tenants and leaseholders – are part of the definition of the ‘area’, then the loss of their homes – 106 homes, if one takes one set of figures (that out of the existing 566 units – of which 511 are social rented and 55 leasehold – only 406 will be affordable in the new scheme),¹³ or 219 homes, if one takes another set of figures, (of the new units 255 are at target rent and 92 are intermediate),¹⁴ cuts against any and all of the three types of well-being – economic, social or environmental – which is required to be defined as an achievement to justify the act of CPO.

My statement is made as part of the broader context of the reduction of social housing provision across London in general, and the increasing rental and house price increases that make it hard for any but those on high incomes to remain in the capital.¹⁵

Locating the Aylesbury as part of the historical context of post-war Welfare State Public Housing

Crossmount House, where I live, was built in 1967, as one of five, designed by Colin Locus, one of the architects of the more famous LCC Alton Estate at Roehampton.¹⁶ The Alton Estate was developed in two phases, Alton East (formerly Portsmouth Road), was built in 1952–5,¹⁷ and Alton West (formerly Roehampton Lane), was built in 1955–9.¹⁸ The target population of 10,000 made it the largest of the L. C. C. developments, including two thirds of its

house-building programme during the early 1950s, and one of the largest housing projects in Europe. Alton East pioneered the design of 'point' blocks, based on Swedish designs, of which Crossmount House is an example, and Alton West pioneered the design of 'slab' blocks, based on Le Corbusier's famous *Unité d'Habitation*, built between 1947 and 1953 in Marseilles, designed to house around 1600 people in 337 apartments, including 23 different types,¹⁹ and situated in 8.65 acres of parkland, an essential design aspect of the project, providing a place for leisure and exercise, and also offering views to all its inhabitants: 'everyone looks out on trees and sky'. The *Unité de Marseilles*, was in turn inspired by the Narkomfin Communal House in Moscow, designed by Moisei Ginzburg with Ignatii Milinis in 1928–1929, for the workers of the first Soviet Commissariat of Finance Ministry, a scheme which included dwelling blocks and communal facilities, and was orientated to include air, sun and access to greenery, via ribbon windows, free-standing columns and roof gardens.²⁰ A key aspect of the Unité and the Narkomfin designs were the communal spaces, specifically the wide corridors, later termed 'streets in the sky' by the British post war architects, Peter and Alison Smithson, and which inspired the recently refurbished Park Hill in Sheffield,²¹ as well as the Aylesbury.²²

The asymmetry of leaseholder/freeholder relations

I first came across the contradictions of the 'right to buy' and the confused boundaries of public and private regarding leaseholder private ownership of public housing first introduced by Margaret Thatcher under 'right to buy' in the case of my own balcony. Many post-war public housing schemes are currently judged to have failed in their intentions or to be structurally unsound, but the problem is more often the lack of investment in the communal spaces and infrastructure, rather than the original aspirations or engineering design. I see the years of neglect in my own point block, where the communal spaces – laundries, one on each floor – all lie empty, the doors recently padlocked by Southwark Council, because of the unspecified 'health and safety' threat they pose. Yet the one act of repair Southwark Council have invested in, as part of the Warm Dry Safe programme, in design terms is both aesthetically crude and dysfunctional in that it prevents residents ever accessing our balconies again. The beautiful Crittall windows, one of the reasons I purchased the flat, and which frame my view over Burgess Park, were single-glazed, so rightly they needed to be upgraded. They were removed by Southwark in July 2014 and replaced with new double-glazed units whose configuration completely ignore the original 1960's design: the three original, each 1.7m long, picture windows have been replaced by six narrow ones, whose plastic frames are double the width of the originals, and whose sills are so high that I can no longer step out onto my balcony, to the edge of the building-line which as my lease shows is my private property, and perform my leaseholder duty in repairing and maintaining my balcony. Arguing that *they* own the balcony – but with no evidence to support their claim – Southwark Council are now not able to keep to their part of the contract, to repair and maintain the balcony. Currently it is filthy, the plaster is cracked and crumbling off the exterior wall, and the screws have fallen out of the frame that holds the glass screen (which I can now no longer reach to clean) in place – eighteen stories off the ground. It seems that even replacing the interior gas pipe for the block with an exterior one is proving difficult given the fact that Southwark and its contractors can no longer access the balconies without scaffolding. I paid £2000 of my own money for legal

advice, and around £500 to commission architects who designed an alternative scheme, which replaced the windows with slim-framed double glazed fittings, retaining the original configuration, and allowing access to the balcony. Southwark refused. And I have just paid £11,000 for the WDS works, bringing the total of Major Works Bills I have paid 2010-14 to £25,000. This doesn't include the Annual Service Charge.

My experience as a Southwark leaseholder over my own windows and balcony has highlighted to:

- (i) The imbalance of power intrinsic to the relation between Southwark leaseholders and Southwark Council, and how Southwark Council has the power to make decisions that are extremely difficult for leaseholders to challenge without expensive legal advice. (In my view, having supervised 12 PhDs to completion, and examined around 20 others, I would estimate that reading and analysing the paperwork involved in the CPO process that leaseholders are subjected to, would take an academic, trained to post graduate level, around four years of full-time research.) While much legal aid has been withdrawn, Southwark Council have access to fully trained team of lawyers, who I assume are paid for out of Southwark Council and thus public funds. Is it in the public interest to use public funding to pay for a legal team whose work is focused on dispossessing people of their homes, both tenants, and leaseholders, who bought their properties in good faith, from the very vendor who is now seeking to demolish those homes it sold?
- (ii) The lack of importance with which Southwark Council hold 1950s architecture, in particular, they way in which they do not value the importance of the view, which is integral to the design of point and slab blocks in post-war welfare state housing.

Locating the Aylesbury in the current context of 'Estate Renewal'

The Wyndham Estate in which I live is, like the Aylesbury Estate and the 'Order Land' within it, is located in Southwark's 'estate renewal zone'. As the 35% campaign reports, Southwark Council has 'recommended a lower CIL rate in the lower value area of the Borough, within which the majority of housing estates identified for Estate renewal are located.' CIL stands for Community Infrastructure Levy.²³ Much of Southwark's housing strategies for council estate 'renewals' is informed now by research conducted by property consultants, Savills, who have recently advised the need to 'unearth the potential' of public land, which includes regenerating existing brownfield estates.²⁴ The post-war 'point' and 'slab' blocks that make up most estates, such as the Aylesbury, are not dense enough Savills argue; they must be replaced by mansion blocks situated on re-introduced old street layouts.²⁵ To support this argument Savills draws on a report published by Create Streets, which based on the results of polls, puts forward the case that people do not like in living in post-war high-rise blocks.²⁶ However, such viewpoints are directly countered by qualitative research, such as that conducted recently on the Aylesbury Estate by Dr Richard Baxter, who interviewed residents using oral history interviews with 25 residents, as well as hometours and autophotography to enable triangulation of findings and 'provide different knowledge about domestic verticality'. His research counters the dominant trend in academic literature to dismiss high-rise living as a failure, showing instead, based on

residents' testimonies, the importance of the high-rise view to identity formation, and the pleasurable role of vertical experiences in belonging to place and in home-making.²⁷

Likewise Loretta Lees has pointed out how unfavourable representations of post-war estates like the Aylesbury in the media, have helped to create a biased impression of a violent underworld by those who do not live there, and thus participated in building an image of a failing housing estate which requires demolition. Lees argues that the residents of the Aylesbury were 'faced with a "false choice": that 'if they rejected the regeneration 'deal' they would continue to live on an estate that needs upgrading and repair' or 'If they accepted the deal (which actually they didn't!) they could have a newly built neighbourhood in which they may not even get a chance to live and would be totally changed'. Lees argues that: 'The contrast between disinvested local authority stock in London and the highly valuable land it sits on has created a "state-induced rent gap" with massive capital accumulation potential.'²⁸ And it is this capital potential, and the profit it promises, to be gleaned by the private sector and for private interest, which I posit as the impetus for the regeneration of the Aylesbury in general, and the 'Order Land' in particular, rather than a desire to improve the wellbeing of the area in the public interest.

Indeed in April 2014, the Government commissioned Savills to investigate the potential of Create Street proposals. Following a Create Streets suggestion, the 2014 Budget created a £150m estate regeneration fund, which invites expressions of interest from the private sector to bid for funds for 'schemes ... to deliver regeneration through the redevelopment of existing social housing estates'. The funding to be used for costs associated with 'leaseholder buy-outs, de-canting/re-housing tenants, demolition ...'²⁹

The need to 'unearth the potential' of public land, includes the 'renewal' (read full or partial demolition) of existing 'brownfield sites' of post-war public housing estates and open them up for private investment, rather than, I would argue, 'the greater public benefit'. This is the context in which, I assert, the use of CPOs to acquire leaseholder properties needs to be understood.

Here are the reasons which I assert are not 'in the public interest', and thus do not justify the CPO of leaseholder properties on the 'Order Land', and thus goes against Protocol 1, Art. 1 of the European Convention of Human Rights:

(1) Choosing to demolish rather than refurbish is not 'in the public interest'.

The Conisbee report dated 10 March 2005 is a structural survey of the Aylesbury Estate commissioned by Southwark Council.³⁰ Based on an assessment of the buildings, the Jespersion construction technique used to construct the Aylesbury, and the Building Regulations current at the time of construction, it concludes that the only action required is minor repairs to the 5-storey blocks. [for detail on this see *Statement of Case* paras 5.10-15] However, at a meeting on the 27 September 2005 Southwark took the decision to demolish rather than refurbish the Aylesbury.

Since the findings of the Conisbee report suggest that the Aylesbury Estate can be reasonably refurbished and gives no structural reason to demolish. However, Estates in other London Boroughs, built using the same construction system, such as Six Acres in Islington, have been refurbished rather than demolished. Thus it can only be concluded that it was for reasons other than structure that the decision to demolish rather than refurbish was reached. Calculations included in Annex A and C and referred to at 4.4 of the report of the Southwark Council meeting held on 27 September 2005, are accessible on the Southwark website. There is also this summary of costs: '4.4: Present calculations assume a land transfer to RSI's or other partners at current land values, construction costs a 15% developer profit margin, and management costs of around £16m over 10 years. If the estate were to provide 2288 social housing units and the balance of sale (2603) the development would be broadly cost neutral. The preliminary assessment available at annex C indicates a small deficit of £7m:.... There would be other effects on council funding in which phased reduction in HRA income would be partly compensated by maintenance savings'.³¹ However, I have not been able to acquire adequate evidence of any cost benefit analysis undertaken to ascertain on what financial basis the decision was taken. It also appears from discussions with Aylesbury leaseholders concerning the bundles of information they have been sent by Southwark, that a key numerical table on p. 10 of the Conisbee report is missing. [see the Witness Statement of Beverley Robinson, which at point 2 refers to the missing 'table of comparative costs at page 10 of the CD25'.]

Recent reports produced by experts in the field of urban regeneration and engineering argue that 'the refurbishment of social housing can deliver significant improvements in energy, environmental and health performance', leading to costs savings and improved living standards for residents. The overall lifetime costs of refurbishment may be lower than demolition and construction, with less disruption to local communities and residents'.³² [See also the expert witness statement of Dr Kate Crawford] A recent Government report suggests that a refurbishment scheme will generate significantly more positive quantifiable benefits and significantly fewer disbenefits than a new build/demolition scheme'.³³ The decision to demolish is not environmentally sound, especially in the short term, as noted in Southwark Council's *Sustainability Appraisal of Aylesbury Area Action Plan* (May 2009) point 5.3.9 which states that 'the comprehensive demolition option scores poorly in the short term',³⁴ and I can find no evidence of evaluations of how the short term loss in terms of embodied energy or carbon is balanced in the long term. [see the Witness Statement of Kate Crawford, para 9]

(2) Reducing the number of affordable units from those in the existing Aylesbury Estate to those in the planned redevelopment is not 'in the public interest'

At the Southwark Council meeting held on 27 September 2005, it states that '4.3 b. The existing Aylesbury "footprint" can accommodate an uplift in density (in line with GLA guidelines and the draft Southwark plan for an urban zone of this nature) from the current 2759 units to a new 4900 units.' And that 'c. The newly developed area will comprise a mix of tenures and on present land values it will be able to accommodate the present level of social

housing units (2288) on the Aylesbury footprint'.³⁵ However, four years later, in the *Equalities Impact Assessment for Aylesbury Area Action Plan* (January 2009), Southwark state concerns that:³⁶

- The need to maintain an economic and social mix in the area may encourage land market forces to become a major influencer on the programme, at the expense of the existing resident mix. This will force low-income families and unemployed into cheaper locations.

Southwark Council's private partner in the regeneration of the Aylesbury is Notting Hill Housing Trust (NHHT) who say on its current website:³⁷

The partnership is committed to delivering a masterplan for 3,500 new homes, 50% of which will be affordable homes, 75% of which will be for social rent and 25% for Shared Ownership or equity. A minimum of 30% across all tenures will have three bedrooms or more. This will help meet Southwark Council's commitment to building more affordable and social rented homes in a range of sizes to meet housing demand. In line with the [Aylesbury Area Action Plan](#), there will be a net increase in homes from 2,400 to 4,200.

Policy 3.15(b) of the London Plan says 'Loss of housing, including affordable housing should be resisted unless the housing is replaced at existing or higher densities with at least equivalent floorspace'. However, as has been well-documented [see the data and discussion of this in the *Statement of Case by the Aylesbury Leaseholders* paras. 2.1-2.22] the planning applications 14/AP/3843 and 14/AP/3844 associated with the 'Order Land' will see a net increase of private homes coupled with a net loss of affordable housing on the estate footprint.³⁸ It is extremely hard to obtain clear figures on this given the complexity of the scheme and the multiple players involved: specifically, (i) the division of the demolition and redevelopment of the Aylesbury Estate into numerous phases spread-out over many years with numerous different planning applications, and the distribution of the promised allocation of 50% of all new units as affordable (with 25% of these being shared ownership or equity and 75% social rent) across these schemes; (ii) the changing definitions of the terms used from the original – 'social tenants' and 'leaseholders (owner-occupier)', to the current classifications – 'social rent', 'target rent', 'affordable rent', 'intermediate rent', 'shared ownership', 'shared equity', and 'private for sale'.

We do know from *the Statement of Case made by the London Borough of Southwark under Rule 7 of the Compulsory Purchase Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2007*, that there are 566 existing units on the 'Order Land', and that in the new scheme which will provide 815 homes, only 255 will be at target rent, and only 92 are intermediate, so there is a shortfall of 219 units to replace the existing provision (that shortfall reduces to 163 if we also count the 50 mixed affordable tenure extra care units and the 6 units for people with learning difficulties).³⁹ The 'existing baseline figure'

given in the Council's objection statement version 2 of 24 April 2015, breaks this figure of 566 down into 511 social rent and 55 leasehold.⁴⁰ However, the 92 intermediate units are not available only to leaseholders from the 'Order Land'.

3 habitable rooms. 830 units are proposed in the new scheme of which 406 will be affordable. By unit numbers this is a loss of 105 (the existing baseline is 566 homes of which 511 social rent, 55 leasehold). However

In addition, there is concern that the replacement 'social rented' units will not be social rented as per the current definition. Recently it has been shown that what has been promised in other NHHT schemes, as 'social rent' in planning applications is later converted to 'target rent' which is not guided by regulations. This is the subject of the detail of the section 106 agreement, as part of the planning applications ref: 14/AP/3843 and ref: 14/AP/3844 relevant to the 'Order Land', which, still after the Planning Inquiry of 23 April 2014 has not been issued or agreed.⁴¹

Of the 575 Aylesbury households decanted from the estate to date (387 tenants and 188 leaseholders),⁴² just a third (195) have managed to remain in Walworth.⁴³ If the redevelopment continues along these lines then, similar to the example of the Heygate Estate, a mile to the north, it is likely that the Aylesbury regeneration will have the paradoxical effect of displacing precisely those people who it was initially intended to benefit.⁴⁴ So that despite Southwark's claims to be creating a 'stronger' and 'more vibrant' community, we will see instead the weakening of the community with the displacement of existing residents, both tenants and leaseholders, from their homes to more distant London boroughs and outside the capital. As published research evidences, the tenants of the Heygate were displaced from central London into other boroughs, and leaseholders ejected from the city entirely.⁴⁵

(3) Displacing mixed communities, which already exist is not 'in the public interest'.

Although I disagree with the 'right to buy' on principle, I purchased a property in a public housing estate, because I could not afford any other option in London. From living on public housing estates in London since 2000 I can see that the 'right to buy' has produced a mixed community of estate residents – council tenants and leaseholders. This quality of mixed tenure is one of the pre-existing components of diversity in most public housing estates across London, certainly in the Wyndham where I live, as well as the Aylesbury Estate and the 'Order Land', which are described by Southwark Council in its *Equalities Impact Assessment for Aylesbury Area Action Plan* (January 2009), as follows:⁴⁶

There are around 7,500 residents in 2,758 dwellings in the estate, of which around 18% are now in private hands through “right to buy”, with approximately 82% council tenants. Residents are highly diverse in terms of ethnic composition with 67% of them belonging to a minority ethnic group. Around 21% of them are over 60 years of age (compared with 14% across Southwark). There is also a relatively high proportion of lone parent households and non-European born persons. The needs and aspirations of the above groups will need to be assessed and incorporated into the mixed tenure balance:

Given then, that by its own admission, the Aylesbury Estate and the ‘Order Land’ within it, is *already* a diverse community with mixed tenure, this undermines least one of the reasons that Southwark Council has given for wishing to redevelop the Aylesbury Estate in order to create a ‘vibrant community’.

Southwark Council in its *Equalities Impact Assessment for Aylesbury Area Action Plan* (January 2009), states:⁴⁷

- new mixed tenure housing through partnerships with Residential Social Landlords (RSL’s);
- by allocating existing Council units to those residents who wish to remain Council tenants;
- by identifying new affordable housing (under the planning obligations) in the redevelopment area which will be available to Aylesbury households;
- and by introducing a package of other measures including compensation for leaseholders to offer the widest possible choice of re-housing opportunities.

Under 0.1.4, of the *Sustainability Appraisal*, which is a requirement as part of the process of plan making under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, adequate provision has to have been made for key worker housing and intermediate affordable housing,⁴⁸ yet no explicit allowance has been made for the rehousing of the existing leaseholders. Indeed in the early strategy document, *8 Issues and Options Report, Part 3: Delivery and Phasing*, from October 2007, where Southwark Council outline their options for delivering change as part of the Aylesbury Action Plan, the term ‘leaseholders’ is only mentioned once in para. 3.1.5, to say ‘In addition the homes of leaseholders will need to be acquired’.⁴⁹ However, no explicit allowance has been made for the existing leaseholders on the ‘Order Land’ in Planning applications 14/AP/3843 and 14/AP/3844, and no specific figures are given for existing numbers of leaseholders on the ‘Order Land,’ only on the Aylesbury Estate overall, of which the figure quoted as of 7 April 2015, but as given at the time of the outline application is 290.⁵⁰

Southwark Council’s only argument for not providing the ‘right of return’ for leaseholders on the ‘Order Land’ is that such an offer has not been on any other regeneration schemes in the past:⁵¹

3. Right to return is required	The option to return for leaseholders is not an offer that the council has made on any of its big regeneration schemes in the past and so has
--------------------------------	---

3

	been consistent with that policy in respect of the Aylesbury estate. Option to return offers
--	--

The assumption is that leaseholders might be able to acquire shared ownership or equity of the intermediate units but the difference between the sums they are being offered for their own properties and the price of those intermediate units for sale undermines this possibility. A recent Government report on estate regeneration states that ‘leaseholders should be offered a like-for-like replacement of their property, or a similar offer, wherever possible’,⁵² but the Southwark Council offer of shared ownership (from a min of 25% to a max 75% share of the ownership and paying rent on the rest) or shared equity (for a min 50% or a max 100% of the ownership, paying a mortgage on the rest) does not necessarily allow for this provision as I illustrate below.⁵³ The shared equity model was introduced in 18 March 2014, and is only available subject to financial qualification.⁵⁴ And ‘where a resident homeowner can afford to purchase a suitable alternative property on the open market without assistance is access to the enhanced re-housing package restricted.’⁵⁵

Leaseholders will present their own very specific examples with figures, so all I will do in general is refer to the example of a type of flat – in this case, a two bedroom flat overlooking Burgess Park on the fifth floor or above. A leaseholder flat of this type might be valued at between £120,000 (initially by Southwark’s inhouse valuers) to around £200,000 (after going to tribunal and in comparison with other test cases). However, a new duplex two bed flat overlooking Burgess Park on the top – fifth floor – of a new development is currently on the market with Barnard Marcos, advertised on Prime Location, for £650,000,⁵⁶ while other two bed flats overlooking the park are around £550,000. Other two bed flats on lower floors with no park view are around £450,000. So if a leaseholder wished to remain high up, and to retain a park view, in the best case example, having gone to tribunal, depending on whether after financial means testing they were offered an equity or shared ownership option, they might have to need to find around £250,000 to cover the difference in cost. And this would be subject to (i) availability of a suitable flat and (ii) ability to find a mortgage provider.

For leaseholder to find a replacement of a flat with the same qualities as their own in the local area, and at a price they can afford, has almost no chance of success.

(i) In terms of availability: Such a flat has to be available in a local new build scheme which offers the option of a shared equity or ownership purchase at the time the CPO's flat is demolished. In points 3 and 4 of *Southwark's objection statement version 2 - ALG Statement of case updatedpdf*, (24 April 2015), their response to *The Statement of Case* submitted by the Aylesbury Leaseholders on 3 April 2015, Southwark Council state that: 'The option to return for leaseholders is not an offer that the council has made on any of its big regeneration schemes in the past and so has been consistent with that policy in respect of the Aylesbury Estate'. They note:⁵⁷

Policy dictates that resident home owners should be prioritised for Low Cost Home Ownership Schemes in the newly developed units but that this will be dependent on what is available at the time.

Additionally, the distribution of different kinds of housing unit within the phased redevelopment schemes is such that many of the flats high up and overlooking the park are only available to purchase on the open market.

(ii) In terms of finding a mortgage: One could only obtain such a mortgage, on a high income, aged up to perhaps 50. Leaseholders maybe on low or average incomes, maybe unemployed, maybe in their 50s or above, in which case it is more difficult to take out a mortgage, certainly not one that could be paid off in their life-time.

So the situation on the ground, does not seem to match the statement made in option 2, of the *Homeowner's Pack* issued by Southwark Council which states that leaseholders will have the option of:

... purchasing a new property through a low cost homeownership scheme with Notting Hill Housing Trust, or shared ownership with another housing association ... This is where you buy a share of the new property, while the remained of the property is owned by a housing association (also known as a Registered Provided "RP" or a Registered Social Landlord "RSL". In most cases rent is paid on the part of the property, which is still owned by the housing association. However as part of the Aylesbury Development Partnership Agreement with the council, Notting Hill Housing Trust will be offering a number of new low cost home ownership properties on the Aylesbury footprint to existing resident Aylesbury homeowners on terms tailored to meet the needs and the financial circumstances of individual leaseholders.⁵⁸

For example, on 7 March 2015 when I went with an Aylesbury leaseholder, on an open day to see what properties

were available, the representative of NHHT, said that there were no shared equity units on offer to Aylesbury leaseholders and that this was a matter of concern only for Southwark Council, which seems strange given that NHHT and Southwark Council are meant to be in partnership.

Additionally, Southwark Council's guidance for leaseholders states that if leaseholders wish to 'seek council rehousing assistance' they will only 'accept applications from homeowners those who 'Either submitted a successful claim for the Right to Buy the property before 27 September 2005: or Bought the property from another homeowner before 27 September 2005'.⁵⁹

(4) Organising the new housing units according to economic status is not "in the public interest".

Southwark Council in its *Equalities Impact Assessment for Aylesbury Area Action Plan* (January 2009), states:⁶⁰

- That the phasing plan ensures quality standards are maintained throughout the redevelopment and the objective outlined above of developing economic and social diversity does not create an area of "haves" and "have nots".

However, although arguing for mixed communities, Southwark Council have commissioned new designs, which, for example, at Camberwell Fields are segregated into zones – private sale, social rent, and intermediate – according to the financial situation of the occupants/buyers.⁶¹ In phase 1a of the Aylesbury redevelopment, the units are distributed such that the south-facing views over Burgess Park previously enjoyed by a mix of tenants and leaseholder will in the future mainly benefit those units for private sale on the open market. See in the plan how the majority of units located in the part of the scheme overlooking the park (D) and directly behind this (B/E) are for sale, while the intermediate are mainly located on site A, towards the back of the site, and site D, at the far back of the site, is in the main social rented units.⁶²

Aylesbury Regeneration – Phase 1a

Details of residential units showing anticipated completion dates and unit make-up.



Tenure	Site A Completed April 2011	Site B/E Completes September 2012	Site C Completes June 2012	Site D Completes February 2013	Total Units
Social Rented	17	36	15	13	101
Intermediate Rent	15	0	0	0	15
Shared Ownership	0	12	3	3	18
Private for Sale	0	83	0	44	127
Total Units	52	131	18	60	261

(5) Ignoring the results of democratic decision-making processes is not ‘in the public interest’

Unlike Heygate residents, who were denied a ballot on the future of their estate, Aylesbury residents were fully balloted. In 2001 76% of Aylesbury residents turned out to vote against a proposed stock transfer and regeneration (73%).⁶³ This democratic process has been ignored by Southwark who have gone ahead with privatization regardless of the majority of residents’ wishes.

(6) Prioritizing private profit over leaseholder wellbeing is not “in the public interest’

For Southwark Council to successfully buy back properties via the CPO process that they have previously sold to leaseholders, they need to show that in the use of CPOs for the regeneration of the Aylesbury Estate ‘public benefit will outweigh the private loss’. However, one key financial objective of the redevelopment of the Aylesbury Estate as stated in the report of the meeting of Southwark Council on 27 September 2005 is to allow developers to make 15% profit. How can the aim of making a profit for private developers be for the public benefit, when the private loss of leaseholders whose properties are being CPO’d and how in some cases are not allowed to keep their life savings is ignored?

(7) Redaction of key information concerning viability is not ‘in the public interest’

The advantage of demolition with new build replacements over refurbishment is that existing residents can be permanently displaced. The claim made by the Aylesbury Area Action Plan that ‘replacement of all the existing social rented housing would not be possible economically’,⁶⁴ is not possible to disprove since the viability studies and financial models that have formed the basis of the decision-making have been redacted from key documents, and are not available for public scrutiny. For example, when requesting information concerning the partnership deal between Southwark Council and NHHT, Southwark Council chose to withhold information that is in the public interest, in favour of protecting the private and commercial interest of NHHT, stating: ‘The harm that would arise to the economic interests of Notting Hill were the information to be disclosed’. Southwark Council’s letter noted that ‘In this instance, the council asserts that the public interest in providing this information does not outweigh the likely prejudice to commercial and economic interests of both the council and the third party.’⁶⁵ If Southwark Council wishes to argue that the demolition of the ‘Order Land’ is in the public interest and that public benefit outweighs private loss, what does it mean to protect the privacy of the developers’ financial information while demanding that leaseholders should have their finances means tested and open to public scrutiny, as well as give up their savings.

V.

¹ See for example Loretta Lees, ‘The Urban Injustices of New Labour’s “new urban renewal” the case of the Aylesbury Estate’, accessed at https://southwarknotes.files.wordpress.com/2009/12/lorettalees_pptx.pdf; and Richard Baxter, QMUL, and Mark Davidson, Clark University, ‘The violence of urban regeneration: home and place unmaking in the gentrification of the Aylesbury Estate’. See also Ben Campkin, *Remaking London: Decline and Regeneration in Urban Culture*, (London: IB Tauris, 2013) for his chapter on the Aylesbury and wider look at ‘regeneration’.

² See <http://35percent.org/>; <http://betterelephant.org/>; and <https://southwarknotes.wordpress.com/>

³ See for example, Donna Haraway, ‘Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective’, *Feminist Studies*, v. 14, n. 3, (Autumn 1988) pp. 575-599. (<http://www.staff.amu.edu.pl/~ewa/Haraway,%20Situating%20Knowledges.pdf>) and D. Soyini Madison, *Critical Ethnography: Method, Ethics and Performance* (chapter 1) (http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/4957_Madison_I_Proof_Chapter_1.pdf)

⁴ See *Statement of Case made by the London Borough of Southwark under Rule 7 of the Compulsory Purchase Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2007*.

⁵ See *Statement of Case made by the London Borough of Southwark under Rule 7 of the Compulsory Purchase Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2007*, p. 4, point 1.11.

⁶ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7691/1918885.pdf, see para. 17.

⁷ <http://ukhumanrightsblog.com/incorporated-rights/articles-index/protocol-1-article-1/>

⁸ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7691/1918885.pdf, see para. 19.

⁹ Southwark Council, *Southwark’s objection statement version 2 - ALG Statement of case updatedpdf*, (24 April 2015), p. 21, points 2.04 – 2.06.

¹⁰ See *Statement of Case made by the London Borough of Southwark under Rule 7 of the Compulsory Purchase Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2007*, pp. 8-9.

¹¹ http://35percent.org/images/LBS_NHHT_DPAgreement.pdf, p. 37.

¹² See *Statement of Case made by the London Borough of Southwark under Rule 7 of the Compulsory Purchase Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2007*, p. 2.

¹³ Southwark Council, *Southwark’s objection statement version 2 - ALG Statement of case updatedpdf*, (24 April 2015), p. 21, points 2.04 – 2.06.

¹⁴ See *Statement of Case made by the London Borough of Southwark under Rule 7 of the Compulsory Purchase Inquiries Procedure Rules 2007*, pp. 2-4.

¹⁵ See for example, Rebecca Ross's *London is Changing* (2015), at <http://curbed.com/archives/2015/02/24/london-housing.php> and maps which document the privatization of social housing across London for example <https://mappinglondonshousingstruggles.wordpress.com/> and <http://www.theguardian.com/news/datablog/interactive/2014/may/18/public-private-partnership-housing-projects-london-mapped>.

¹⁶ For journal articles from the 1950s, see: For Alton East only, *Architectural Review* (January 1954), v. 115, n. 685, pp. 49–66, pp. 52–6; R. Furneaux Jordan, 'L. C. C.: New Standards in Official Architecture', *Architectural Design* (November 1956), pp. 303–23, pp. 307–9; and 'Housing and Schools by the London County Council', *Concrete Quarterly* (January–March 1956) n. 28, pp. 2–17, pp. 8–11. For Alton West only, 'Roehampton Lane Estate', *Concrete Quarterly* (October–December, 1958) n. 39, pp. XX–XX; *Architectural Design* (January 1959) pp. 7–21; 'Alton Estate (W) Roehampton Lane, London, SW15', *The Architect's Journal* (5 November, 1959) pp. 461–78; and 'Alton (West) Estate, Roehampton Lane, SW15', *RIBA Journal* (July 1960), pp. 328–9. For the whole estate, 'Alton Estate, Roehampton' in 'LCC Housing II', *The Architect and Building News*, (11 June 1958) pp. 767–74; 'The Slab and Point Blocks of Flats on the London County Council Roehampton Estate', *Architecture and Building* (April 1959) pp. 129–36; and Nicolaus Pevsner, 'Roehampton: L. C. C. Housing and the Picturesque Tradition', *Architectural Review*, (July 1959) 126, pp. 21–35. For secondary sources on Roehampton see for example Joseph Rykwert, 'Architecture', Boris Ford (ed.) *Modern Britain: The Cambridge Cultural History*, [1988] (Cambridge: The University of Cambridge, 1992), pp. 253–277; Simon Pepper, 'Housing at Roehampton', Ford (ed.) *Modern Britain*, pp. 279–287; and descriptions in Bullock, *Building the Post-War World*; Glendinning and Muthesius, *Tower Block*; and John R. Gold, *The Practice of Modernism: Modern Architects and Urban Transformation, 1954–1972* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007).

¹⁷ The architects of Alton East were noted as Dr. J. L. Martin (Architect to the Council in succession to Robert H. Matthew); H. J. Whitfield Lewis (Principal Housing Architect); R. Stjernstedt, A. W. C. Barr, O. J. Cox, A. R. Garrick, Adams, J. Partridge, H. Graverson and P. Nevill (Assistant Architects), with Ove Arup and Partners as Engineers and Oscar Faber and Partners as Heating and Ventilation Engineers. See for example, *Architectural Review* (January 1954) v. 115, n. 685, pp. 49–66. Although elsewhere R. Stjernstedt and O. J. Cox are described as Architects in Charge; Ove Arup and Partners as Engineers; and Kirk and Kirk Ltd. as Contractors. See 'Housing and Schools by the London County Council', *Concrete Quarterly* (January–March 1956) n. 28, pp. 2–17, p. 11.

¹⁸ The architects of Alton West were Hubert Bennett (Architect to the Council in succession to Prof Sir J. L. Martin and Robert H. Matthew); H. J. Whitfield Lewis (Principal Housing Architect); K. Powell (Assistant Housing Architect in succession to Michael Powell); Colin Lucas (Architect in Charge); J. A. Partridge, W. G. Howell, J. A. W. Killick, S. F. Amis, J. R. Galley, and R. Stout (Architects); W. V. Zinn (Consulting Engineer). See for example, 'Housing at Priory Lane, Roehampton, London SW15', *Architectural Design* (January 1959), pp. 7–21, p. 7.

¹⁹ For the initial designs see, Le Corbusier et P. Jeanneret, *Oeuvre complete 1938–1946*, v. 4, publié par Willy Boesiger, architecte, Zurich (Erlenbach–Zurich: Les Editions d'Architecture Erlenbach–Zurich, 1946) pp. 172–87. See also Le Corbusier, *The Marseilles Block*, [1950] translated by Geoffrey Sainsbury, from the French Unité d'Habitation de Marseille (London: The Harvill Press, 1953), where Le Corbusier describes it as 'a block of 360 flats', see p. 7, and as 337 homes, see p. 42. For specific contemporary commentaries and discussions, see Alban Janson and Carsten Krohn, *Le Corbusier, Unité d'habitation, Marseilles*, (London and Stuttgart: Axel Menges, 2007) and Jacques Sbriglio, *Le Corbusier: The Unité d'Habitation in Marseilles, and Rez-les-Nantes, Berlin, Briey en Foret, Firminy*, (Basel, Boston, Berlin and Paris: Birkhauser Publishers and Fondation Le Corbusier, 2004).

²⁰ See *Contemporary Architecture* (1929) n. 5, pp. 158–64 for plans and *Contemporary Architecture* (1930) n. 5, pp. 6–13 for photographs of the just completed building. For Catherine Cooke's translation of Moisei Ginzburg, 'Housing Complex for Employees of Narkomfin, Moscow', *Contemporary Architecture* (1929) n. 5, pp. 161–2, see Cooke, *Russian Avant-Garde*, p. 120. See also Victor Buchli, 'Moisei Ginzburg's Narkomfin Communal House in Moscow', *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, (1998) v. 57, n. 2, pp. 160–81/

²¹ See for example, David Lewis, 'Criticism', *Sheffield*, A Special Number edited by Pat Crook, *Architectural Design*, (September 1961), pp. 397–398; 'Housing at Park Hill and Hyde Park, Sheffield', *The Architects' Journal Information Library* (21 July 1965), p. 160; and 'Park Hill Development', *The Architects' Journal* (23 August 1961), p. 272.

²² See the work of Richard Baxter on the importance of the view to Aylesbury residents. See for example Richard Baxter, QMUL, and Mark Davidson, Clark University, 'The violence of urban regeneration: home and place unmaking in the gentrification of the Aylesbury Estate', (April 2015) and Richard Baxter, 'The High-Rise Home: Practices of Verticality on the Aylesbury Estate' (April 2015), paper submitted to the *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*.

²³ See for example <http://35percent.org/blog/2014/07/23/mystery-objector-1301/> (accessed 13 February 2015). As 35percent report, 'But more worrying is the Council's response on page 109, where it states that it has "recommended a lower CIL rate in the lower value area of the Borough, within which the majority of housing estates identified for Estate renewal are located." 35percent refers to p. 109 of the www.southwark.gov.uk/.../cdcil5_appendix_i_of_regulation_19_consultation_statement. CIL stands for Community Infrastructure Levy.

²⁴ See http://www.savills.co.uk/_news/article/72418/175241-0/4/2014/savills-research--london-regeneration-research-proposal For specific reports see for example <http://pdf.euro.savills.co.uk/residential---other/spotlight-public-land.pdf> (accessed 13 February 2015).

²⁵ See <http://pdf.savills.com/documents/Foreword%20by%20Community%20Secretary,%20Eric%20Pickles%20and%20the%20regeneration%20research%20proposal.pdf> (accessed 13 February 2015).

²⁶ See the report by Nicholas Boys Smith and Alex Morton, 'Create Streets; Not just Multi-Storey Estates' at <http://www.createstreets.com/> See also 'Better Regeneration' and 'Why aren't we building more streets?'. The low regard in which Create Streets hold high-rise housing is made clear by the fact that in one essay 'Create Streets Lite' an image of a tower block in the Wyndham Estate is captioned with the name of a tower block on the Portland Street Estate.

²⁷ See for example Richard Baxter, 'The High-Rise Home: Practices of Verticality on the Aylesbury Estate' (April 2015), paper submitted to the *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*

²⁸ Loretta Lees, 'The Urban Injustices of New Labour's "new urban renewal" the case of the Aylesbury Estate', accessed at https://southwarknotes.files.wordpress.com/2009/12/lorettalees_pptx.pdf

²⁹ See https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/320196/140613_Estate_Regeneration_Prospectus.pdf

³⁰ See Alan Conisbee and Associates, *Aylesbury Estate: Robustness Considerations to Inform Risk Assessments*, (10 March 2005), job no. 050041. Obtained from Southwark Council under FOI 493517

³¹ See <http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/Data/Executive/20050927/Agenda/Item%2007%20-%20The%20AylesburyEstate%20Revised%20Strategy%20-%20Report.pdf> and See <http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/CeListDocuments.aspx?Committeeld=118&MeetingId=986&DF=27%2f09%2f2005&Ver=2>

³² See <http://www.engineering.ucl.ac.uk/engineering-exchange/files/2014/10/Report-Refurbishment-Demolition-Social-Housing.pdf>

³³ See https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/KnockItDownOrDoltUp_0.pdf

³⁴ See *Sustainability Appraisal of Aylesbury Area Action Plan* (May 2009). http://www.southwark.gov.uk/downloads/download/1975/aylesbury_area_action_plan_accompanying_documents

³⁵ See <http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/Data/Executive/20050927/Agenda/Item%2007%20-%20The%20AylesburyEstate%20Revised%20Strategy%20-%20Report.pdf>

³⁶ See *Equalities Impact Assessment for Aylesbury Area Action Plan* (January 2009), p. 7. http://www.southwark.gov.uk/downloads/download/1975/aylesbury_area_action_plan_accompanying_documents

³⁷ See <http://www.nottinghillhousing.org.uk/our-developments/aylesbury-estate-southwark>

³⁸ See for example <https://southwarknotes.wordpress.com/2015/04/01/aylesbury-estate-is-everyones-fight/>

³⁹ See *Statement of Case made by the London Borough of Southwark under Rule 7 of the Compulsory Purchase Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2007*, pp. 2-4.

⁴⁰ Southwark Council, *Southwark's objection statement version 2 - ALG Statement of case updatedpdf*, (24 April 2015), p. 21.

⁴¹ See http://35percent.org/images/AylesburyPlanningApplications_ref15AP3843-44.pdf

⁴² See <https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/216037/response/534726/attach/html/2/Freedom%20of%20Information%20request%20response%20for%20405721.pdf.html>

⁴³ See <https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/216037/response/543034/attach/html/3/lbsouthwark%20cbarfield%2025%2007%202014%2011%2004%2032.pdf.html>

See also http://www.peoplesrepublicofsouthwark.co.uk/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=3656:13-days-left-to-object-to-demolition-of-the-aylesbury-estate&catid=21:news&Itemid=156

⁴⁴ See <http://35percent.org/blog/2013/06/08/the-heygate-diaspora/>

⁴⁵ For a mapping of the displacement of tenants and leaseholders from Southwark's Heygate Estate, see the article by Loretta Lees, Just Space, and SNAG (Southwark Notes Archives Group) 'The Social Cleansing of Council Estates in London', Ben Campkin, David Roberts and Rebecca Ross (eds). *Regeneration Realities: Urban Pamphleteer*, n. 2, (2014).

⁴⁶ See *Equalities Impact Assessment for Aylesbury Area Action Plan* (January 2009), p. 8.
http://www.southwark.gov.uk/downloads/download/1975/aylesbury_area_action_plan_accompanying_documents

⁴⁷ See *Equalities Impact Assessment for Aylesbury Area Action Plan* (January 2009), p. 5.
http://www.southwark.gov.uk/downloads/download/1975/aylesbury_area_action_plan_accompanying_documents

⁴⁸ See *Sustainability Appraisal of Aylesbury Area Action Plan* (May 2009).
http://www.southwark.gov.uk/downloads/download/1975/aylesbury_area_action_plan_accompanying_documents

⁴⁹ See Southwark Council, *8 Issues and Options report, Part 3: Delivery and Phasing*, p. 147.

⁵⁰ Master Plan clarification letter sent by Southwark Council, 7 April 2015, p. 2, table 1.

⁵¹ Southwark Council, *Southwark's objection statement version 2 - ALG Statement of case updatedpdf*, (24 April 2015), pp. 3–4.

⁵² See https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/KnockItDownOrDoltUp_0.pdf

⁵³ See http://www.southwark.gov.uk/downloads/download/1079/aylesbury_homeowners_rehousing_toolkit, p. 7.

⁵⁴ *Statement of Case made by the London Borough of Southwark under Rule 7 of the Compulsory Purchase Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2007*, p. 12, point 5.20.

⁵⁵ *Statement of Case made by the London Borough of Southwark under Rule 7 of the Compulsory Purchase Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2007*, p. 12, point 5.21.

⁵⁶ See http://www.primelocation.com/new-homes/details/35797322?search_identifier=655ae7d606b9ab6729f3c4798d354200#rWFcveMRhiC3eWJS.97

⁵⁷ Southwark Council, *Southwark's objection statement version 2 - ALG Statement of case updatedpdf*, (24 April 2015), p. 4.

⁵⁸ See http://www.southwark.gov.uk/downloads/download/1079/aylesbury_homeowners_rehousing_toolkit, p. 10.

⁵⁹ See http://www.southwark.gov.uk/downloads/download/1079/aylesbury_homeowners_rehousing_toolkit, p. 12.

⁶⁰ See *Equalities Impact Assessment for Aylesbury Area Action Plan* (January 2009), p. 5.
http://www.southwark.gov.uk/downloads/download/1975/aylesbury_area_action_plan_accompanying_documents

⁶¹ See the zoning of this development where Aylesbury leaseholders are being offered shared ownership deals. See <http://www.camberwellfields.com/the-development/site-plan>

⁶² See <https://southwarknotes.files.wordpress.com/2009/12/aylesbury-phase-1a.jpg>

⁶³ See <http://betterelephant.org/blog/2015/02/06/aylesbury-estate-facts-and-figures/> and <http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/Data/Executive/20050927/Agenda/Item%2007%20-%20The%20AylesburyEstate%20Revised%20Strategy%20-%20Report.pdf>

⁶⁴ See http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/200211/area_action_plans/1327/aylesbury_area_action_plan

vii.

⁶⁵ See the letter I received in response to my request for information: 502731, received on 3 March 2015 in which I requested: to see a copy of the Partnership Agreement between Notting Hill Housing Trust and London Borough of Southwark. 'Your request has been dealt under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004. In response to it we have enclosed a redacted version of *copy of the Partnership Agreement between Notting Hill Housing Trust and London Borough of Southwark.*'