

18th April 2015

Dear Planning Committee Councillor,

We are writing in reference to the above planning applications for Notting Hill Housing Group's redevelopment of the Aylesbury estate.

We are very concerned about Notting Hill's S106 affordable housing proposals in this development for the following reasons.

On 21<sup>st</sup> December 2010, Southwark's planning committee approved an application by Notting Hill for redevelopment of part of the Neckinger estate ([ref:10/AP/3010](#)), forming part of the Bermondsey Spa regeneration. The application included provision for 44 social rented units, which is confirmed in the both the officer's report and the GLA planning report. However, the [S106 legal agreement](#) with Notting Hill signed a month later on 25<sup>th</sup> Jan 2011, defined those 44 social rented units in terms of affordable rent (i.e. up to 80% market rent). Notting Hill informs us that these 44 units are indeed now let at 'affordable rent's averaging 58% of market rent. This is double what the social rents should have been for these homes and well beyond the means of most Southwark residents.

On 28 February 2012, the planning committee approved an application from Notting Hill to redevelop part of the Elmington estate in Camberwell ([ref:11/AP/4309](#)). Again this included provision for 41 social rented homes and again the definition of social rent was switched to affordable rent when the [S106 legal agreement](#) was signed a month later (22<sup>nd</sup> March 2012).

On 6<sup>th</sup> November 2012, the planning committee approved an application from L&Q homes to redevelop the second phase of the Aylesbury regeneration ([ref:12/AP/2332](#)). Again this included provision for social rented homes (49 in total) and again these were switched to the affordable rent definition when the [S106 legal agreement](#) was signed 3 months later on 19<sup>th</sup> Feb 2013.

Naturally we are very concerned that the same fate awaits the current Aylesbury applications and with such a large number of social rented units at stake we felt the need to contact you personally.

Our concerns are further compounded that there is no definition of social rent in the [Development Partnership Agreement](#) with Notting Hill for the Aylesbury redevelopment. Instead there is only a reference to 'target rents' for which there is no policy definition in any of Southwark's policies or the London Plan, nor in the National Rent Regime regulatory framework which governs social rents.

We know that Mayor Boris Johnson is very keen on including affordable rent as a subcategory of social rent and we know that Southwark has [fought hard](#) to resist this. We also know from a draft response to a [question to the Mayor](#), that of the £92m funding Notting Hill has received from him, only 81 homes for social rent are provided for in this allocation.

We are asking for your help in ensuring that this trend of switching from social rent to affordable rent post planning approval does not happen with the Aylesbury applications and that all social housing reprovided on the estate is truly social rented housing. **We therefore ask you to reject the application, until such time as a full S106 legal definition of the precise social housing tenure proposed is published for public consultation.**

Yours sincerely  
Jerry Flynn (on behalf of the 35% Campaign)