

Professional Role

My name is Jane Rendell and I have been a Professor of Architecture and Art at the Bartlett School of Architecture at University College London (UCL) since 2008. I worked as an architectural designer on social housing in the 1980s and 90s, I have an MA and PhD in architectural history. 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County Council (LCC), and how the democratic aspirations of the post war period to provide housing based on need have been replaced by a market-based housing model.

Methodology

(1) Literature Review

My statement is based on the following sources: (i) academic literature held in the public domain on housing, regeneration and the current London Housing Crisis, including evidence-based analyses of the Aylesbury Estate made by Professor Loretta Lees and Dr Richard Baxter;¹ (ii) summaries of the on-going Aylesbury demolition on three key websites – 35%, Southwark Notes, and Better Elephant;² (iii) material on the redevelopment of the Aylesbury Estate since 2005 from the Southwark Council website or accessed through FOI requests.

(2) Situated Knowledge

My published research draws on my personal experience, on what Professor Donna Haraway has described as 'situated knowledge'.³ Since 2010 I have been a resident leaseholder of a flat on the eighteenth floor of Crossmount House, on the Wyndham Estate, half a mile west of the Aylesbury Estate and the 'Order Land'.⁴ I have been a Strategic Member of the Aylesbury Leaseholders Action Group since November 2014, through which I have first-hand knowledge and understanding of the experiences of various Aylesbury leaseholders.

My experience as a Southwark leaseholder (over my own windows and balcony described in my statement) has highlighted for me:

- (i) The imbalance of power in relations 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. (Having supervised 12 PhDs to completion, and examined around 20 others, I 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 While much legal aid has been withdrawn, Southwark Council have access to fully trained lawyers, who I assume are paid for with public funds.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 holds Modern architecture, particularly how they devalue the view and the communal areas, which are integral to the design of 'point' and 'slab' blocks in post-war welfare state housing.

My statement is based on research given *pro-bono*, partly to help my neighbours, and partly as my home is in a post-war 'point' and 'slab' block estate in Southwark's renewal zone. I will return to the relevance of this definition.

The Aylesbury in the historical context of post-war Welfare State Public Housing

Crossmount House, where I live, was built in 1967, it is a point-block, one of five, designed by Colin Locus, one of the architects of the renowned LCC Alton Estate at Roehampton.⁵ With a target population of 10,000 the Alton Estate was the largest of the L. C. C. developments, and one of the largest housing projects in Europe. Alton East pioneered 'point' blocks, based on Swedish designs, of which Crossmount House is a fine example. Alton West pioneered 'slab' blocks, based on Le Corbusier's famous *Unité d'Habitation*, built between 1947 and 1953 in Marseilles,⁶ and situated in 8.65 acres of parkland, 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, a scheme which included green space, communal facilities and whose dwelling blocks were orientated to include air, sun and access to greenery, via ribbon windows and roof gardens.⁷ Key to the *Unité* and the Narkomfin designs were the communal spaces, specifically the wide corridors, for people to meet and socialize, 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,⁸ as well as the Aylesbury.⁹

The Aylesbury Estate is a large modernist high-rise estate in Southwark, South London. It was part of Southwark's ambitious plan for social housing in the 1960s. The first residents moved in during 1969 and it housed up to 10,000 residents. Initially very well received, it declined in the 1980s-90s. The Aylesbury Estate had a strong community in the 1970s, which fragmented in the 1980s with immigration and increasing urban marginality. Nevertheless networks of ties exist that are important to some long-term residents. These were comparatively strong in 2001 when 76 percent of residents turned out to vote against a proposed stock transfer and regeneration (73 percent). Partially responding to the capacity of the estate to mobilise, the state has since engaged in a process of community dismantling and reshaping. A strategic and symbolic display of power, following the 2001 vote Southwark demolished the community centre, which is where the vote took place. For many residents this was a focus of community and site of memories.¹⁰

The Aylesbury Estate is a place infused with meaning, memory and community attachments. For example, in the early years laundry rooms on first floor walkways were sites where residents got to know neighbours (Baxter, forthcoming). The community and youth centres were also places where residents became involved

in activities, such as art, dance and bingo, and made friendships. However, talking to residents, it becomes clear that some spaces on the estate are *more* than place. Homes, they are intense places of enhanced significance, feelings and relationships. The domestic interior of flats, where residents spend most of their time, are implicated within family and personal possessions.¹¹

The Aylesbury in the current context of 'Estate Renewal'

Much of Southwark's housing strategy for council estate 'renewal' is informed by research conducted by property consultants, Savills, who recommend that councils 'unearth the potential' of public land.¹² The post-war 'point' and 'slab' blocks that make up most estates, including the Aylesbury, are not dense enough Savills argue; they must be replaced by mansion blocks situated on re-introduced old street layouts.¹³ Savills cite a report published by Create Streets, which claims that people do not like in living in post-war high-rise blocks.¹⁴ However, such viewpoints are directly countered by qualitative research, such as conducted recently on the Aylesbury Estate by Dr Richard Baxter, who interviewed residents. Dr Baxter's oral history research counters the dominant trend to dismiss high-rise living as a failure, showing instead the importance of the high-rise view to people's sense of identity, and the pleasurable role of vertical experiences in belonging to place and in home-making.¹⁵ As London property prices have been leveraged up to unsustainable levels, the motive for 'unearthing the potential' of public land, which depends on the demolition of post-war public housing estates, is to open them up for private investment, rather than 'the greater public benefit'. This is the context for the use of CPOs to acquire leaseholder properties.

Overall Argument

I question Southwark Council's use of Compulsory Purchase Orders to acquire leaseholder properties on the 'Order Land'. In my view, there is not a 'compelling case in the public interest',¹⁶ to 'justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected',¹⁷ by the use of CPOs which would go against Protocol 1, Article. 1 of the European Convention of Human Rights:¹⁸

(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.

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'.¹⁹ The *Statement of Case made by the London Borough of Southwark under Rule 7 of the Compulsory Purchase Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2007* states:²⁰

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.

In my view, the regeneration programme of the Aylesbury is not promoting/improving the wellbeing of the area. If we recognize the existing residents as part of the 'area', then raising the economic value of the area, and thus the price of buying and renting homes, does not contribute to the well-being – economic or social – of these residents. Removing people from their homes against their will certainly does not improve the social well-being of the area, while demolishing well-designed housing does not contribute to the environmental wellbeing of the area.

The following aspects of Southwark's regeneration scheme do not promote or improve the wellbeing of the area, are not 'in the public interest', and thus do not justify the CPO of leaseholder properties on the 'Order Land':

(1) Choosing to demolish rather than refurbish

The Conisbee report of March 2005 is a structural survey of the Aylesbury Estate commissioned by Southwark Council.²¹ 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. [see *Statement of Case* paras 5.10-15] Estates in other London Boroughs, built using the same construction system, such as Six Acres in Islington, have been refurbished rather than demolished. However, at a meeting on the 27 September 2005 Southwark decided to demolish rather than refurbish the Aylesbury. Therefore the decision to demolish rather than refurbish was reached for reasons other than structure. I have been unable to access information of any cost benefit analysis undertaken to determine the financial basis for the decision. It also appears that a key numerical table on p. 10 of the Conisbee report is missing

from the bundles of information sent to Leaseholders by Southwark. [see Witness Statement of Beverley Robinson, point 2.]

(2) Reducing the number of affordable units

There are 566 existing units in the 'Order' land, of which 511 are social rented and 55 leasehold. They will be replaced by 830 new units of which only 406 are affordable;²² so there is a net loss of 160 affordable units.

Furthermore, only 255 of the affordable units are rented, and their rent has been set not as social rent but 'target rent',²³ 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'.²⁴

The addition of 424 units for private sale at the full market rate, against the loss of 511 social rented units is evidence not that public benefit outweighs private loss, but of the reverse: that private benefit outweighs public loss.

The complexity of the scheme and the multiple players involved makes it extremely hard to obtain clear figures on this: specifically,

- (i) the division of the demolition and redevelopment of the Aylesbury Estate into numerous phases spread over many years with numerous different planning applications,
- (ii) 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
- (iii) the changing definitions and proliferation of the terms used, from – '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'.

(3) Displacing mixed communities

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 prime features 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'. Southwark Council in its *Equalities Impact Assessment for Aylesbury Area Action Plan* (January 2009) describes a ratio of 18% leaseholders to 82% tenants. They also describe the existing residents as highly diverse in terms of ethnic composition, with 67% belonging to a minority ethnic group, and around 21% over 60 years of age.²⁵ By its own admission, the Aylesbury Estate and the 'Order Land' within it, is *already* a diverse community with mixed tenure, which contradicts a key reason that Southwark Council has given for redeveloping the Aylesbury Estate to create a 'vibrant community'.

Of the 575 Aylesbury households removed from the estate to date (387 tenants and 188 leaseholders),²⁶ just a third (195) have managed to remain in Walworth.²⁷ If the redevelopment continues along these lines, as with the Heygate

Estate, a mile to the north, whose tenants were displaced from central London into other boroughs, and leaseholders ejected from the city entirely,²⁸ the Aylesbury regeneration will have the paradoxical effect of displacing precisely those people who it was intended to benefit.²⁹ Despite Southwark's claims to be creating a 'stronger' and 'more vibrant' community, we will see the community weakened and people displaced from their homes to more distant London boroughs and outside the capital.

Under 0.1.4, of the *Sustainability Appraisal*, which is a requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, adequate provision has to have been made for key worker housing and intermediate affordable housing.³⁰ Southwark Council's only argument for not providing the 'right of return' for residents, specifically leaseholders, on the 'Order Land' is that such an offer has not been on any other regeneration schemes in the past.³¹ And yet Southwark Council stated in the Executive meeting of 26 September 2006:³²

Key issues for consideration

11. The work undertaken by the decant sub-group has highlighted areas where residents' aspirations do not fully coincide with the Council's preferred approach; these areas are covered below along with the relevant policy considerations and proposals. Given the magnitude and complexity of the rehousing issues for Aylesbury, the work of the sub-group has informed the drafting of the borough wide policy.

And in the same meeting argues for 100% replacement:

Rehousing policy and Aylesbury context.

12. For Aylesbury, the 100% replacement requirement will be part of the masterplan brief; it has already been agreed that the new Aylesbury homes

A recent Government report states that 'leaseholders should be offered a like-for-like replacement of their property, or a similar offer, wherever possible',³³ yet Southwark has made no allowance for rehousing the existing leaseholders. In the early strategy document, *8 Issues and Options Report, Part 3: Delivery and Phasing*, from October 2007, 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'.³⁴ No 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 at the time of the outline application is 290.³⁵ The assumption is that leaseholders can 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 intermediate units for sale negates this possibility. The shared equity model is only available subject to financial qualification.³⁶ 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.'³⁷ Additionally, Southwark Council's guidance for leaseholders states that if leaseholders wish to 'seek council rehousing assistance' they will

only 'accept applications from homeowners 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'.³⁸

A two bedroom flat overlooking Burgess Park on the fifth floor or above might be valued (by Southwark's valuers) between £120,000 to around £200,000 (after going to tribunal and in comparison with other test cases). However, a duplex two bedroom flat overlooking Burgess Park on the fifth floor of a new development is currently advertised on Prime Location, for £650,000,³⁹ 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 their park view, in the best case example, having suffered the inconvenience, loss of earnings and stress of taking the case to tribunal, if after financial means testing they were offered equity or shared ownership, they would need to take on between £350,000 and £450,000 of debt to cover the difference in price. And this would be subject to (i) availability of a suitable flat and (ii) ability to find a mortgage provider.

(4) Organising the new housing according to economic status

Southwark Council in its *Equalities Impact Assessment for Aylesbury Area Action Plan* (January 2009), states it will not 'create an area of the "haves" and "have nots"'.⁴⁰ Yet housing at Camberwell Fields is segregated into zones – private sale, social rent, and intermediate – according to the purchasing power of the occupants/buyers.⁴¹ In phase 1a of the Aylesbury redevelopment, the units are distributed so the south-facing views over Burgess Park previously enjoyed by a mix of tenants and leaseholders will mainly benefit units for private sale on the open market. See in the plan how the majority of units 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 mainly social rented units.⁴²

(5) Ignoring the democratic decision-making processes

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%).⁴³ 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

Southwark Council plan to compulsorily purchase properties that they previously sold to leaseholders. 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 making a profit for private developers be for the public benefit? Public benefit includes the social mobility based on the right to become

a homeowner, and the social stability based on security of ownership. Yet when a local authority uses statutory powers to dispossess leaseholders of their homes and life savings, to the great benefit of private capital, trust in public institutions as systems of governance is weakened.

(7) Redaction of key information concerning 'viability'

The claim made by the Aylesbury Area Action Plan that 'replacement of all the existing social rented housing would not be possible economically',⁴⁴ is impossible to disprove since the viability studies and financial models that form the basis of the decisions have been redacted from key documents, and are unavailable for public scrutiny. When requesting information concerning the partnership deal between Southwark Council and Notting Hill Housing Trust, Southwark Council withheld information that is in the public interest, to protect the private 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 asserted 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.'⁴⁵ Southwark Council argues that the demolition of the 'Order Land' is in the public interest and that public benefit outweighs private loss, yet this contradicts its decision to protect the privacy of the developers' financial information, while demanding that leaseholders should have their finances means tested and open to public scrutiny.

V.

¹ See 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 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,%20Situated%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 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 Country 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).

⁶ 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).

⁷ 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/

⁸ See 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.

⁹ See the work of Richard Baxter on the importance of the view to Aylesbury residents. See 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*.

¹⁰ See 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).

¹¹ See 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).

¹² 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).

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

¹⁴ 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.

¹⁵ 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*

¹⁶ 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.

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

¹⁸ <http://ukhumanrightsblog.com/incorporated-rights/articles-index/protocol-1-article-1/>

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

²⁰ See *Statement of Case made by the London Borough of Southwark under Rule 7 of the Compulsory Purchase Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2007*, p. 2.

²¹ 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

²² Southwark Council, *Southwark's objection statement version 2 - ALG Statement of case updatedpdf*, (24 April 2015), p. 21, points 2.04 – 2.06.

²³ 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.

²⁴ http://35percent.org/images/LBS_NHHT_DPAgreement.pdf, p. 37.

²⁵ 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

²⁶ See
<https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/216037/response/534726/attach/html/2/Freedom%20of%20Information%20request%20response%20for%20405721.pdf.html>

²⁷ 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

²⁸ 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).

²⁹ See <http://35percent.org/blog/2013/06/08/the-heygate-diaspora/>

³⁰ See *Sustainability Appraisal of Aylesbury Area Action Plan* (May 2009).
http://www.southwark.gov.uk/downloads/download/1975/aylesbury_area_action_plan_accompanying_documents

³¹ Southwark Council, *Southwark's objection statement version 2 - ALG Statement of case updatedpdf*, (24 April 2015), pp. 3–4.

³² <http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/Data/Executive/20060926/Agenda/Item%2015%20-%20Rehousing%20of%20Tenants%20and%20Homeowners%20for%20the%20Aylesbury%20Estate%20Regeneration%20Programme.pdf>

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

³⁴ See Southwark Council, *8 Issues and Options report, Part 3: Delivery and Phasing*, p. 147.

³⁵ Master Plan clarification letter sent by Southwark Council, 7 April 2015, p. 2, table 1.

³⁶ *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.

³⁷ *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.

³⁸ See http://www.southwark.gov.uk/downloads/download/1079/aylesbury_homeowners_rehousing_toolkit, p. 12.

³⁹ See http://www.primelocation.com/new-homes/details/35797322?search_identifier=655ae7d606b9ab6729f3c4798d354200#rWFcveMRhiC3eWJS.97

⁴⁰ 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

⁴¹ See the zoning of this development where Aylesbury leaseholders are being offered shared ownership deals. See <http://www.camberwellfields.com/the-development/site-plan>

⁴² See <https://southwarknotes.files.wordpress.com/2009/12/aylesbury-phase-1a.jpg>

⁴³ 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>

⁴⁴ See http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/200211/area_action_plans/1327/aylesbury_area_action_plan

⁴⁵ 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

vii.

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.*'