Good afternoon all.

My name is David Parton, and I am one of the three Labour councillors for Rye Lane ward - the local government ward covering the Aylesham centre site.

I am here to ask you to reject Berkeley Home's appeal against Southwark Council's planning refusal on the grounds laid out by Southwark's legal counsel - and also to encourage you to consider the many other reasons for refusal.

The current application threatens to undermine Southwark's real progress in delivering social rent homes.

There is a huge need for affordable housing in Southwark, with more than 4,000 households in and around Peckham specifically on the social housing waiting list.

There are also currently approximately 1,383 households in the SE15 area alone living in overcrowded accommodation - more than a quarter of all overcrowded households on Southwark's housing register.

With just 12% affordable housing allocated to this scheme, it is simply incomprehensible that this scheme's supposed 'affordable housing benefits' could outweigh the substantial, multiple harms laid out in this application - including adverse impacts on house prices, fears over the potential displacement of local people and businesses, and the fundamental altering of the area's character.

A recent research paper, on the links between these sort of incongruous luxury developments and displacement of social and economically vulnerable people in Peckham, evidences that these kinds of concerns are supported by fact.

Trust for London's Poverty Profile (March 2025) analyses 53 London neighbourhoods including three in Peckham. The results show that families and low-income Londoners may be being priced out of their neighbourhoods, and ultimately out of London.

This was determined by observing significant above-London-average increases in incomes throughout the 2010s that could not be through individuals increasing their incomes alone - i.e. resulted from wealthy groups moving in.

At the same time, these neighbourhoods have seen their populations change significantly – with a noted drop in their Black population and fewer families with children. They have also seen the proportion of residents living in social housing drop.

This is a form of displacement, and is fundamentally a material harm the inspector must consider.

And even under the Government's recently revised rules for affordable housing delivery in London, this scheme falls egregiously short.

I implore the inspector: this application is so bereft of affordable housing, for an area in such exceptional need of affordable housing, that it cannot be acceptable.

Some of the physical harms include damage to the Rye Lane conservation area and neighbouring buildings - by destroying historic sight-lines, overshadowing historic and listed buildings, and severely blocking the daylight and sunlight permanently to properties adjoining the site.

And there are many other reasons to refuse this appeal too, such as:

- The absence of legal guarantees to provide Community Land Trust homes - a fundamental, core tenement of the allocation for development on this site;
- The business relocation strategy failed to identify all small and independent businesses and did not meet policy requirements for consultation and viable relocation options - when asked to revise the plan accordingly by Southwark Council, the applicant did not respond;
- The shocking fact the application fails to meet the GLA's Urban Greening Factor requirements, scoring 0.38, strikingly below the 0.4 required - truly shocking considering the site is currently a paved car park; and
- The allocation of still tall towers in the centre of the site, rather than on the south east corner as stipulated in the Southwark Plan, which effectively destroys the view of the City of London from the rooftop of Peckham Levels and other surrounding buildings.

While some of these point could be improved by the applicant, they have shown no appetite to improve the scheme and by pushing for non-determination, they have shown no respect for local governance or residents.

I encourage the inspector to refuse this appeal.