**Aylesbury – Planning History**

Research by Catriona Sinclair for FOBP September 2022

Changes to the Aylesbury development over time

Southwark Council scrapped the Aylesbury Area Action Plan (AAAP), a 182-page planning document (incorporating 29 policy documents) which set the parameters for the redevelopment of the Aylesbury estate and which resulted from 4 years of consultation and a public examination. It has been replaced without consultation, by a [2-page 'Area Vision and 5-page 'site allocation'](https://nam12.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.southwark.gov.uk%2Fassets%2Fattach%2F38832%2FEIP202a-Aylesbury-Background-Paper-Update-20042021.pdf&data=05%7C01%7C%7Cf71b2e5180da410fa16b08da9e85f62f%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C637996595462751855%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=g6ljgEmmFzkthaUMjfPytqMnEziwa3vvSE%2FuI9VH7SY%3D&reserved=0), as part of the [New Southwark Plan](https://nam12.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.southwark.gov.uk%2Fplanning-and-building-control%2Fplanning-policy-and-transport-policy%2Fnew-southwark-plan&data=05%7C01%7C%7Cf71b2e5180da410fa16b08da9e85f62f%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C637996595462751855%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=XF9SpN5XBQSQrwQRf4Ir4acb87UJdT%2FUYVjLd9DUBXs%3D&reserved=0) (NSP).

The decision was revealed at the Examination in Public (EIP) of the NSP. The AAAP covered all aspects of the redevelopment, including housing, design, open space and the phasing of the development.

Southwark maintain that all the relevant policies in the [AAAP](https://nam12.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.southwark.gov.uk%2Fplanning-and-building-control%2Fplanning-policy-and-transport-policy%2Fdevelopment-plan%2Farea-action-plans-section%2Faylesbury-aap&data=05%7C01%7C%7Cf71b2e5180da410fa16b08da9e85f62f%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C637996595462751855%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=i6tPyzASV7TQMXIDQbcMStd4WuYnCgkViVvwPyHmhNc%3D&reserved=0) will be taken into account by the NSP, so that such things as more generous space standards, more family housing and car-parking for residents are retained. The lack of any prior notice or consultation has raised worries that much that was beneficial in the AAAP will not be carried out.

(See: [https://www.35percent.org/posts/2021-05-04-southwark-rips-up-aylesbury-objectives](https://nam12.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.35percent.org%2Fposts%2F2021-05-04-southwark-rips-up-aylesbury-objectives&data=05%7C01%7C%7Cf71b2e5180da410fa16b08da9e85f62f%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C637996595462751855%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=ByIcTV9N0ElyeQWD8vOnJXUd1mVHltR5Cn%2ByvjDLdj4%3D&reserved=0) for above info.)

There was Outline Planning Permission in 2014/5 for Aylesbury but by 2022 it was decided to increase the density of the development again and so there was a redesign which led to Phase2B.

*1. Albany Road*

**Aylesbury Area Action Plan 2010 (AAAP):** Albany Road will be a calmed route and will be better integrated with the park so that it is perceived as a route through the park.

**Public responses to AAAP recorded by Southwark (PR):** Proposed street layouts were generally supported in the public response to the AAAP. The … proposals to alter the character of Albany Road were mentioned specifically;

**Aylesbury Outline Planning Permission 2014/5**(LPA ref: 14/AP/3844) **(OPP):**The overall character of this street is proposed to change to a “Park Road”. By contrast with the existing buildings, the proposed development will be much closer to the park, framing the edge of Albany Road as a pleasant place to walk or to cross over the Burgess Park.

• Integrate Albany Road into Burgess Park by changing its character to a ‘Park Road’;

• Improve cycling both along Albany Road and between Burgess Park and the regeneration area.

[http://www.aylesburynow.london/web/uploads/files/Planning\_Application/Overall\_Masterplan/03\_Masterplan\_Design\_And\_Access\_Statement.pdf](https://nam12.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.aylesburynow.london%2Fweb%2Fuploads%2Ffiles%2FPlanning_Application%2FOverall_Masterplan%2F03_Masterplan_Design_And_Access_Statement.pdf&data=05%7C01%7C%7Cf71b2e5180da410fa16b08da9e85f62f%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C637996595462751855%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=UjUg7fiZ4tMFIEw%2BgLQlh1xT4HLLAFtmuGmWkubSfZY%3D&reserved=0)

Due to the level of vehicle traffic and bus movements along Albany Road and Thurlow Street, provision for cycling has not been included other than within the carriageway. This will be subject to further consultation with Southwark and TfL. The introduction of an east-west quietway through Burgess Park and the East-west Community Spine through the proposed development offers alternative cycling provision.

**New Southwark Plan (NSP):**The calming of Albany Road and its integration with the park and making the Burgess Park frontage a varied and attractive face to the park have not been confirmed.

**Planning Application 22/AP/2226 Aylesbury Estate Site Phase 2B** **(APH 2B)**

Land Bounded By Thurlow Street, Albany Road, Kinglake Street and Bagshot Street London Southwark SE17 And SE5

Albany Road to the south of the site will provide an alternative route to Tesco superstore and is provided with wider footway provision. Burgess Park could also be used to access Old Kent Road and provides a traffic free and pleasant route to the park.

Plot 4D [in Phase 2B] The important southern elevation which addresses Albany Road and Burgess Park can be described as having a ‘civic’ presence. The broad public open space to the south of the building means that it helps to form the edge of this park and that it can be seen from a great distance. The string of buildings that form this edge should be considered as part of a whole.

The broad space between the kerb line of Albany Road and the southern façade of 4D allows for a new green space to be formed. This space will be open to the public and offer protected spaces to stop and rest whilst at the same time affording privacy to the ground floor maisonettes from passing traffic and pedestrians along this boundary road.

According to the Transport Assessment Part 1 for Phase 2B, instead of improving the connection between the Aylesbury and Burgess Park there will be a community link route running parallel north of Albany Road to be more cycle and pedestrian friendly.

However, later parts of the transport assessment state:

The wider regeneration of the Aylesbury Estate (**Phase 4C**) will increase the width of the footway [on Albany Road] and [have] new trees to improve the existing pedestrian experience. In addition, regular formal and informal crossing points will be included to increase opportunities for pedestrians to access Burgess Park. Albany Road in the vicinity of the site and as part of the wider redevelopment of Aylesbury Estate will be transformed from a wide, high speed traffic dominated road to a park road with green edges, slower traffic and frequent crossings to facilitate pedestrian and cycle movements.

*2. Green Fingers*

**AAAP:** Three green fingers will run from Burgess Park into the AAP area connecting with Surrey Square Park [Bagshot St], the Missenden play area and Faraday Gardens.

**PR:**Proposed street layouts were generally supported in the public response to the AAAP including the green fingers ... were mentioned specifically

**OPP:**Green Links: Access to Burgess Park is to be emphasized by creating wider streets with larger canopy street trees and raingardens

**NSP:**Green fingers confirmed in New Southwark Plan.

**APH 2B:**The proposals are structured around two new public spaces — a neighbourhood square on Thurlow Street and a neighbourhood park off Bagshot Street — providing 4,000m2+ new public space and retaining an increased number of existing trees compared with the Outline Planning Permission.

Thurlow Street is seen as a boulevard with a series of street gardens. The area of the boulevard next to 2B has 'special status’ where it meets Burgess Park. However, Thurlow Square is further up Thurlow Street. Thurlow St is also the route for the Southwark Spine for cycling.

Bagshot Street is a ‘green finger’ linking Burgess Park and Surrey Square with Bagshot Park halfway in between the two parks. Bagshot Street will have integrated parking, repaved footways, new rain gardens and increased tree planting although there is “limited capacity for new tree planting”. The current LTN barrier is proposed to be formalised through a new permanent tree planter in the carriageway.

The MUGA in Bagshot Street will be over an attenuation tank.

*3. Building Heights*

**AAAP:**Most of the new Aylesbury development should have a general height of between 2 and 4 storeys respecting the setting of the conservation areas. The general height in Thurlow Street and Albany Road will be greater, mostly between 7 to 10 storeys.

Buildings which are taller than the general height should be situated in important positions:

• one district landmark building of between 15 and 20 storeys at the junction of Thurlow Street and Albany Road to mark the main entrance to the neighbourhood and symbolise the area’s regeneration;

• local landmark buildings of between 10 and 15 storeys to mark the entrances to Portland Street, the King William IV and Chumleigh green fingers, and also the Amersham site.

• The taller buildings should be elegant and slender. Proposals should demonstrate that harmful effects on residents, pedestrians and cyclists, such as overshadowing and wind funnelling, will be minimised.

 The taller buildings will mark the main access points to the neighbourhood, whilst at the Burgess Park frontage they will create a varied and attractive face to the park. They will make good use of higher land values in these areas and help to support the delivery of the project.

**PR:**Density and building heights: Respondees generally considered the proposed building heights to be too tall and thought more open spaces should be provided;

**OPP:**Taller mansion blocks line Thurlow St and Albany Rd, punctuated by tall buildings intermittently placed along the ‘park edge’. Plot 4A (now in Phase 2B) is defined in the OPP as a ‘district landmark’ which marks the junction of Thurlow St and Albany Rd.

[http://www.aylesburynow.london/regeneration/planning-information/outline-masterpla](https://nam12.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.aylesburynow.london%2Fregeneration%2Fplanning-information%2Foutline-masterpla&data=05%7C01%7C%7Cf71b2e5180da410fa16b08da9e85f62f%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C637996595462751855%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=13pqCPY%2BPjr695l%2BD3DX4WPclsvH5XPC1IMLuGh4rzE%3D&reserved=0)

Tall building strategy design code:

* Landmark tower 16-20 storeys
* Park edge 10-15
* Gateway tower (related to another tower as a pair)

[http://www.aylesburynow.london/web/uploads/files/Planning\_Application/Overall\_Masterplan/06\_Masterplan\_Design\_Code\_Revised.pdf](https://nam12.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.aylesburynow.london%2Fweb%2Fuploads%2Ffiles%2FPlanning_Application%2FOverall_Masterplan%2F06_Masterplan_Design_Code_Revised.pdf&data=05%7C01%7C%7Cf71b2e5180da410fa16b08da9e85f62f%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C637996595462751855%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=MKAjELM7O66xUHheiY9Ydo3b%2BGRtADjl%2FvmK9LfMAQM%3D&reserved=0)

**NSP:**The New Southwark Plan confirms the AAAP building heights, elegant/slender tall buildings and minimising harmful effects on residents, pedestrians and cyclists, such as overshadowing and wind funnelling

**APH 2B:** The OPP established building height principles which influenced the application. However, the height for a landmark building now goes up to 25 storeys according to the current planning document.

The Phase 2B Masterplan strategy for tall buildings states that it follows the principles of ‘Policy D9 Tall buildings’ set out in The London Plan. Whether part of a group or stand-alone, tall buildings in Phase 2B reinforce the spatial hierarchy of the local and wider context and aid legibility and wayfinding.

In Vol. 3 of the Built Heritage, Townscape and Visual Impact on the Environment Part 3 the effect of the 25/6 storey tower is visualised and the impact report downplays the effect of the size of the tower in this location (see below). In fact, the tower does not look slender and it is much taller than surrounding buildings and trees. The suggestion that such a tall building is required to introduce the Aylesbury development area is described as a 'positive urban design move’ and the effect would be ‘beneficial’ by Montagu Evans, property consultants.\*

*The effect on the Cobourg Conservation Area*

"The Residents live in area that is undergoing substantial change. These visual receptors have a Medium susceptibility to change. Park users have a Low susceptibility to change as their focus is on the park. Using professional judgement, the overall susceptibility is Low due to the area undergoing substantial change and the majority of receptors here being park users. It has a Low sensitivity. The magnitude of impact would be Medium. The Project would give rise to a Minor Likely effect. The effect is not significant.The overall Scale of Effect would be Minor. The effect would be Beneficial."

*The effect on the very low houses on Albany Road*

"The proposed slender tower provides the new focus of the view,  provides a gateway to the Aylesbury Estate regeneration site.The magnitude of impact would be Medium. Cumulative development would give rise to a Minor Likely effect. The effects are not significant. The overall Scale of Effect would be Moderate. The effect would be Beneficial “

"The introduction of two slender elements marking the edge of Burgess Park and the gateway to the newly regenerated area is a positive urban design move through the Proposed and cumulative Developments. The effects are significant. The overall Scale of Effect would be Minor. The effect would be Beneficial.”

*The effect from Burgess Park*

"The Residents that use the park live in area that is undergoing substantial change. These visual receptors have a Medium susceptibility to change. Park users have a Low susceptibility to change as their focus is on the park. Using professional judgement, the overall susceptibility is Low due to the area undergoing substantial change and the majority of receptors here being park users. The view is mostly characterised by tall, contemporary developments in the distance. It has a Low sensitivity. The magnitude of impact would be High. … Cumulative development would give rise to a Moderate Likely effect. The effects is significant. The overall Scale of Effect would be Moderate. The effect would be Beneficial."  
  
  
  
from the Aylesbury Phase 2B Built Heritage, Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment: Vol 3 of Environmental Statement

[http://www.aylesburynow.london/web/uploads/files/Planning\_Application/Phase\_2b/Environmental%20Statement%20Vol%201%20(HTVIA)%20(Part%201).pdf](https://nam12.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.aylesburynow.london%2Fweb%2Fuploads%2Ffiles%2FPlanning_Application%2FPhase_2b%2FEnvironmental%2520Statement%2520Vol%25201%2520(HTVIA)%2520(Part%25201).pdf&data=05%7C01%7C%7Cf71b2e5180da410fa16b08da9e85f62f%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C637996595462751855%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=6v9RWvyoTdKszw2m3xPwA43bZU8FupW8XZIcbWczdnM%3D&reserved=0)

*4. Open space*

**AAAP:** New development must provide a high quality network of public open spaces of different sizes and functions which link well together and contain good pedestrian and cycling routes.

**PR:** Open space and Burgess Park: Many of the respondees supported the idea of improving Burgess Park. Many however felt that further work needed to be done with the community to work up proposals for Burgess Park. A number of respondees mentioned that consultation on issues affecting Burgess Park should not be confined to residents in the Aylesbury area;

[**35percent.org**](https://nam12.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2F35percent.org%2F&data=05%7C01%7C%7Cf71b2e5180da410fa16b08da9e85f62f%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C637996595462751855%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=E1mLFCxvzWv7leD5h4vaSdMNmjAS3voRgFH2Su4lO9w%3D&reserved=0) **(35%):**  Policy 4.5.1 of the AAAP requires that the Aylesbury redevelopment results in no net loss of open space. While the NSP has the strategic target for the borough, to retain and protect all open space, it makes no specific reference to open space requirements for the redeveloped Aylesbury.

**NSP:** The New Southwark Plan states that "Protecting and improving open space plays an important role in climate change adaption and mitigation”.

*5. Children’s play areas*

**AAAP:** Small children’s play areas should be integrated into the residential areas. Detailed landscaping plans will be required as an integral part of development proposals

All development proposals must provide 10 sqm of children’s play space / youth space per child bed space.

**35%:** Paragraph 4.5.2 of the AAAP says: "We will require children’s play areas to be integrated into the residential areas. About 3 hectares of children’s play space and youth space will be provided”. The proposed New Southwark Plan makes no requirement to replace any of the children's play and youth space.

**NSP:**

P15 Residential Building

11. Provide private amenity space, communal amenity space and facilities for all residents, and child play space on site using the GLA calculator [This calculator tool has been developed using 2011 census data and the London Development Database. It contains 112 separate developments which occurred across London between 2004 and 2011. The play space calculation uses the New London Plan requirement of 10 square metres per child.].

Child play space should be on ground or low level podiums with multiple egress points;

14. Provide communal facilities including gardens and community rooms. Provide green communal amenity space for all residents and additional communal play areas for children (aged up to 16) for apartments. Communal amenity space should be designed to provide multiple benefits (e.g. recreation, food growing, habitat creation, SUDS) and should be additional to external communal amenity space; and

15. In circumstances where private and communal amenity space and facilities or child play space cannot be provided on site, this should be provided as private amenity space with the remaining amount added to the communal space requirement; and, we will seek a financial contribution towards providing new or improving existing public open space or play space provision in the vicinity of the site; and

16. Maximise the use of sustainable technologies and materials; and

17. Complete a Whole Life-cycle Carbon Assessment for Major Referrable schemes for existing buildings and identify where materials can be recycled and reused.

**APH 2B:** Environmental statement

There will be a total of 3,202m2 play and playable space provided at the Project to serve the young population (i.e. age 0 to 17) [that] reside in the new homes. This will have a minor beneficial (not significant) effect on play space provision local to the Project Site.

Plot 4A/4D: shared courtyard garden.

Plot 4B: courtyard garden.

Plot 5A: courtyard and podium.

Plot 5C: courtyard garden and roof terrace.

*6. Delivery of new homes*

**35%:** ([https://www.35percent.org/posts/2021-05-04-southwark-rips-up-aylesbury-objectives](https://nam12.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.35percent.org%2Fposts%2F2021-05-04-southwark-rips-up-aylesbury-objectives&data=05%7C01%7C%7Cf71b2e5180da410fa16b08da9e85f62f%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C637996595462751855%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=ByIcTV9N0ElyeQWD8vOnJXUd1mVHltR5Cn%2ByvjDLdj4%3D&reserved=0) )

While various community facilities have been completed, the house building programme has fallen many years behind schedule. Over 2,500 new homes should have been built by now [2021], according to the AAAP’s timetable at an average rate of 221 homes per year; in fact, only 408 have been completed, giving a rate on only 40 homes per year.

These figures also take no account of the homes lost through demolition. When this is factored in, the situation is even worse. Southwark will have to build 2,750 homes just to get back to where we were, before demolition began. Southwark claim that this will be done by 2027/28, but they then must build 1,500 more homes to reach 4,200 homes and this will not be achieved until 2035.

**APH 2B:** In the Environmental Statement it states that the OPP is no longer in line with current planning policy aspiration and that an increase in the density will make better use of the land.

The delivery of new homes, including affordable homes, would have a moderate beneficial (significant) effect on meeting the policy target for new housing provision in the Borough.

The Project will also bring a long-term minor beneficial (not significant) effect to the Greater London economy by drawing additional local spend from residents of the private and shared ownership homes.

*7. Trees*

**OPP:** Green Links: Access to Burgess Park is to be emphasized by creating wider streets with larger canopy street trees and raingardens

**NSP:** Tree planting on existing roads and new roads.

**APH 2B:**

No existing Tree Preservation Orders

Current number of trees in Phase 2B: 49 -- 0 As, 14 Bs, 19 Cs and 16 Us

28 trees are proposed for removal, 12 of these are U (remove) Cat, 14 C (low) Cat and 2 B (moderate) Cat trees.

The non-U trees are being removed to facilitate the development.

The proposed removals will be mitigated by the planting of 125 new trees which will be high quality planting stock located within best practice tree planting pits. The legacy will be a more diversified tree population better suited for long term development and retention. (Tamla Trees consulting arborists report).

Interior streets: A network of tree-lined streets (including new and extended streets, Mina, Elvey and Haywood) is planned to give structure to a verdant, residential neighbourhood.

\* *[Historic England Advice Note 4’ (HEAN4)* provides advice on planning for tall buildings within the historic environment. Montague Evans states that the advice is permissive of development rather than restrictive and that Historic England positively acknowledge the role that tall buildings have to play in delivering sustainable development”.

It seeks to champion best practice planning processes and exemplar schemes to guide stakeholders towards a better outcome for the historic environment. Stakeholders, and in particular local planning authorities, will find guidance within it for the preparation of development plans and navigation of the development management process.  
[https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/tall-buildings-advice-note-4/](https://nam12.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fhistoricengland.org.uk%2Fimages-books%2Fpublications%2Ftall-buildings-advice-note-4%2F&data=05%7C01%7C%7Cf71b2e5180da410fa16b08da9e85f62f%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C637996595462751855%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=TnBOJZ%2B7sfIqRvghRwm1wADNiPNr62AnfhGcoo1GeOM%3D&reserved=0) ]