

109 Wesley Close
Harrow
Middlesex
HA2 0SD

Date: 30 October 2020

Secretary of State (HCLG)
National Planning Casework Unit
5 St Philips Place
Colmore Row
Birmingham
B3 2PW

By email only: pcu@communities.gsi.uk

Dear Sirs,

Re: Formal objection to the confirmation of The London Borough of Harrow (Grange Farm Estate Regeneration Phases 2 and 3) Compulsory Purchase Order 2020 ("the Order")

I refer to the letter of 24th September 2020 received from Harrow Council in regard to the abovementioned Order and write to formally object to the granting of the Order.

My mother, who is 77 years old, and I live at 109 Wesley Close, which is one of the properties that falls under the scope of the proposed Order. We, together with my father, who passed away last year following illness, have lived at this property since it was newly built in 1995 pursuant to an assured tenancy granted by Notting Hill Genesis Housing Association ("NHGHA") (then Paddington Churches Housing Association). The tenancy of our property is currently held solely in my mother's name by way of succession, and I am a permitted occupier.

The site of our property, which I believe was acquired by Paddington Churches in the early 90s from Harrow Council, comprises of four townhouses and six flats. The houses have their own private gardens and off-street parking while some of the flats have private and a communal garden and allocated off-street bay parking. The occupants of all four townhouses have been the same since we all moved into the newly built properties at around about the same time in 1995. As a result of this, we have built good relationships with one another and there is a strong sense of community and looking out for each other, which is sadly lacking in these current times.

Having read the Statement of Reasons enclosed with the Council's aforementioned letter, the crux of the Council's reasons for the regeneration is on the basis of improving the housing stock in South Harrow due to the dwellings on the estate having been built in the 1960s (para. 1.5). The Council states that these buildings are no longer cost effective to maintain and provide a sub-standard living accommodation to its occupants (para. 2.5). The Council anticipates that phase 3 of the regeneration, which includes the 10 units at 109-118 Wesley Close and the 10 units at 66-75 Osmond Close, both of which are owned by NHGHA, will provide 300 units for private sale and 185 units for affordable housing (para. 1.13).

Whilst the Council's Statement of Reasons arguing for the CPO is 47 pages long, comprising of some 226 paragraphs, I could only find reference to the properties owned by NHGHA at one solitary paragraph, namely 1.18. The Council argues that the CPO is essential in order to give effect to the regeneration for the purposes of improving the current standard of accommodation, "Building a Better Harrow", and "increasing the supply of housing in the borough".

Unfortunately, the salient reasons given for the regeneration of the estate do not apply to those properties owned by NHGHA. These building were all constructed with bricks and mortar in the mid-

90s and therefore fully complied with the relevant building regulations. These properties are not in any state of disrepair or lacking general maintenance. As such, it would be wholly disproportionate and a misuse of taxpayer, or any other, money to knock down properties which are approximately 25 years old and in very good condition in order to rebuild similar properties on the same land.

All aspects of the reasoning contained within the Statement of Reasons do not apply to my property and this is clearly supported by the lack of any reference or evidence therein. Quite simply, and to paraphrase, the Council wishes to knock down other properties within close proximity of the proposed regeneration, without any good reason, in order to further the regeneration agenda, even if this approach would cause great inconvenience to those residents affected.

The Council's objective to create a "lifetime neighbourhood" contradicts their intention to displace me and my neighbours when we have lived on the same street together for 25 years. Knocking down well built and building regulation compliant buildings to build new well-built building regulation compliant buildings in their place is both illogical and absurd. Requiring almost 20 social housing households currently occupying the properties owned by NHGHA to lose their properties in order for the Council to deliver 185 new units for affordable housing is senseless. Also, ironically, the Council mentions anti-social behaviour in its statement, but the anti-social behaviour only became prevalent on the estate after the Council started relocating longstanding households, only to then replace them with temporary accommodation tenants, whilst the regeneration works were delayed.

In regard to my objection, my mother is currently 77 years old and suffers from ailing health. She has high blood pressure, cholesterol, asthma, and diabetes, and in 2019, she underwent an operation to remove a cancerous growth from her lungs. This, coupled with the loss of her husband of 35 years, has left her in a fragile condition. To be frank, she probably doesn't have many years left in her and the uncertainty and disruption caused by this regeneration is having a detrimental affect on her health and wellbeing. She would potentially be 81 years old when the phase three works commence. If a CPO affecting our property is made, she would then, at the age of 81, together with me, be required to pack up nearly 30 years of our lives into boxes and relocate. This would no doubt detrimentally impact on the quality of her life and her general wellbeing and independence in the latter stages of her life. Surely, a local authority, being the operating factor in such a circumstance is not in the "public interest". The land which our property occupies only forms a very small part of the estate, thus the Council could easily carry out the regeneration without infringing on our Human Rights in respect of a right to private and family life.

While I do not oppose the regeneration or CPO to cover the Resiform properties referred to in the Order, which is because they are in a poor state of disrepair and quality, I do strongly object to any regeneration and CPO which will cause us to lose our homes. It is evident from the Statement of Reasons that all of the reasoning set out do not apply to those properties owned by NHGHA, which have not passed their "ideal useful life" and are therefore not "proving difficult and expensive for the Council to maintain" and as such a CPO should not be granted to cover those properties. By referring to the NHGHA properties within the Statement of Reasons, the Council is attempting to mislead the reader by categorising it with the Resiform properties.

For the foregoing reasons, my mother and I respectfully ask you to reject the Council's application or, at the very least, direct the Council to vary its CPO application so that it removes mine and my neighbours' properties from it. I assume that our landlord, which is a registered social landlord and registered charity, does not want to sell our properties, hence why the Council is trying to obtain the CPO.

Yours sincerely,

A black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

Manoj Rajah