



Jules Pipe, Deputy Mayor, Planning, Regeneration
and the Fire Service

(via email)

27 August 2025

Dear Jules,

Lesnes Estate, Planning Ref. 21/01948/OUTEA

I am hoping to get some more insight into the decision the Mayor has made to approve the Lesnes Estate planning application (21/01948/OUTEA), with reference to the Stage 2 report.

I am not convinced a number of the conclusions reached by the report are adequately substantiated, nor take into account the extensive and detailed concerns raised by me, a number of residents, or former Assembly Member Siân Berry.

1. **Consideration of alternative options.** The stage 2 report nonetheless (p.10) concludes that “the applicant has demonstrated that alternatives to demolition have been fully explored”, but it is not clear how this has been adequately demonstrated (especially given that an architecture firm and retrofit assessor presented a plan to completely retrofit the estate between stages 1 and 2).

Could you confirm how this conclusion was reached?

2. **Equalities Impact Assessment.** As far as I am aware, there is not a published, up to date Equalities Impact Assessment for this proposal. The stage 2 report (p.12) states, “that it is not considered that the proposals would result in discrimination”. But then goes on to say, “GLA officers recognise that some adverse effects would be felt by some protected characteristic groups, but these have been mitigated, and the permanent impacts associated with the proposal are positive.”

Could you confirm how this conclusion was reached? Could you share the Equalities Impact Assessment? And could you confirm what mitigation measures are being referred to here?

3. **Full and transparent consultation.** We have heard repeatedly from residents that engagement with community has been incredibly poor throughout. This is, of course, anecdotal – but worthy of looking into further. But the stage 2 report (p.11) states that “the Statement of Community Involvement demonstrates that full and transparent consultation has occurred.” It goes onto state that “Peabody has also advised that it has continued to consult and engage with residents on the regeneration over the last five years.”

What scrutiny did the GLA conduct on the Statement of Community Involvement, in line with the expectations set out in the Good Practice Guide (for “transparent”, “extensive”, “responsive” and “meaningful” engagement)? What evidence did Peabody provide of the ongoing engagement over the past five years, and how did you come to the conclusion their consultation met each of these expectations?

4. In 2020, Peabody’s question to residents in the ballot was “Are you in favour of Peabody’s proposal to include Lesnes Estate in their regeneration plans for South Thamesmead?”. Nowhere in the landlord document was “demolition” used. This is not transparent or honest. Understandably, many residents have raised that they did not know they were voting for the demolition of their homes, especially considering the reported paucity of engagement by Peabody in the build-up. This is not acknowledged in your Stage 2 report, which concludes that “the engagement approach generally accords with the key principles set out in the Mayor’s GPGER.”

Could you confirm how you came to this conclusion, with regards to the ballot?

Kind regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Zoë Garbett". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Zoë Garbett
Green Party Member of the London Assembly