

MAYOR OF LONDON

Zoë Garbett

C/o Joseph.Goodman@london.gov.uk

Our ref: DMPR 2025-013

Date: 22 October 2025

Dear Zoë

Thank you for your correspondence dated 27 August 2025 regarding the planning application at Lesnes Estate and Coralline Walk, Bexley, for the demolition of existing structures and the phased redevelopment of the site to provide for up to 1,950 residential units and up to 3,225 sq.m. of non-residential floorspace (GLA refs: 2021/0692/S1 and 2021/0853/S2, and LPA ref: 21/01948/OUTEA). My apologies for the delay in responding.

As you are aware, Bexley Council initially consulted the Mayor of London on the planning application on 16 June 2021. On 10 August 2021, he considered a report (link [here](#)¹) prepared by GLA Planning officers on the proposal. The report advised the Council that the application did not yet fully comply with the London Plan for the reasons set out in paragraph 216 of the report but that the possible remedies set out in the same paragraph could address these issues.

On 13 October 2022 Bexley Council decided that it was minded to grant permission for the application subject to planning conditions and conclusion of a Section 106 agreement. On 16 June 2025, the Mayor having now considered a report on the case (GLA ref: 2021/0853/S2 (link [here](#))²), advised Bexley Council that the Mayor was content for the Council to determine the case itself, subject to any action that the Secretary of State may take.

With regards to the points raised in your letter:

1. Consideration of alternative options

The consideration of alternative options is addressed in detail in the Stage 1 report between paragraphs 29-31, and is summarised in Paragraph 38 of the Stage 2 report. As highlighted in the Stage 1 report, Peabody explored several options including retaining and repairing existing homes; undertaking refurbishment works and environmental improvements; and replacing existing homes with new ones. This has included consideration of - the condition of the stock and the public realm; works needed to address housing and public realm issues; the potential for densification, based on connectivity and townscape character; existing residents' rehousing needs and how they might be accommodated; the feasibility and viability of refurbishment/redevelopment plans; and the presence and spatial distribution of third party owners. Peabody's investigations concluded that refurbishment was not a feasible option for a number of reasons, including:

- a) The design and precast concrete construction of the existing housing makes the stock more susceptible to damp, condensation and mould growth than traditionally constructed dwellings;
- b) The homes have poor energy performance, with many in the bottom 10%, when compared to all other Housing Association dwellings in England;

¹ <https://glaplanningapps.commonplace.is/planningapps/21-01948-OUTEA>

² <https://glaplanningapps.commonplace.is/planningapps/21-01948-OUTEA>

MAYOR OF LONDON

- c) The existing housing is not financially sustainable to maintain due to the above issues, and the net present value of these homes is within the lowest 10% of all Peabody managed general needs stock; and
- d) The proximity to the Housing Zone development makes Wolvercote Road an intuitive extension of the new development and provides well timed rehousing opportunities for existing Wolvercote Road residents who want to stay living in the area.

While the plans submitted by the architecture firm and retrofit assessor, summarised at Stage 2 at Paragraph 29, were considered at Stage 2, GLA Officers had accepted that the applicant had demonstrated that alternatives to demolition had been fully explored at Stage 1 given the above summarised considerations presented by the applicant team.

2. Equalities Impact Assessment

The equalities impact assessment (EqIA) as prepared by WSP on behalf of the applicant following review of the residents ballot, decant strategy and residential allocation; construction phases; and masterplan designs and proposed operation of the scheme.

The EqIA was requested by GLA Officers, as set out in paragraph 56 of the Stage 1 report, and is available on the Bexley Council webpage for this application (LPA ref: 21/01948/OUTEA), dated 27 October 2021, linked [here](#)³. The assessment is also appended to this letter for your reference. As you have noted, at paragraph 74 of the Stage 2 report, GLA officers recognised 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.

The impacts and mitigation measures are included in detail in WSP's EqIA. In summary, the key potential impacts on protected groups could arise from disruption/stress due the need to move home, construction impacts, and the more limited car parking in the new development. The mitigations for these impacts are, in summary:

- The offer proposed by Peabody for the re-financing of homes and the decant of the residential community (which includes options to move to the redeveloped site in the same neighbourhood, however residents can opt for another Peabody property or request support to purchase a new house elsewhere in the UK);
- The inclusion of accessible adaptable homes, and disabled car-parking spaces within the development;
- Health benefits of low car neighbourhoods (including through the use of active transport and reduced emissions impacting air quality);
- The decant strategy will mean that neighbours who currently live near each other will be moved into new properties together at the same time;
- Compensation payments will also be offered which will more than meet the costs associated with professional moving services;
- Residents will be kept updated of the progress of the phases of moving to the new properties, along with being given a two-week period to move home, with support from Peabody for the costs and the organisation of this move. Where this has been identified as being potentially stressful for some residents, there are provisions to ensure that if needed, there is additional flexibility over this timeframe.

³ <https://pa.bexley.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QUJ3DGBE00400>

MAYOR OF LONDON

- Impacts during the construction period will be mitigated through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Construction Logistics Plan and any upcoming alterations to the street network will be communicated to residents ahead of time, with suggested alternatives proposed where relevant and required.
- Delivery of reprovided and new affordable homes in a tenure blind development.

3. Full and transparent consultation

The Stage 1 report between paragraphs 46 and 53 addresses the requirement set through the Mayor's Good Practice Guide for Estate Regeneration (GPGER) for full and transparent consultation and meaningful ongoing involvement with estate residents throughout the regeneration process to ensure resident support.

As highlighted in the Stage 1 report, the applicant's statement of community involvement provides a record of the pre-application public consultation that was carried out between January 2019 and January 2021.

Before progressing to Stage 2 in June 2025, GLA Officers requested an update from Peabody in respect of the resident consultation carried out related to the proposals given the length of time that had passed since the Stage 1 report. Peabody advised that whilst the resident ballot and pre-planning engagement had been completed at this stage, they had continued to engage with residents and to make themselves available to affected residents such as through 1:1 meetings. GLA officers were satisfied that full consultation had taken place with respect to the requirements of the GPGER.

4. GLA Ballot

While considerations around residents ballots and funding conditions are not planning issues, GLA officers asked Peabody to address the representations received by both the Council and GLA in the residents ballot, prior to reporting the case at Stage 2. Peabody confirmed that while the ballot document didn't use the word 'demolition', it mentioned moving to new homes. Peabody provided the following sentences from the ballot document to demonstrate this:

- "providing new homes for you"
- "if there is a 'yes' vote we will be able to provide new high-quality homes for existing residents"
- "we're already building new homes in South Thamesmead and if there is a majority 'yes' vote you will have the opportunity to move into one of these".
- "you will move to a new home which meets your housing needs".
- "we want to keep the community together which is why we're providing new homes for you in South Thamesmead".
- "we will make moving to your new home as easy as possible".
- "if you are an existing Peabody resident on either an assured or secure tenancy you'll be offered a new home in South Thamesmead".
- "if you are an existing homeowner and you live in your home (it's your main residence) you will be able to buy one of the new homes we're building in South Thamesmead...alternatively you may choose to buy a new home elsewhere".
- "you will move into your new home as soon as it's available"

GLA officers accepted the basis of this reasoning and confirmed at Stage 2 that the engagement approach followed was in line with the key principles set out in the Mayor's GPGER.

MAYOR OF LONDON

I trust this response addresses the concerns raised in your letter.

Kind Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jules Pipe". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line underneath the name.

Jules Pipe CBE,
Deputy Mayor for Planning and Regeneration