Planning Inspectorate

Compulsory Purchase Order Decision

Site visit made on 28 August 2026

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

Decision date: 1st October 2026

Order Ref: APP/PCU/CPOH/Q5300/3377197

Joyce and Snell's Estate, Edmonton, London N18 1XT

- The Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) was made under section 17 of the Housing Act 1985 and the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 by the London Borough of Haringey Council on 8 August 2023.
- The purpose of acquisition is demolish the property to facilitate regeneration of the area.
- The main grounds of objection are that the owner/leaseholder disputes that the necessary procedures have been followed, there is a lack of necessity in the public interest, there would be a disproportionate impact on her Human Rights, negotiations have not been undertaken properly and that there is uncertainty over the delivery of the redevelopment.
- There is 1 remaining objection.

Decision

1. The London Borough of Enfield (Joyce and Snell's Estate Regeneration) Compulsory Purchase Order No1 2025 is confirmed.

Legal framework

2. As set out above, the power to acquire land and buildings under the provisions of the Housing Act 1985 is granted for the specific purpose of providing housing. The 1985 Act does not authorise compulsory acquisition for any other purposes.

3. In exercising the powers conferred by the Act, the acquiring and confirming authorities are required to have regard to the relevant government Guidance. In this case the applicable Guidance is the 'Guidance on the Compulsory Purchase Process', published by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government in 2025 (the Guidance).

4. In all cases, compulsory acquisition will involve an infringement of the lawful owner's right to the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions, under Article 1 of the First Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights, which was incorporated into UK law by the Human Rights Act 1998. Because of this, the Guidance makes it clear that the use of compulsory powers should only be used as a last resort and will only be justified where there is a compelling case in the public interest.

The Order Lands, surroundings and background

5. The Order Land, Wadham House, as shown on the Order Map, is located on the Joyce and Snell's Estate and is in the ward of Upper Edmonton in the London

Borough of Enfield. The Estate is approximately 1 kilometre from Edmonton town centre and sits on the southern boundary of the borough with the London Borough of Haringey.

6. The Estate is bounded by the railway on the western edge, with North Middlesex University Hospital located on the other side of this. Fore Street bounds the eastern edge of the Estate leading to Tottenham High Road. Within close proximity to the north is the North Circular (A406) and to the south sits light industrial uses and housing.

7. The Order Land comprises Wadham House which includes 45 individual properties made up of 5 x 1-bedroom flats and 40 x 2-bedroom maisonettes over 5 storeys. As is the case with other blocks on the Estate, Wadham House appears very dated and is in a poor physical state.

8. The Council owns the freehold of the Order Land and originally sold the leasehold of 25 properties under Right to Buy legislation. Since 2022, the Council has bought back 10 of the leasehold properties that it sold. The Council is yet to acquire the properties of 15 leaseholders, of which, 5 are resident leaseholders, 8 are non-resident leaseholders and 2 are owned by Housing Gateway Ltd ('HGL') which is a company wholly owned by the Council.

9. The 8 non-resident and the 2 HGL leasehold owned properties are let out on Assured Shorthold Tenancies ('ASTs'). Also, 2 properties are subject to a headlease arrangement with Atlantic Lodge (Housing) Limited ('Atlantic') and are sub-let out to tenants on ASTs (the 'Headlease ASTs'). Following a rehousing process, only 13 secure Council tenants remain in occupation in Wadham House.

10. The Council has been using 14 of the properties which have been acquired from leaseholders or have been vacated by Council secure tenants for temporary accommodation (TA) on licence agreements which can be terminated on serving notice.

11. Full details of the interests to be acquired are listed in the Schedule annexed to the Order (Document 1) and the block is shown edged red on the map accompanying the Order (the Order Map). The outstanding interests within Wadham House are included within the Order.

12. The 13 remaining Council secure tenants, 2 HGL AST tenants, 2 Atlantic headlease AST tenants and the TA tenants in occupation at Wadham House are included within the Order. Although the Council expects to secure vacant possession of these properties through the statutory process, they are included within the Order to provide certainty on timescales for the Order and ultimately in obtaining vacant possession of the building if necessary.

The case for the Council

13. In order to accurately represent the submissions, I have taken much of the summary of this case from the documentation submitted by the Council, largely unaltered.

14. Wadham House, which comprises the Order Land, is very dated with poor levels of insulation, security and amenity. Whilst the Council ensures it meets its obligations under the Decent Homes standard in respect of secure tenants, the block will not meet Decent Homes standards over the long term and the

costs of refurbishment to give a 30-year life are prohibitive. As such, a decision has been made that the demolition and reprovision of homes on the Order Land and adjacent land will provide the best value for money and result in the most effective quantitative and qualitative housing gain.

15. There is a significant need for new homes in the Borough and in addition, affordable housing is in very short supply in the borough with 7,190 people (as of 31 st January 2025) on the Council's local housing register seeking to rent a home from the Council or registered provider. Of all the applicants on the register 2,477 were homeless households in temporary accommodation. In this context, it is important that the Council utilises any opportunity to provide a qualitative and qualitative social housing gain.

16. The Council undertook a consultation exercise in relation to redevelopment of the Estate. This secured a turn out rate of 85% and 78.8% of eligible residents voted in favour of the Estate masterplan which includes the demolition of Wadham House and the provision of replacement and additional new homes on the Order Land and adjacent site.

17. The delivery of the CPO Scheme is critical in unlocking the delivery of the Estate masterplan as it will provide 270 affordable homes to facilitate the decanting of residents of other blocks on the Estate required for future development phases. The delivery of the masterplan will bring a substantial qualitative and quantitative housing gain, alongside wider benefits including the creation of over 5,000 jobs, new open space, 2,735 sqm of new community and civic space, 2,981 sqm of new retail/commercial space and 793 sqm of workspace.

18. A hybrid planning application for the Estate masterplan was submitted by the Council in April 2024 and successfully received resolution to grant on 16th July 2024. The Decision Notice was issued on 2nd May 2025. As such, permission is in place for development comprised in the proposed CPO Scheme. The permission is not subject to any unusual or onerous planning conditions.

19. In relation to The London Plan Policy H1 the Council has previously failed to deliver sufficient housing and the approved scheme for the wider estate will help to achieve this much needed policy aim.

20. Policy H8 of the London Plan governs the approach to estate regeneration which is broadly supported subject to guidance within the Mayor's Good Practice Guide to Estate Regeneration and meeting other relevant London Plan policies. Where a development scheme proposes the demolition of an existing estate London Plan Policy H8 requires that alternatives to demolition have first been considered. Residents were originally consulted on redevelopment proposals for the Estate in 2017 with options such as infill development, partial redevelopment and 'do nothing' considered. This consultation revealed that a majority of residents wanted a fresh start for the Estate and did not support partial measures to improve the Estate. The consultations with residents and the ballot outcome confirmed a high level of support for the Estate masterplan which includes the CPO Scheme i.e., the demolition of Wadham House and the provision of replacement and additional new homes on the Order Land and adjacent site.

21. London Plan Policy H10 requires developments to secure a range of unit sizes. The CPO Scheme comprises a range of units sizes including 1, 2 and 3 bed

flats, 3 and 4 bed maisonettes and 5 bed houses. The approved redevelopment scheme would comply with London Plan Policy D6 requires any new dwellings to meet specified internal space standards. Policy D6 also includes a requirement to maximise dual aspect dwellings and ensuring the provision of sufficient daylight and sunlight to new dwellings.

22. In relation to the Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010 -2025) (Core Strategy) and Development Management Document (2014) (DMD) the Core Strategy sets out a vision involving regeneration of areas including the Estate. The vision sets out that physical, social, and economic regeneration of Edmonton, and specifically Angel Edmonton (where the Order Land is located), will be continued and supported to reinvigorate this town centre and address spatial and social inequalities.

23. DMD Policy 4 sets out that development involving the loss of existing residential homes will only be permitted if there is no net loss of residential floorspace overall and requires that in all cases, development must provide new homes of a higher quality and design standard as part of a scheme which improves the wider external environment. Additionally, this policy supports managed programmes of housing investment including the Council's own Estate Renewal Strategy and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Business Plan both of which include the delivery of the Estate Masterplan. The Estate masterplan including the CPO Scheme's compliance and fit with the Core Strategy and the DMD has been assessed and confirmed as part of the planning permission grated in May 2025.

24. The Enfield Draft Local Plan (2019 -2039) is yet to be adopted but the redevelopment of the Estate will help to achieve the aims of housing renewal and enhancement of the residential quality and quantity with an appropriate location in the Borough.

25. The vision of the Enfield Housing and Growth Strategy 2025 -2030 is to shape the future of housing in Enfield for current and future generations by working in partnership and bringing in long-term investment. The CPO Scheme supports the priorities and principles of the Housing Strategy by: providing more good quality homes that local people can afford, delivering carbon neutral and resilient homes and services, creating healthy, well-connected, digitally enabled, inclusive and well-managed neighbourhoods, allowing different people on different incomes to live together, ensuring that people live in comfort and in neighbourhoods where they can live healthy lives, allowing residents to live in inclusive and accessible homes and ensuring that new homes are delivered, and existing homes improved in line with the Council's target to be a carbon neutral council by 2030 and be a carbon neutral borough by 2040.

26. In relation to housing need, there is requirement for additional housing in the borough, with a target of over 12,460 new homes over a ten-year period (2019-2029). Affordable housing is in desperately short supply in the borough with 7,190 people (as of 31 st January 2025) on the Council's local housing register seeking to rent a home from the Council or registered provider. Of all the applicants on the register 2,477 were homeless households in temporary accommodation, including families with some living in Bed and Breakfast or hotels due to a lack of other viable options.

27. As this demonstrates, there is a significant need for additional social housing in the Borough. As such, it is essential that Wadham House is demolished, which

will make way for a quantitative and qualitative gain of 225 high-quality new homes in the Borough, all of which will be affordable.

28. In September 2022, the Council undertook a consultation exercise on a number of proposals relating to the development of phases 0 -1 of the Estate masterplan including the relocation of children's play facilities, relocation of car parking spaces, the demolition of garages (located to the rear of Wadham House) and the demolition of Wadham House.

29. The Council extended the consultation exercise beyond its requirement to include not only required to consult with secure tenants but also owners of freehold/leasehold properties on the Estate. The Council received 32 responses to the consultation of which 78% indicated that they were neutral to very happy with the proposals put forward for consultation.

30. On 15th September 2021, the Council resolved to approve the business case and funding for the delivery of phases 0 -3 of the Estate masterplan (including the demolition of Wadham House comprising the Order Land), to progress the ballot proposals including the Landlord Offer to be made to residents and a budget envelope to commence the buyback of leasehold properties within the blocks needing to be demolished to allow the construction of the new homes within phases 0 -3 of the Estate masterplan. Cabinet also noted that, if agreement cannot be reached by negotiation for all third-party interests, the Council will require CPO powers to enable it to progress.

31. The planning permission has been granted in hybrid form with details approved for phases 0-3 and outline permission for the remainder of the 11 phases. The Council considers that there is no planning impediment to the implementation of the scheme.

32. In relation to funding, in September 2021, the Council's Cabinet approved budget envelopes for the Estate masterplan regarding: £55m for buy-backs related to Phases 0-3 of the Estate masterplan, £10m for project and professional fees, estimated £449.3m for the first ten years of the capital programme against a total budget of £687.4m. The Council's latest HRA Business Plan (2025/26) includes £358.64m for the delivery of phases 0-3 of the Estate masterplan including project/wider scheme costs and contingency.

33. The Council has been awarded £59.4 of grant funding from the GLA under the Affordable Housing Programme for the delivery of phases 0-1 of the Estate masterplan. Additionally, the Council has secured £50m of grant funding from the GLA's Land Fund, £40m of which is for buybacks on the Estate (including fees and compensation) which reduces the Council's own £55m budget envelope for Phase 03 buy backs approved in September 2021 to £15m. The remaining £10m of the GLA's Land Fund allocation is to be used to fund power connection costs for the Estate masterplan including the CPO Scheme.

34. The Council is therefore satisfied that the costs of acquisition, rehousing residents and subsequent demolition of Wadham House in the Order Land and the subsequent construction of 270 homes on the Order Land and adjacent Council owned site can be met in full, from internal resources and GLA grant funding that have already been allocated for these purposes.

35. With regard to Human Rights, the Council has taken into account the impact of the Order on the Convention rights of those whose interests will be affected by

the Order generally and through an Equalities Impact Assessment. In view of the factual background to the Order as set out in this Statement, and the compelling justification for making the Order, the Council considers that the exercise of compulsory purchase powers in this case is justified because it is in the public interest, authorised by law and necessary and proportionate in order to achieve the Council's objectives of securing a quantitative and qualitative housing gain.

36. The Council states that, if the Secretary of State or Inspector confirms the Order, the compulsory acquisition of the interests in the Order Schedule will be necessary only if they have not already been acquired by agreement at a reasonable cost and within the timescales required to deliver timely demolition. As explained within the Councils main statement, efforts to acquire the relevant interests are ongoing. Further, all those whose interests are compulsorily acquired will be entitled to fair compensation.

37. The Council is therefore of the view that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the compulsory acquisition of each and every parcel of land comprised in the Order Schedule. It is also convinced that the public interest that is to be served by demolition of Wadham House to enable a quantitative and qualitative housing gain outweighs the necessary interference with the private rights and interests that exist in the Order Land.

38. The Council, therefore, believes that in making the Order it has struck a fair and proportionate balance between the interests of those whose Convention rights will be affected and the wider public interest. Overall, the Council is satisfied for the reasons set out above that the CPO can lawfully be made and that the Order is a proportionate measure to achieve the Council's objectives in the public interest.

39. The Council has undertaken an Equalities Impact Assessment which concludes that on balance, while acknowledging there will be some negative impacts experienced during the construction and relocation phases, the long-term benefits of the scheme are expected to significantly improve housing conditions and quality of life for residents with protected characteristics. The Assessment will continue to be monitored and reviewed throughout the progression of the proposals and the Council will seek to ensure that they will reduce, mitigate or even eradicate negative impacts of the Scheme.

The objection

40. The remaining objector has submitted specific objections which are concise and I have reproduced them, largely unaltered.

41. *Procedural Concerns.* The Council must comply with the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 and related statutory requirements. Any failure in serving notices, publishing the Order, or adhering to timelines renders the Order invalid.

42. *Lack of Necessity and Public Interest.* Under Section 226 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, a Compulsory Purchase Order should only be confirmed if it facilitates development, redevelopment, or improvement that is clearly in the public interest. The scheme does not clearly promote economic, social, or environmental well-being. The Council has not adequately demonstrated that acquiring this property is essential or that sufficient alternative solutions were properly considered.

43. *Disproportionate Impact and Human Rights.* This property was purchased as part of my long-term retirement plan. I intend to keep it for at least ten more years to provide financial security in retirement. No amount of compensation offered under the compulsory purchase process would enable me to acquire an equivalent property on the current market, meaning the proposed acquisition would cause irreparable financial harm and undermine my future livelihood. Compulsory acquisition is a serious interference with property rights and raises grave concerns under Article 1 of Protocol 1 of the European Convention on Human Rights, which protects peaceful enjoyment of possessions.

44. *Negotiation Issues.* Paragraph 2 of the Compulsory Purchase and Compensation Guidance (MHCLG) requires acquiring authorities to make genuine efforts to negotiate and purchase the land by agreement before resorting to compulsory powers and to cover reasonable professional costs incurred by affected landowners during negotiations. The Council has not informed me of this entitlement, nor has it demonstrated meaningful engagement, which is contrary to best practice and guidance.

45. *Uncertainty of Scheme Delivery.* Case law such as Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd v Wolverhampton City Council [2010] UKSC 20 emphasizes that a Compulsory Purchase Order should not be confirmed where there is uncertainty about the scheme's viability or funding. The Council has not provided sufficient evidence that the proposed scheme is viable, funded and ready to proceed. There is no clear timetable, details of confirmed planning permission, or assurance of secured funding. Without these guarantees, the Order is premature and fails to meet the requirements for a compelling case in the public interest. This lack of certainty undermines confidence in the scheme and reinforces that compulsory acquisition is neither necessary nor proportionate at this stage.

The Council's update and response

46. Since the making of the Order, the Council has progressed with preparations in readiness for demolition of Wadham House, securing additional vacancies, with 8 properties now void at the Order Land, plus agreement reached with a further resident leaseholder. The current remaining interests comprise: 4 resident leaseholders; 9 non-resident leasehold interests; 11 secure Council tenants (who are being rehoused); plus 9 assured shorthold tenants; and 11 temporary accommodation tenants who occupy pursuant to licence agreements.

47. The Council indicates that it will continue to engage with owners/residents and other affected parties in order to secure vacant possession and is making progress to mitigate impacts where appropriate. Whilst some parties are currently exploring moves away from the Estate, engagement from non-resident leaseholders has been more limited and continues to present the principal barrier to acquisition by agreement. The Council has included all interests within the Order to provide certainty on vacant possession, so as to provide a backstop contingency and assurance for delivery.

48. The Council adds that since the Order was made, there has been a significant progress in the programme which reinforces the need for confirmation of the Order at the earliest opportunity. The Council has entered into a main works contract with Hill Partnerships Ltd for the delivery of Blocks A and D, and acquisition of Wadham House is critical to unlocking Block D in particular. The

Council states that any delay in securing vacant possession would have a direct impact on delivery of this phase of the scheme. 220 homes are dependent upon acquisition of the Order Land and delivery of Block D. These homes are a fundamental component of the Estate's decanting strategy, providing accommodation for existing residents and so enabling subsequent phases of regeneration to come forward. Therefore, the Order is not only necessary for the delivery of Block D, but is also critical to unlocking the wider Estate Masterplan. This reinforces both the substantial public benefits of the scheme and the clear justification for confirmation of the Order at the earliest opportunity.

49. The Council confirms that appropriation of Phases 0-1 which includes the Order Land took place on 16th April 2026 following receipt of ministerial consent from the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government under Section 19(2) of the Housing Act 1985.

50. In relation to the remaining objector's statement, the Council has responded to each point, as follows. *Procedural Concerns*; the objector does not make any specific allegation of procedural defects beyond pointing out that her postcode was incorrect on initial correspondence with one digit incorrect. The Council indicates that this has been corrected and that, in any event, the objector has not been disadvantage as she was clearly aware of proceedings and has engaged in them. The Council confirms that all other procedural requirements have been complied with.

51. *Lack of Necessity and Public Interest*; the Council states that the remaining objector incorrectly refers to section 226 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and cites the legal tests associated with such. However, the enabling power for the Order, as set out in the Statement of Reasons is pursuant to Part 2, section 17 of the Housing Act 1985, in respect of housing purposes. The Council reiterates that there is a compelling case in the public interest for confirmation of the Order so that the regeneration scheme can provide, amongst other things, 270 high-quality homes to replace the 45 homes in Wadham House, thereby securing a substantial quantitative and qualitative housing gain and unlocking the wider estate masterplan, in an area where there is much need for additional homes. Furthermore, the purposes for which the Order Land is required could not reasonably be achieved by other means. Alternatives to the Order and demolition, including refurbishment, partial redevelopment and doing-nothing were assessed before proceeding with the Order and it has been concluded that the costs of refurbishing Wadham House to provide a 30-year life were prohibitive. Furthermore, that the redevelopment proposals were supported in the 2021 resident ballot, which achieved an 85.5% turnout with 78.5% of those voting in favour.

52. *Disproportionate Impact and Human Rights;* the Council states that it has treated the remaining objector fairly and has had full regard to the Human Rights Act 1998 and the Public Sector Equality Duty, as described in the Statement of Reasons. It considers that any interference with private rights is lawful and proportionate and is outweighed by the significant public benefits of the scheme. It also confirms that it will continue to adhere to measures and mitigations pursuant to its Equality Impact Assessment. Therefore, the use of compulsory purchase powers is proportionate and justified. In relation to compensation, the Council states that it does not accept the suggestion that no fair or equivalent financial package has been put forward and underlines that a

robust and transparent assessment has been undertaken, with provision in place to afford fair and reasonable compensation, in line with the Compensation Code. The Council states that it remains keen to reach voluntary agreement with the remaining objector, but maintains that concerns on compensation can be separately assessed and this should not delay confirmation of the Order. The Council concludes on this point by stating that it is willing and able to agree a fair and reasonable negotiated settlement to achieve vacant possession.

53. *Negotiation Issues;* the Council confirms that since 2022, it has been seeking to acquire interests across the Joyce and Snell's Estate by agreement, and in the remaining objector's case that engagement has included correspondence, email exchanges, calls and meetings. Furthermore, following notification of the objection, the Council set up a meeting on 16 March 2026, with a detailed follow-up letter of 31 March 2026 provided, plus the formal Offer Letter of 20 May 2026, a follow-up email of 9 June 2026 and a letter dated 25th June providing reference to the Councils Independent Tenant and Leasehold Advisors (ITLA). The Council states that promotion of a CPO in parallel with negotiations is supported by the Government's Guidance on Compulsory Purchase. An authority is not required to await the failure of that process before making an order. The Council adds that it continues to engage with affected parties so as to reach agreement, which supports the Council's case that compulsory powers are being used only where agreement has not been achieved. In relation to assistance with payment of associated fees, the Council states that her ability to recover reasonable professional costs has repeatedly been made clear. This was pointed out at the outset to all affected parties, detailing disturbance payments which could be claimed in the initial offer letter to the remaining objector on 31st January 2024, repeated in correspondence on 9th December 2025 and has been reinforced in the Council's recent correspondence comprising the Council's formal offer letter of 31 March 2026, which referred expressly to reimbursement of independent valuation costs, solicitor's fees and other reasonable transaction-related costs. The Offer Letter of 20 May 2026 then set out the same position in detail, including contributions of up to £900 for a second valuation, up to £1,800 plus VAT for legal fees on sale and purchase respectively, onward survey fees, mortgage-related fees where applicable, and SDLT.

54. *Uncertainty of Scheme Delivery*; the Council sets out a detailed response which reiterates the points contained in its Statement of Reasons and associated documents. It concludes that the development is live, fully funded, contractually committed, and supported by an implementable planning consent, with an advancing programme capable of implementation, subject only to securing vacant possession which is dependent on confirmation of the Order.

Conclusions

55. The Government's Guidance on the making and confirmation of compulsory purchase orders identifies what factors are relevant to have regard to in deciding whether or not to confirm an order. These require: that the scheme underpinning the CPO fits with planning policy and guidance, both locally and nationally; it is clear how the land would be used if the CPO was confirmed; the necessary resources are available; that there are no overriding planning impediments; would the scheme promote improvement of the economic, social

or environmental wellbeing of the area; consideration of achieving the objectives by other means.

Planning Policy

56. It is recognised in by the Council that the area is in a poor physical condition and that its layout and form means that it is in need of regeneration, being appropriate for intensification. Encouragement is given to the physical and economic regeneration of the area. The National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance seek the provision of new homes in sustainable locations such as this, where transport, jobs and services are close at hand.

57. Moreover, the proposals for the Order Lands are consistent with the aims of London and local policies for the regeneration of disadvantaged urban areas. I also find that the proposal accords with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance which promote good design which integrates with the urban form and creates an environment which is beneficial and accessible to the community and makes efficient use of resources.

Use of the Land and improvement in Economic, Social and Environment terms

58. Planning permission exists for the redevelopment and alterations on the Estate. I consider that the provision of modern homes and other facilities in a sustainable location where infrastructure is readily available would achieve the aims set out above. This will be to the long-term benefit of the area and its residents in economic, social and environmental terms. Therefore, it is clear how the Order Lands will be used.

Resources

59. The Council is in partnership with a large developer. They have demonstrated that they have the necessary financial resources to undertake the proposed redevelopment of the estate and that the scheme is financially viable. The Council has the necessary approval for its own expenditure. From the available evidence, I find that there is a good prospect of the successful implementation of the redevelopment of the site and estate.

The Planning Position

60. In the light of the foregoing, I am satisfied that the use of the Order Lands for the purposes specified would be consistent with the planning policy advice and guidance and is founded on a strategy for the urban regeneration of this Estate. The proposal would introduce buildings of a much improved and modern standard. Their design is appropriate to the character and appearance of the area. It would provide much needed additional homes of a variety of sizes and to modern standards.

61. The implementation of the proposal would remove the existing out-dated residential accommodation and remove buildings which have an out-dated design and provide new and improved buildings which would have a beneficial effect on the local area.

62. I am therefore satisfied that there are compelling material considerations which demonstrate the need and suitability of the site for the proposed regeneration.

Could the aims be achieved by other means

63. The Council has demonstrated that it has considered alternatives in relation to the provisions for housing at the Estate. It has clearly concluded that retaining the existing buildings and improving them would not be viable and would be undesirable in social and environmental terms. This view is shared by residents of the Estate, as demonstrated by responses to public consultation.

The Outstanding Objection

64. The remaining objector raises issues, as set out previously. In relation to procedural concerns, the objector does not identify any procedural defect in the Council's progression of the CPO. The single point relating to an incorrect part of the objector's post-code has not led to any prejudice in the objector engaging in making representations. Therefore, taking account of this and the Council's submissions along with its confirmation that all procedural requirements have been complied with, I am content that there has been no procedural shortfall and no prejudice to anyone with an interest in this case.

65. In relation to the necessity of the scheme and it serving the public interest, the Council has clearly demonstrated that the alternatives to demolition and redevelopment are not viable and would fail to achieve the benefits that the proposed redevelopment would bring about. These relate to the public benefits of the greater provisions of better quality homes in a much improved physical environment.

66. In relation to negotiations, the Council's submissions and associated documents clearly supports the position that the Council has undertaken a full and considered exercise in negotiations with all parties where relevant and particularly in the case of the remaining objector.

67. Regarding the delivery of the scheme, the Council's submissions provide full support for the conclusion that the scheme can be delivered. There is no foreseeable planning impediment, finance is available and secured and engagement with a major contractor is ongoing.

68. In relation to the effects on the objector's Human Rights, I am satisfied that the Council has taken account of these effects and has made an appropriate balance between interference of Human Rights and the public benefits that would arise from the CPO. The Council also states that it has had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty, as described in the Statement of Reasons. I consider that interference with private rights is lawful and proportionate and is outweighed by the significant public benefits of the scheme. The Council also indicates that that it will continue to adhere to measures and mitigations pursuant to its Equality Impact Assessment.

Other matters

69. Confirming the Order would interfere with Human Rights in relation to peaceful enjoyment of possessions, under Article 1 of the First Protocol and Article 8 as set out under the Human Rights Act 1998. However, those are qualified rights; interference with them in this instance would accord with the law and be in pursuance of a legitimate aim to seek the provisions of more and better quality homes in an improved physical environment. This aim, which is in the public interest cannot be achieved by means that are less interfering with their rights. Furthermore, the Council has stated that it intends to use any such powers (if confirmed) as a last resort.

70. I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) set out under s149 of the Equality Act 2010 and to the Council's Equality Impact Assessment. Having taken account of its aims and to the overriding benefits of the scheme for the redevelopment of the Estate I conclude that those aims would be furthered by the provision of more and better quality homes.

Conclusions

71. For the reasons set out above, there is a compelling case for the redevelopment of the Estate to provide much needed additional homes of a greatly improved quality. There is no viable alternative to such redevelopment.

72. The compulsory acquisition would be a principal step to achieve both a quantitative and a qualitative housing gain. Consequently, although the use of compulsory purchase powers should always be a last resort, in my judgement, the point has now been reached where that last resort has become the only realistic way forward, having regard also to the Council's stated intention to agree a settled outcome and only use compulsory powers as a last resort. Although the rights of the owners may be infringed, such an infringement is justified in this case, by the benefits to the wider public interest.

73. In the circumstances, I find that the case made out by the Council for the use of compulsory purchase powers is compelling.

74. For the reasons given above and having regard to all matters raised I therefore confirm the London Borough of Enfield (Joyce and Snell's Estate Regeneration) Compulsory Purchase Order No1 2025.

T Wood

INSPECTOR