

Re: Re-sending as a New Thread

From: Rewired Rewired (re_wired@ymail.com)

To: georgina.solan@enfield.gov.uk

Date: Saturday, 27 June 2026 at 03:09 BST

Subject: Statutory Review Request – Unlawful Succession Refusal (23 Byron Terrace)

Dear Georgina, Dear Housing Management Team,

I am writing to formally request a **Statutory Review** of the refusal decision issued regarding my succession application for **23 Byron Terrace**.

After reviewing the **Housing Act 1985 (Part IV, Succession on Death of Tenant)** and the **Enfield Council's Tenancy Agreement, (3.11 Right to Succeed)** as well as the information provided in your refusal email, it is clear that the decision is **not compliant with the statutory criteria** and must be reconsidered.

I set out the relevant facts and legal points below.

1. The refusal reason is not a lawful ground under the Housing Act 1985

Your email states that my succession was refused because:

“You already have your own tenancy at 109 Burncroft Avenue.”

However, the Housing Act 1985 does **not** list “holding another tenancy” as a disqualification for succession.

The Act requires only that the successor:

- 1) **Occupied The Dwelling as Their Only or Principal Home at The Time Of Death,**
- 2) **Lived With the Tenant for the 12 Months Prior, And**
- 3) **Is A Qualifying Family Member.**

I meet all of these statutory requirements.

There is **no provision** in Sections 87–89 that allows a council to refuse succession because the applicant holds another tenancy elsewhere.

2. 109 Burncroft cannot be treated as my “principal home” under the Act

The Housing Act focuses on **actual occupation**, not the existence of another tenancy.

109 Burncroft was **not** my principal home because:

- 1) **It Is Medically Unsuitable (Confirmed by the 2018 Court Proceedings).**
- 2) **I Was Legally Prevented from Entering Due To Bail/Tag Restrictions.**
- 3) **The Court Ordered the Council to Process a Housing Management Transfer.**
- 4) **My Mother Provided the Support I Required At 23 Byron Terrace.**
- 5) **I Was Displaced From 109 Through No Choice of My Own.**
- 6) **I Have Never Abandoned the Tenancy; I Was Prevented from Occupying It.**

A tenancy that is **unsafe, unsuitable, and impossible to occupy** cannot be treated as a “principal home” for succession purposes.

3. Why I cannot return to 109 Burncroft or live there alone

Returning to 109 is **not possible, not safe, and not lawful** because:

- 1) The Property Is Medically Unsuitable for My Disability-Related Needs.
- 2) The Court Recognised Safety Concerns and Ordered a Transfer.
- 3) Bail/Tag Restrictions Legally Prevent Me from Entering the Property.
- 4) I Cannot Live Alone Due To Disability-Related Support Needs.
- 5) My Mother Provided Essential Support At 23 Byron Terrace.
- 6) The Council Failed to Provide the Required Two-Bedroom Replacement.

For these reasons, 109 cannot be considered a viable or lawful residence.

4. My legal right to remain at 23 Byron Terrace

Under the Housing Act 1985, a qualifying successor has the right to remain in the property **until a lawful decision is made**.

Your refusal email does not constitute a lawful decision because:

- 1) It Is Not a Formal Decision Letter.
- 2) It Does Not Include the Legal Basis.
- 3) It Does Not Include Evidence.
- 4) It Does Not Include Review Rights.
- 5) It Does Not Include Signatures or Authorisation.
- 6) It Does Not Include an Equality Act Assessment.
- 7) It Does Not Include a Safeguarding Assessment.

I request written confirmation of my legal right to remain in 23 Byron Terrace during the statutory review.

5. I am the only legally qualifying successor under Section 89(7).

Section 89(7) applies only when more than one person qualifies.

In this case:

- 1) I Am the **Only** Person Who Lived with The Tenant.
- 2) I Am the **Only** Person Who Meets The 12-Month Rule.
- 3) I Am the **Only** Person with Evidence of Residency.
- 4) My Sister Does Not Qualify Under the Act.

Therefore, under Section 89(7), the council **must** treat me as the successor.

6. Equality Act 2010 and Care Act 2014 duties were not considered

The refusal does not address:

- 1) My Disability,
- 2) My Support Needs,
- 3) My Dependency on My Mother,
- 4) The Council's Duty to Make Reasonable Adjustments,
- 5) Safeguarding Concerns,
- 6) The Risk of Harm If Displaced.

This is a breach of statutory duties.

7. Request for full disclosure of decision-making records

To ensure the statutory review is conducted lawfully, I request **full disclosure** of the following:

- A. The name, job title, and department of the officer who reviewed my application.**
- B. The name, job title, and department of the manager who approved the refusal.**
- C. A signed copy of the refusal decision.**
- D. The internal notes used to reach the decision.**
- E. The evidence relied upon to justify the refusal.**
- F. The policy or legal guidance used to support the refusal.**
- G. Any safeguarding assessment carried out.**
- H. Any Equality Act reasonable adjustments assessment carried out.**
- I. Confirmation of whether any other succession applications were submitted.**
- J. Confirmation of whether those applicants meet the statutory criteria.**

This information is required for a lawful statutory review and for transparency under housing law.

8. Summary

The refusal reason given ("you already have a tenancy") is:

- Not Supported by The Housing Act,
- Not Supported by Enfield's Tenancy Agreement,
- Not Supported by Case Law,
- Contradicted By The 2018 Court Order,
- Contradicted By My Evidence of Residency,
- Procedurally Unlawful,
- And Must Be Reviewed.

I respectfully request written confirmation that the statutory review has now commenced.

Based on the Housing Act 1985, the 2018 court order, and Enfield Council's own policies, I further request that the refusal be reconsidered and overturned as part of this review.

Kind regards,

Mr. Simon Paul Cordell

23 Byron Terrace Edmonton, London N9 7DG

On Friday, 26 June 2026 at 12:17:54 BST, Georgina Solan <georgina.solan@enfield.gov.uk> wrote:

Hi Simon

I have re-sent the email to you. For ease, I have also copied and pasted it in bold below:

Hi Simon

Thank you for your email. A decision has now been made.

Your succession application has been reviewed by management and has been denied as you do not fulfil the criteria for succession due to having your own tenancy at 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, EN3 7JQ.

This means that you have no legal right of occupation of 23 Byron Terrace.

I cannot comment on any actions taken by the police.

I cannot comment on any disputes between yourself and any of your family members.

The above information would be shared with the police upon request.

Kind regards

Georgina Solan
Resident Relationship Officer
Housing & Regeneration
Enfield Council
Edmonton Centre
36-44 South Mall, Edmonton Green, N9 0TN
Tel: 0204 534 2653

Georgina.Solan@enfield.gov.uk

Protect the Environment – Think Before You Print.

"Enfield Council is committed to serving the whole borough, fairly, delivering excellent services and building strong communities."

From: Georgina Solan
Sent: Friday, June 26, 2026 12:16 PM
To: Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com>
Subject: FW: Re-sending as a New Thread

Hi Simon
Please see my previous email below

Kind regards

Georgina Solan

Resident Relationship Officer
Housing & Regeneration
Enfield Council
Edmonton Centre
36-44 South Mall, Edmonton Green, N9 0TN
Tel: 0204 534 2653

Georgina.Solan@enfield.gov.uk

Protect the Environment – Think Before You Print.

"Enfield Council is committed to serving the whole borough, fairly, delivering excellent services and building strong communities."

From: Georgina Solan
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 1:57 PM
To: Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com>
Subject: RE: Re-sending as a New Thread

Hi Simon

Thank you for your email. A decision has now been made.

Your succession application has been reviewed by management and has been denied as you do not fulfil the criteria for succession due to having your own tenancy at 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, EN3 7JQ.

This means that you have no legal right of occupation of 23 Byron Terrace.

I cannot comment on any actions taken by the police.

I cannot comment on any disputes between yourself and any of your family members.

The above information would be shared with the police upon request.

Thank you.

Kind regards

Georgina Solan
Resident Relationship Officer
Housing & Regeneration
Enfield Council
Edmonton Centre
36-44 South Mall, Edmonton Green, N9 0TN
Tel: 0204 534 2653

Georgina.Solan@enfield.gov.uk

Protect the Environment – Think Before You Print.

"Enfield Council is committed to serving the whole borough, fairly, delivering excellent services and building strong communities."

From: Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 1:06 PM
To: Georgina Solan <Georgina.Solan@Enfield.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Re-sending as a New Thread

Subject: Urgent: Immediate Written Confirmation Required Regarding My Lawful Right to Remain at 23 Byron Terrace

Dear Georgina

I am requesting **immediate written confirmation** of my lawful right to remain in occupation at **23 Byron Terrace** while my succession application is being processed.

A previous Housing email to the police, which simply stated that my name is not on the tenancy, has been **misinterpreted** by officers as meaning that I have **no right to be inside the property**. This interpretation is **incorrect**, has caused significant harm, and is not supported by the Housing Act 1985.

To avoid further misunderstanding, I need Housing to clarify the legal position **without delay**.

Background and Legal Position

- I am my late mother's **eldest son** and have **never fully moved out** of the property due to long-term disabilities and dependency.
- I have been a **permanent member of the household**, and 23 Byron Terrace has remained my only stable base.
- I contacted the relevant departments regarding succession immediately after my mother's passing and have since **completed and submitted the formal succession application**.
- Under the **Housing Act 1985 (Sections 87–89)**, a qualifying family member residing with the tenant at the time of death has the **right to remain in occupation until a formal succession decision is made**.

Evidence Regarding My Sister's Non-Residency

My sister, who has raised a dispute with the police, **was not living at the property** at the time of my mother's death or at any point before her recent return from holiday. Her claim of residency is contradicted by clear evidence:

- She has her **own flat**, where she was living before she travelled.
- I provided police with evidence of her residence at her own address before she left the country.
- While abroad, she sent threats to me and to my friends, stating she would "set me up" on her return.
- Upon returning from holiday, she went to **her own flat first** and dropped off her belongings there.
- She then arrived at 23 Byron Terrace with **no suitcase, no clothes, and no personal belongings**, which is visible on police body-worn cameras.
- The rooms at 23 Byron Terrace show **no signs of her occupation**:
 - The bed in my mother's room remains on its side where I left it while cleaning.
 - The bed in my former room remains dismantled.
 - No one has been sleeping in the front room; friends have checked and confirmed this.

These facts demonstrate that she was **not resident** at the address and therefore her claims do not affect my legal position or my right to remain.

Police Involvement

This is a **civil housing matter**, and the police have no authority to determine succession or occupation rights. Their current position appears to be based on:

- a misunderstanding of Housing's earlier email, and
- my sister's inaccurate statements.

The officers involved have stated that they will be contacting Housing for clarification. I therefore require **urgent written confirmation** from you so that I can provide it directly to them.

My Requests (Strengthened and Legally Precise)

I respectfully request that Housing confirm **in writing**, as a matter of urgency:

1. That I am lawfully entitled to remain in occupation at 23 Byron Terrace while my succession application is under consideration, in accordance with the Housing Act 1985.
2. That the earlier email to the police should not be interpreted as meaning I have "no right to be inside the property", and that such an interpretation is incorrect.
3. That this matter is governed solely by Housing legislation and not by police powers, and that the police cannot determine or restrict my occupation rights.
4. That my sister's dispute and her claim of residency do not alter my legal standing, do not constitute evidence of occupation, and do not affect my right to remain in the property.
5. That Housing will provide clear written clarification to the police if requested, to prevent further misunderstanding or unlawful exclusion.

Thank you for your assistance. Given the current circumstances and the involvement of the police, I would appreciate your **prompt written confirmation**.

Kind regards,
Simon Cordell
Care-of: 23 Byron Terrace
Enfield

On Tuesday, 16 June 2026 at 12:46:39 BST, Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com> wrote:

Message: Hello, I thought it would be best to resend this message as a new thread. Please find the document attached again for your review.

Kind regards,
Mr. Simon Paul Cordell



[Follow us on Facebook](#)

[Twitter](#)

www.enfield.gov.uk

Enfield Council is committed to serving the whole borough fairly, delivering excellent services and building strong communities. Opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual and not necessarily those of the London Borough of Enfield. This email and any attachments or files transmitted with it are strictly confidential and intended solely for the named addressee. It may contain privileged and confidential information and if you are not the intended recipient and receive it in error you must not copy, distribute or use the communication in any other way. All traffic handled by the Government Connect Secure Extranet may be subject to recording/and or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

This email has been scanned for viruses but we cannot guarantee that it will be free of viruses or malware. The recipient should perform their own virus checks.