

FINAL LEGAL REBUTTAL TO THE COUNCIL'S CLAIM OF HAVING CONSIDERED “*Wider Evidence Available Regarding My Occupancy and Residence Arrangements*”

The evidence submitted demonstrates continuous occupation, constructive occupation, dependency, vulnerability, and long-term connection to 23 Byron Terrace. The Council has already received sufficient evidence to determine succession under the Housing Act 1985. The refusal issued is invalid, procedurally defective, and issued by an officer without legal authority. I request immediate escalation to an authorised officer and issuance of a lawful decision with Section 202 rights.

EVIDENCE TABLE

Weblink 1: [01. 18-5-2026www.universal-credit.service.gov.uk.pdf](http://01.18-5-2026www.universal-credit.service.gov.uk.pdf)

The Universal Credit journal is a contemporaneous, government-recorded timeline proving my vulnerability, displacement, dependency, and long-term residence at 23 Byron Terrace. It shows repeated confirmation that all my mail goes to Byron Terrace, that I cannot manage communication independently, that my mother acts as my representative, that I experience panic and incapacity, and that my tenancy was being administratively managed due to my condition. This evidence materially affects the statutory test under the Housing Act 1985 and must be reviewed as part of the “wider evidence” the Council claims to have considered.

Weblink 1: [02 Passport Uk Residence.pdf](http://02.Passport.Uk.Residence.pdf)

My passport confirms that I was born in Enfield, that I am a British citizen, and that my identity is consistent across all evidence submitted. This document alone establishes a lifelong connection to the borough and reinforces my status as a qualifying family member under the Housing Act 1985. It is high-weight, government-verified evidence that materially affects the statutory test and must be reviewed as part of the wider evidence the Council claims to have considered.

Weblink 1 of 3: [03- 01. Parking Tickets11.pdf](http://03-01.Parking.Tickets11.pdf)

Weblink 2 of 3: [03- 02. Parking Tickets12.pdf](http://03-02.Parking.Tickets12.pdf)

Weblink 3 of 3: [03- 04. Parking Tickets14.pdf](http://03-04.Parking.Tickets14.pdf)

Weblink 4 of 3: [03. Parking Tickets13.pdf](http://03.Parking.Tickets13.pdf)

“ALL FOUR”

The parking-ticket documents issued by Enfield Council repeatedly list my name and address as **“Mr Simon Cordell, 23 Byron Terrace, Hertford Road, London, N9 7DG.”** These are official enforcement notices, receipts, and correspondence generated directly by the Council. They demonstrate continuous residence, physical presence in the borough, active administrative engagement, and long-term use of the succession address. This evidence materially affects the statutory test under the Housing Act 1985 and must be reviewed as part of the wider evidence the Council claims to have considered.

Weblink 1: [04. Kings Oak Hospital Hernia.pdf](#)

The Kings Oak Hospital documents confirm my identity, medical vulnerability, and long-term residence at 23 Byron Terrace. They show that I underwent a significant surgical procedure, required ongoing care, and relied on local Enfield medical services. My address is recorded throughout as 23 Byron Terrace, demonstrating that both the NHS and Circle Health Group recognise this as my home. This evidence materially affects the statutory test under the Housing Act 1985 and must be reviewed as part of the wider evidence the Council claims to have considered.

Weblink 1: [05. Screenshot 18-5-2026 19163 www.just-eat.co.uk.pdf](#)

The Just Eat delivery record confirms that food was delivered directly to me at 23 Byron Terrace, Hertford Road, London, N9 7DG, with the order placed late at night and paid for using my own card. This is real-world evidence of daily occupation, physical presence, and active use of the succession address. Delivery-service records are recognised as modern indicators of principal home, and this evidence materially affects the statutory test under the Housing Act 1985. It must be reviewed as part of the wider evidence the Council claims to have considered.

Weblink 1: [06. Giff Gaff Binder1.pdf](#)

The GiffGaff account records confirm my identity, billing address, financial activity, and long-term residence at 23 Byron Terrace. My name, phone number, and payment history are all registered to this address, and my billing card is tied to the same location. The account also shows dependency on my mother for managing digital and administrative tasks, reinforcing vulnerability and household integration. This evidence materially affects the statutory test under the Housing Act 1985 and must be reviewed as part of the wider evidence the Council claims to have considered.

Weblink 1 of 7: [07- 11. - re wired@ymail.com - Yahoo Mail.pdf](#)

Weblink 2 of 7: [07- 01. 10-08-2018-LBE v Simon Cordell-E00ED049 amended Order 09082018.pdf](#)

Weblink 3 of 7: [07- 02. Edmonton Lower Court Order Correspondence .pdf](#)

Weblink 4 of 7: [07- 03. LBE v Simon Cordell-E00ED049 Amended Order.pdf](#)

Weblink 5 of 7: [07- 04. LBE v Simon Cordell-E00ED049 Amended Order.pdf](#)

Weblink 6 of 7: [07- 09. Seal-Court-Order-09-08-2018-got-on-the-06-12-2018.pdf](#)

Weblink 7 of 7: [07- 10. 11.22.2018 RE For the attention of District Judge Dias E00.pdf](#)

COUNCIL MANIPULATION OF A SEALED COURT ORDER

The Edmonton County Court orders, and correspondence confirm my vulnerability, displacement, dependency, and long-term tenancy involvement. They show that I required a two-bedroom property, that my mother acted as my support and representative throughout this period, and that she continued to provide me with safe accommodation and essential care. They also confirm that my absence from Burncroft was involuntary and legally recognised.

Critically, these documents reveal that the Council interfered with a County Court order in a manner that was procedurally improper, unfair, and undertaken while I was

clinically vulnerable. The amended orders, the correspondence addressed to District Judge Dias, and the sealed order dated 09/08/2018 demonstrate that the Council altered the wording of the order, bypassed the correct legal procedure, and submitted their version to the court behind the defending party's back. This resulted in the order being sealed without my knowledge, without my understanding to challenge it, and without the involvement or approval of my legal representative or my mother, who was acting on my behalf.

This conduct prevented the implementation of the court's intention to protect me through rehousing, and instead left me unhoused, unsupported, and exposed to ongoing danger. The sealed order carries judicial authority; any alteration, avoidance, or manipulation of its terms constitutes a serious procedural failure and raises significant concerns about the Council's compliance with judicial directions. This evidence materially affects the statutory test under the Housing Act 1985 and must be reviewed as part of the wider evidence the Council claims to have considered. It also raises grave concerns about procedural fairness, safeguarding obligations, and the Council's handling of a vulnerable resident's legal protections.

Weblink 1: [08. Si Driving Licence \(1\).pdf](#)

My UK driving licence, issued by the DVLA, confirms my full legal identity and residence at 23 Byron Terrace, Hertford Road, London, N9 7DG. It is current, government-verified, and consistent with all other official records. This document provides high-weight proof of principal home, lawful residence, and long-term connection to the borough. It materially affects the statutory test under the Housing Act 1985 and must be reviewed as part of the wider evidence the Council claims to have considered.

Weblink 1: [09. Doctors Gp.pdf](#)

I have always been registered with my GP directly across the road from my home at 23 Byron Terrace. While living at this address, an administrative error led to me being deregistered without notice, even though I was fully resident there. The email confirms that I had not received any letters about this and that the NHS later acknowledged the deregistration "Should Not Have Happened."

Because of this mistake, I temporarily could not access emergency medical care for a severe hernia and had to provide proof of identity and residence—including my passport and driving licence including bills—to show that I was still living at 23 Byron Terrace and the issue was fairly addressed. This situation demonstrates my long-term residence at the succession address.

Weblink 1 of 2: [10- 01. Co - Care of Address 23 Byron Terrace.pdf](#)

Weblink 2 of 2: [10- 02. Co - Care of Address 23 Byron Terrace.pdf](#)

The Council Tax Bill for 109 Burncroft Avenue (2026/27) was issued by Enfield Council and sent directly to my care-of address at 23 Byron Terrace, Hertford Road, London, N9 7DG. This demonstrates that the Council itself formally acknowledges my residence and correspondence address at 23 Byron Terrace. Despite the bill relating to 109 Burncroft, the Council's own

records show that all official mail and billing communications are directed to 23 Byron Terrace, confirming their knowledge of my long-term occupancy and care-of status.

This evidence proves that Enfield Council has been fully aware of my living arrangements and correspondence location. It materially affects the statutory test under the Housing Act 1985 and must be reviewed as part of the wider evidence the Council claims to have considered.

Weblink 1: [11- Motor-Insurance Schedule \(1\).pdf](#)

My Motor-Insurance Schedule confirms a full 12-month period of cover from 06/12/2025 at 17:35 to 05/12/2026 at 23:59, registered at my home address of 23 Byron Terrace, Hertford Road, London, N9 7DG. This establishes continuous residence at the succession address throughout the entire policy year. As insurance is a regulated financial product that requires a true and verified residential address, this document provides high-weight proof that I was living at 23 Byron Terrace for the whole of the 2025–2026 policy year.

As of today, the policy has already covered approximately eight months of verified residence at 23 Byron Terrace (from 06/12/2025 to 09/07/2026). Importantly, this includes the period before my mother's death on 04/04/2026, demonstrating that I was already living at 23 Byron Terrace months prior to her passing and remained there afterwards. This evidence directly contradicts the Council's claim that I was not residing at the property and must be reviewed as part of the wider material the Council asserts it considered under the Housing Act 1985.

In addition to the documentary evidence, the police attended 23 Byron Terrace and physically found me living inside the property. Their body-worn footage records my presence in the home at the time of attendance. Following this, the officers issued me with a bail letter stating that I “cannot go back” to 23 Byron Terrace. This restriction was only applied because the police themselves recognised that my intention was to continue living at the address. The police attendance, the body-worn video, and the bail letter together provide independent confirmation that 23 Byron Terrace was my residence at the relevant time.

If any further evidence is required, I am fully able to provide it upon request. Thank you for taking the time to review my succession application and the supporting material I have submitted.

Kind Regards Mr. Simon Paul Cordell

