4. How has the LDF performed?

This section reports on how well the LDF has been performing. The discussion is divided into the main themes of the emerging Southwark Plan and focuses on whether the plan’s objectives are being met.

4.1 Indicators

Indicators are used to give an idea of how the LDF is performing. These indicators cover a wide range of issues and have been chosen so that they cover all the objectives of the LDF. For each of the indicators a target is set for how we would like the plan to perform.

There are three different types of indicators which examine the performance of the plan from a different perspective:

- **Output Indicators**
  These tell us if our planning policies are leading to the right type of development. They are mainly based on council planning application records. The Government also requires us to report back on a set of national indicators.

- **Significant effects indicators**
  These look at whether the type of development that is occurring is having the right impacts on the community and the environment (ie. is quality of life improving as a result of the development that is occurring?). They are based on indicators used to monitor other council strategies, such as the Community Strategy and Neighbourhood Renewal. They can be both statistical or based on people’s perceptions.

- **Contextual indicators**
  These give us a picture of the social, environmental and economic circumstances within which the LDF operates, such as the ethnic makeup of the borough, population growth and economic cycles. These factors are usually outside the direct influence of the LDF but may help to explain why it has performed in a certain way. These indicators can be both statistical as well as based on people’s perceptions.

Figure 4 illustrates how these indicators work together to give us an overall picture of plan performance.

4.2 Where does the information come from?

Each year the council collects data from a range of local, regional and national sources on matters such as new housing, offices and shops, loss of open space, waste management and transport.

A lot of data comes from information on planning applications that the council receives and a survey of development completions that we carry out every year.

---

1 These are called National Core Output Indicators and are set by the Department of Communities and Local Government.
Last financial year the council received 2,061 planning applications for extensions to buildings, new buildings, changes of use as well as for variations to previous permissions. 1,817 applications were determined. Permission was granted in 1,124 of those cases.

It is important to realise that the granting of planning permission does not necessarily mean that a development will take place. Developers have up to three years to build after they receive planning permission. For this reason, it may take some time for the impacts of the emerging LDF to be known.

As well as data on developments, we also use information from other sources such as the annual Residents Survey and records that different council departments are required to keep, such as information on waste and education provision. Other information comes from national sources such as the Census.

Each of the indicators that we are proposing to use to monitor over the coming years is set out in detail in Appendix 2.

Figure 4 – Illustration of how plan performance is analysed

Local Development Framework is used to determine development

Output Indicators
Measure the type of development that the planning policies have led to
Eg. How it is designed, what type of uses, how much of it there is, where it is located, and what assessments it has undergone.

Significant Effects Indicators
Measure how development is impacting on quality of life, the economy and the environment
Eg. Are new office developments leading to more local businesses? Are more people in housing that meets their needs?
4.3 Tackling Poverty and Wealth Creation

Vision: For Southwark to be a place with a thriving and sustainable economy where local people can have the full benefits of wealth creation, with access to choice and quality in the services and employment opportunities that are available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Results</th>
<th>X not meeting target</th>
<th>✓ meeting target</th>
<th>? unclear at this stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Employment floorspace</td>
<td>Net loss of 1,331sqm</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Local services</td>
<td>1,370sqm new office space and 3,393sqm new retail space in town centres</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Arts and cultural uses</td>
<td>3,600sqm development at More London</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Business start-ups</td>
<td>52 new start-ups per 1,000 people. Slightly down on previous year. 41 deregistrations per 1,000 people, slightly up on last year.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Employment (overall)</td>
<td>64.4% employment rate in Southwark compared to 69.1% across London.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Employment (non-white)</td>
<td>Employment rate for people who are not White: 55.8%.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>New childcare places</td>
<td>367 new out of school places created and 381 new pre-school places created</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>New childcare places</td>
<td>82% population within 20mins walk of 3 leisure/sports facilities</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For details of indicators, refer to Appendix 2
For details of targets, refer to Appendix 2

4.3.1 Objective: Remove barriers to employment and improve access to jobs and training for local people.

Indicators: 1, 2, 3, 20, 21, 10, 15, 17, 22, 23, 5, 9, 11, 16, 18

There was a net loss in employment floorspace. This was due to a loss of 6,610sqm of warehousing (Class B8) floorspace. Warehousing land has historically come under pressure for redevelopment from higher value land uses. The emerging Southwark Plan strengthens protection of warehousing and other industrial uses. This year’s loss also needs to be seen in the perspective of 28,080sqm of warehousing floorspace that has been approved but not yet built.
There was a gain in office floorspace (Class B1a), only some of this in preferred locations. Table 2 below summarises employment floorspace completions.

Table 2 – Employment Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Class</th>
<th>Gross completions</th>
<th>Lost/Replaced</th>
<th>Net completions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1 (a)</td>
<td>8,319</td>
<td>3,040</td>
<td>5,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 (b)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 (c)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,610</td>
<td>-6,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,319</td>
<td>9,650</td>
<td>-1,331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. Data only available for completions over 1,000sqm

It is estimated there is 8.7ha of land which is available to be developed for employment uses. Most of this is for office development.

Office developments tend to provide more jobs than warehousing floorspace and there are signs that the office market is improving. 234,472sqm of new office space is under construction.

The net loss of employment floorspace therefore may not continue in the future, particularly as the emerging Southwark Plan is implemented.

Growth in employment floorspace will need to be supported by training schemes to ensure that local residents have the skills and means to access many of the jobs created.

In the reporting year there was an increase in education floorspace. Funds collected through planning contributions can also be spent on training initiatives. We will need to watch over the coming years what effect this has on education and skill levels. The current trend is that education levels of children are improving, however a third of adults have low or no skills.

A higher number of people from nonwhite backgrounds are in elementary occupations, though there are fewer of these jobs in the borough.

Currently, lone parents, disabled people, people over 50 and people from non-white backgrounds have lower employment rates than the borough and London average.

The provision of childcare helps lone parents into employment. Last year more than 700 new spaces were created, however this was lower than the council’s target.

4.3.2 Objective: Contribute towards strong, diverse, long term economic growth, facilitate regeneration, and increase the number, and range of employment opportunities available within Southwark.

Indicators: 1, 2, 3, 6, 20, 7, 10, 15, 5, 8, 9, 11

As discussed above, there was a net loss in employment floorspace in the reporting year (refer to Table 2). However there were gains in office floorspace and signs are that demand for office space is increasing.

The number of business premises in the borough has grown over the past year. Even though the rate of business start-ups has declined slightly, they are still higher than the rate of VAT deregistrations. Overall, there are fewer smaller business units than the previous year.

It will be important for small business units to be protected, and this is something the emerging Southwark Plan aims to do.
There was not much change in the type of businesses in the borough. Most jobs (31%) are in banking, finance and insurance; 27% are in public administration, education and health; and 15% are in hotels, restaurants and distribution.

4.3.3 Objective: Improve the range and quality of services available in Southwark and ensure that they are easily accessible by all sections of the community, particularly by foot, cycle and public transport.

Indicators: 1, 2, 3, 20, 21, 10, 15, 17, 22, 23, 5, 9, 11, 16, 18

Town centres across the borough provide residents with access to a range of services and facilities. Last year, there were increases in the amount of office space (Class B1a) completed in town centres. Most of the remaining major completions were in the highly accessible central activity zone.

Table 3 outlines the major (over 1,000sqm) retail and community service completions in the borough. However, it should be pointed out that many shops, restaurants and cafés will be under 1,000sqm and therefore not captured by current data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Class</th>
<th>Gross completions</th>
<th>Lost/ Replaced</th>
<th>Net completions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1 (a)</td>
<td>8, 319</td>
<td>3, 040</td>
<td>5, 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>1, 370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1, 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>5, 139</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5, 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>2, 339</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2, 339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>1, 082</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1, 082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>1, 054</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1, 054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>14, 514</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14, 514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. Data only for completions over 1,000sqm

There was also an increase in Class D1 floorspace, which includes education facilities and places of worship.

Much of this floorspace was in the new City of London Academy in Bermondsey, which provided much needed educational and community facilities for the borough.

Current estimates are that 82% of the population is within 20 minutes walk of at least three sport and leisure facilities.

There were no major health developments completed, and we do not have data on smaller completions. However, at the end of the reporting year waiting times for health care were on target.
This is in the context of the rate of admissions to hospitals increasing.

4.3.4 Objective: Support regeneration and wealth creation through arts, culture and tourism uses.

Indicators: 12, 14, 13

There was one major arts and cultural development. This was the Unicorn Children’s Theatre at More London totalling 3,600sqm. This is within an area of the borough designated as a Strategic Cultural Area under the emerging Southwark Plan.

No losses of arts and cultural floorspace were recorded, however it is noted that data for completions under 1,000sqm is not currently available.

11 new hotel bedspaces were completed. These were located in an area with high accessibility to public transport. Over 500 bed spaces are under construction in three developments, all in SE1.

Data for smaller completions is not currently available.
4.4  Life Chances

Vision: For Southwark to be a place where communities are given the ability to tackle deprivation through gaining maximum benefits from inward investment and regeneration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Results</th>
<th>X not meeting target</th>
<th>✓ meeting target</th>
<th>? unclear at this stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>New leisure floorspace</td>
<td>No major completions</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>New health floorspace</td>
<td>No major completions</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Education floorspace</td>
<td>13,400sqm increase in education floorspace</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Planning contributions</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Education achievement</td>
<td>47.3% students achieving 5+ A*-C grade GCSEs</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Health care waiting times</td>
<td>98% of patients wait less than 4 hours in A&amp;E and 100% gain access to GP within 48 hours</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Deprivation</td>
<td>Southwark improving, but still in top 20</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Residents’ identifying</td>
<td>71% residents relate to their neighbourhood</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Residents feeling safe</td>
<td>45% residents feel safe outside at night</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Local satisfaction</td>
<td>75% residents satisfied with living in their area</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For details of indicators, refer to Appendix 2
For details of targets, refer to Appendix 2

4.4.1  Objective: Reduce poverty, alleviate concentrations of deprivation and increase opportunities.

Indicators: 20, 78, 19, 15, 17, 22, 23, 27, 28, 31, 34, 41, 42, 45, 58, 63, 65, 70, 79, 81

Overall, the borough has reduced levels of deprivation. In 2000, it was ranked 17 in England. In 1993 it was ranked 2.

Funds collected through planning contributions can be used to target poverty and deprivation. For example through training initiatives, estate renewal works and new affordable housing. A detailed breakdown of planning contributions is not available. Detailed data will be collected over the coming years.

New affordable housing completions and housing quality are discussed later in this report (see Section 4.6). The number of homeless households\(^6\) declined
in the reporting year. The highest proportion (44%) of households who are homeless are from black ethnic groups. Information on targeting employment and poverty has been discussed in the preceding section. Average wages rose slightly last year, however there is not enough data available to determine if people from all groups benefited from this rise.

There is a need to target groups from non-white backgrounds, lone parents and the disabled who experience lower employment rates.

In 2005, 84% of residents felt their local area was a place where people of different backgrounds get on. The result was much the same across different groups.

71% of residents identify with their neighbourhood and 61% with Southwark. Rates were lowest amongst young people and highest amongst older people. 75% of residents are satisfied with their local area.

4.4.2 Objective: Enable growth and development of education, community and welfare services in line with the community’s needs.

Indicators: 20, 21, 26, 17, 22, 23, 34, 45, 70, 79, 13, 16, 18, 24, 30, 31, 32, 33, 43, 44, 72

The local population is growing and is expected to get younger. It is ethnically diverse and more than 15% have a disability. There is also a high number of lone parents.

A growing and diverse population will have many different needs for community facilities and welfare services.

Major completions for the reporting year resulted in:

- 13,400sqm of education floorspace (mostly in the new City Academy)
- 1,114sqm of other community development;
- Net loss of 2ha of publicly accessible open space
- No new health floorspace.

Funding from planning contributions is also used to provide needed facilities and services, such as childcare places and schools. Detailed information on planning contributions will be available in future years.

In terms of the impact of new facilities and services which have been provided:

- There are surplus places in primary schools (data not available for secondary schools) and levels of education achievement are improving across students from all groups (though this may also be due to changes in teaching)
- Waiting times for health facilities are meeting targets (despite increased admissions) and life expectancy is rising
- 75% of residents are satisfied with living in their area
- Numbers of homeless households are declining but numbers of households waiting for social housing have increased
- Approximately 82% of residents are within 20 minutes walk of at least three sport and leisure facilities (current data is not available for access to open space).
4.4.3 Objective: Contribute positively to the character and quality of the surroundings, thereby making places better for people to live in and improving the communities to which they belong.

Indicators: 20, 62, 42, 45, 58, 59, 63, 64, 65, 70

Well designed developments will contribute to the quality of places. Planning contributions can also be used to improve the character and quality of the local environment.

Data on planning contributions will be available in coming years.

Data relating to residents’ satisfaction with their local area and how well they relate to their neighbourhood and the borough have been discussed above (see section 4.4.1).

17 schemes received Secured By Design Certification last year, 2 schemes failed. Not all schemes sought certification. However, this does not mean that they did not contribute to safer communities through good design. The emerging Southwark Plan contains policy that seeks all development to contribute to designing out crime. Across the borough, crime levels dropped last year however this could be due to neighbourhood safety programmes and policing.

Overall, there was no change in the proportion of residents who felt safe outside during the day. However, less residents felt safe outside at night in 2005 than did in 2004. Feelings of safety were lowest amongst females and the elderly.

Area based monitoring
The emerging Southwark Plan identifies specific visions for a number of areas in the borough. These range from large areas where much change and intensification is expected, such as Elephant and Castle, to smaller neighbourhood centres such as West Camberwell where the focus is on protecting and increasing vitality and services. Future monitoring reports will need to set out whether the borough’s planning policies are helping to achieve the visions for these area. Some of the existing indicators already seek area specific information, such as on vacancy rates (Indicator 4) and the location of retail and office development (Indicator 5). Additional indicators may need to be developed, particularly for the large regeneration areas which have specific targets for employment and housing delivery.
4.5 Clean and Green

Vision: For Southwark to be a place where communities are given the ability to tackle deprivation through gaining maximum benefits from inward investment and regeneration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Results</th>
<th>X not meeting target</th>
<th>✓ meeting target</th>
<th>? unclear at this stage</th>
<th>Meeting Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Public open space</td>
<td>Net loss of 2ha publicly accessible open space</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Energy efficiency</td>
<td>Average energy rating of council housing is 64</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Renewable energy</td>
<td>Limited data on new renewable energy installations</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Brownfield Land</td>
<td>All development except City of London Academy in Bermondsey on previously developed land</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Nature Conservation</td>
<td>Loss of 0.8ha of land with nature conservation importance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Secure by Design</td>
<td>17 schemes were certified. 2 schemes failed</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 Listed buildings</td>
<td>90 listed buildings and monuments at risk. No listed buildings were demolished</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 Flooding and water quality</td>
<td>No permissions were granted contrary to advice of the Environment Agency</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 Development density</td>
<td>Within the Central Activity Zone, 31% schemes were within new UDP density range. In the Urban Zone, 48% schemes were within range. In the Suburban Zone, 56% schemes were within range.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Residents’ identifying</td>
<td>71% residents relate to their neighbourhood</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 CO₂ emissions</td>
<td>2,367,687 tonnes released from borough in 2003. No data yet available for 2005.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Air pollution</td>
<td>Particulate pollution exceeded target threshold on 13 days.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Waste management</td>
<td>138,525 tonnes of municipal waste collected (420kg/person). 10% recycled. 3% composted. 63% went to landfill.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Quality of open space</td>
<td>2 parks managed to green flag standard</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>1,042 calls to “It’s Your Call” hotline and 11,040 noise complaints received</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For details of indicators, refer to Appendix 2
For details of targets, refer to Appendix 2
4.5.1 Objective: Protect and improve amenity and environmental quality and encourage sustainable development.

Indicators: 20, 46, 47, 48, 45, 54, 55, 58, 59, 65, 70

Once the emerging Southwark Plan is adopted, data will be collected on the number of sustainability appraisals submitted with planning applications.

Funding from planning contributions can also be used to improve amenity and environmental quality. Data on this will be available in the coming years.

Last year, two open spaces in the borough were managed to Green Flag Award quality. These were Southwark Park and Peckham Rye.

In the reporting year there were 1,042 calls to council’s anti-social behaviour helpline (“It’s Your Call”). In addition, council received 11,040 calls about noise. Not enough data is available yet to put this into perspective.

Data on satisfaction with the local area has been discussed above (section 4.4.1).

4.5.2 Objective: Reduce pollution and improve the environmental performance of buildings especially for energy, water and waste management.

Indicators: 20, 46, 47, 48, 52, 53, 71, 40, 50, 51, 54, 55, 56, 72

Complete data is not yet available on the energy efficiency of newly built or approved developments, or on renewable energy installations. However, it is known that the energy efficiency of council housing is improving.

There is a lack of data on energy usage in the borough. However, it is estimated that 2,367,687 tonnes of carbon dioxide were released from sources within the borough in 2003. More recent data has not yet been released.

The amount of waste generated from households in the borough increased last year, whilst no new waste management facilities were built. One of the Mayor of London’s targets is to increase the amount of waste that is processed within London. The emerging Southwark Plan has allocated land on Old Kent Road for a waste management facility to process the borough’s waste.

Other waste data is summarised in Table 4.

\(7\) This is calculated through the Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) which looks at a dwelling’s annual energy costs for space and water heating.
The proportion of waste being recycled and composted has increased, however it did not reach the target set for last year. This compares with a London-wide recycling rate in 2004/05 of approximately 18%, which is also below the target set by the Mayor of London.\(^8\)

The drop in the amount of waste being used to generate energy was due to the waste to energy plant that council uses being closed for 3 months. This resulted in more waste going to landfill. This resulted in more waste going to landfill.

4.5.3 Objective: All developments should be of a high standard of design and where appropriate should protect and preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the historic environment.

Indicators: 62, 66, 67, 45, 63, 68, 69

Planning policy can facilitate the adaptive reuse of listed buildings. There are approximately 2,500 listed buildings and structures in the borough. Of these, 90 items are at risk due to poor condition. None have had to be demolished however.

There are 37 conservation areas covering 22% of the borough 6 archaeological priority zones covering 14% of the borough (refer to Figure 5).

As discussed above, 17 schemes received Secured By Design Certification last year and 2 schemes failed (refer to section 4.4.3).

Residents’ feelings of satisfaction with their area and sense of identity are also influenced by the design quality of new development. This data has been discussed above (refer to section 4.4.1).

---

\(^8\) London Plan Annual Monitoring Report 2, Mayor of London, February 2006
Figure 5 – Conservation Areas and Archaeological Priority Zones in the borough
4.5.4 Objective: All development should promote the efficient use of and be of high quality and, where appropriate, include a mix of uses.

Indicators: 57, 75, 84, 50, 54, 55, 58

Over the reporting year, most development occurred on previously developed land, with the exception of the City of London Academy, which was built on part of Paterson Park. The benefit of providing the local community with access to this new school was felt to outweigh the loss of the open space.

The emerging Southwark Plan requires the density of new residential development to fall within set ranges.

Table 5 summarises the density of residential completions.

Most schemes were within or below the density ranges. The Suburban Zone experienced the highest proportion of schemes that were above the density range, all of these were located within the Canada Water/Rotherhithe Area. This year’s performance is likely to be due to the fact that many of the schemes completed would have been determined before the emerging density policy was being used.

This is also reflected across London, where only 23% of schemes were within the London Plan’s density ranges in 2004/05. 67% of schemes were above the range.

It should also be noted that density ranges are a guide to development. Urban design and traffic considerations will also be a factor in deciding what is an appropriate scale of development. With respect to building heights, a sample of recent approvals indicates that most schemes are within the height ranges identified in the emerging Southwark Plan.

Figure 6 on the following page illustrates the location of new residential development relative to the density zones in the emerging Southwark Plan.

A discussion on trip generation and mode of travel follows later in the report (see section 4.7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density Range (habitable rooms/hectare)</th>
<th>&lt;78</th>
<th>78 - 130</th>
<th>130 - 350</th>
<th>350 - 700</th>
<th>700 - 1100</th>
<th>Over 1100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approx Target range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough-wide</td>
<td>4 (3.3%)</td>
<td>3 (2.5%)</td>
<td>38 (31.1%)</td>
<td>47 (38.5%)</td>
<td>18 (14.8%)</td>
<td>12 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Activity Zone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (7.7%)</td>
<td>13 (50%)</td>
<td>7 (26.9%)</td>
<td>4 (15.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Zone</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>17 (26.6%)</td>
<td>28 (43.8%)</td>
<td>9 (14.1%)</td>
<td>7 (10.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Zone</td>
<td>2 (6.3%)</td>
<td>2 (6.3%)</td>
<td>19 (59.4%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
<td>2 (6.3%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6 – Density of completed residential development

Legend
- Less than 78 Habitable Rooms Per Ha
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4.5.5 Objective: Create, preserve and enhance open spaces, green corridors, traffic free routes, and biodiversity.

Indicators: 20, 26, 57, 60, 27, 59, 61, 28

In the reporting year, two new open spaces were completed in Peckham, totaling 0.9ha, including the Central Adventure Park on Commercial Way. However 2.87ha of open space at Paterson Park was lost to enable the City Academy to be built (refer to section 4.3.3).

This was a special circumstance. The benefit that this new school would bring the community was felt to outweigh the loss of the open space. 1ha of new public open space is to be provided in the area to offset this loss. In addition the public will have access to new community facilities within the school.

Part of Paterson Park also had nature conservation significance. Consequently, 0.8ha of land of importance for nature conservation was lost in the borough last year.

In terms of the quality of the borough’s open spaces, last year 2 parks were managed to Green Flag Award Standard \(^{10}\). These were Southwark Park and Peckham Rye. Council estimates that these two parks represent 16% of all publicly accessible open space in the borough.

More detailed information on biodiversity and usage of parks will become available over the coming years.

\(^{10}\) The Green Flag Award is the national standard for parks and green spaces throughout England and Wales. For more information visit www.greenflagaward.org.uk
4.6 Creating Choice and Quality in Housing

Vision: Southwark as a place with a diverse housing mix that exemplifies high quality design and accessibility for existing and incoming residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Results</th>
<th>X not meeting target</th>
<th>✓ meeting target</th>
<th>? unclear at this stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>New housing</td>
<td>The number of homes in the borough increased by 1,403 new homes completed</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Dwelling sizes</td>
<td>50% new homes had 2 bedrooms. 12% had 3 or more bedrooms.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Affordable housing</td>
<td>27% of new dwellings were affordable. 66% of these were social housing.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Homeless households</td>
<td>1,039 homeless households. Reduction on previous year.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For details of indicators, refer to Appendix 2
For details of targets, refer to Appendix 2

4.6.1 Objective: Provide more high quality housing of all kinds, particularly affordable housing.

Indicators: 20, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 70, 79, 81, 43, 74, 80

New homes completed

Currently, the London Plan has set a target of 29,530 additional homes to be provided in the borough between 1997 and 2016. Figure 7 on the following page illustrates what progress the council has made towards meeting this target and what new housing we estimate will be developed in the coming years. This is known as the “housing trajectory”. It helps us identify if we are on track to meet our housing target.

In the reporting year the borough’s housing stock grew by 1,382 homes, this includes
- 1,149 self-contained dwellings;
- 96 non-self-contained dwellings
- 137 vacant dwellings brought back into use.

Given the amount of new housing that has been built in the borough since 1997, an average of 1,516 additional dwellings will need to be built every year so that we meet our target. The housing trajectory shows that on present estimates, we should achieve our target by 2016.

Data on the quality of new housing is not available. However information is collected on the overall condition of housing stock. In April 2005, 42% of council housing was not in decent condition. However the council aims to bring all its housing up to Decent Homes standard\(^{11}\) by 2010.

\(^{11}\) This is a Government defined standard.
In the graph above the purple bars represent how many new dwellings were completed each year since 2000/01. The teal bars are estimates of how much new housing will be completed in the coming years. These estimates are based on housing allocations in the emerging Southwark Plan, phasing estimates, previous completion trends and council’s plans for house building. The yellow line tracks progress towards meeting our housing target. It is estimated we will meet it by 2015/16.
Affordable housing

Of all the homes that were built, 410 were “affordable housing”. This represents 27% of all dwellings built, which is below the 50% target of the London Plan and emerging Southwark Plan and down on last year’s performance (which was amongst the highest in London).

A number of factors contributed to this low figure

• 189 affordable dwellings were lost as part of a planned phase of the Peckham Partnership scheme which seeks to improve balance between private and affordable housing in Peckham

• The previous affordable housing target under the existing (1995) UDP is 25%.

The emerging Southwark Plan includes policy intended to strengthen the council’s approach to securing more affordable housing. This includes lowering the threshold at which we will require affordable housing from 15 dwellings to 10.

An analysis of housing approvals last year and dwellings under construction also indicate that affordable housing provision is improving. Last year, 38% of schemes approved were affordable and 52% of dwellings under construction are affordable.
In the London-wide context, affordable housing completions in 2004/05 totaled 27.8% of all housing completions 12.

Of the affordable housing completed, 74% was social housing (compared to the target of 70%) and 26% intermediated housing (compared to the target of 30%).

Affordable housing completions need to be seen in the context of rising house prices, which could explain why the number of households on the waiting list for social housing rose last year.

Almost half (48%) of households are from black ethnic groups and 13% are from other non-white ethnic groups.

Revised data on households in need for all forms of affordable housing will be published as part of the next Housing Needs Survey. This will indicate how effective the supply of affordable housing has been in meeting need.

### Dwelling sizes

Table 6 summarises the different sizes of housing that were completed last year. The mix of sizes met the targets in the emerging Southwark Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Studio</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>306 (31.5%)</td>
<td>572 (58.8%)</td>
<td>90 (9.3%)</td>
<td>4 (0.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable</td>
<td>83 (24.8%)</td>
<td>191 (57%)</td>
<td>33 (9.9%)</td>
<td>28 (8.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>389 (29.8%)</td>
<td>763 (58.4%)</td>
<td>123 (9.4%)</td>
<td>32 (2.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bedroom data from London Development Database (LDD) for 2005/06 is incomplete - data known for 1,307 of 1,500 dwellings completed.
LDD does not distinguish between 1 bedroom and studio units.

---

4.7 Sustainable Transport

Vision: Southwark as a place where access to work, shops, leisure and other services for all members of the community is quick and convenient, and where public transport systems, the road network, walkways and cycleways enable people to travel quickly, conveniently and safely and comfortably to and from their destination, causing minimum impact on local communities and the environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Results</th>
<th>X not meeting target</th>
<th>✔ meeting target</th>
<th>? unclear at this stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meeting Targets</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Parking provision</td>
<td>Two out of 14 non-residential schemes exceeded the new UDP parking standards. Five out of 184 residential schemes exceeded parking standards</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Access to services</td>
<td>All new residential development is within 30mins public transport journey to retail, GP, hospital and schools</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Traffic flows</td>
<td>Traffic increased by 1%</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Private car use</td>
<td>In 2001 33% of trips were by private car</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For details of indicators, refer to Appendix 2
For details of targets, refer to Appendix 2

4.7.1 Objective: Promote more sustainable transport choices for all members of the community in order to reduce congestion, pollution and increase ease of movement.

Indicators: 20, 46, 82, 83, 85, 87, 88, 89, 49,50, 91

The emerging Southwark Plan proposes new maximum car parking standards (with the exception of parking for disabled people, which is sought on all schemes). This new approach requires all schemes to justify the level of parking provided to ensure it is appropriate in light of the transport context of the site.

Five of the 184 residential schemes approved last year, exceeded the parking standards of the emerging UDP. 143 schemes did not provide any on-site parking, most of these were small scheme of less than 15 units.

Of the 14 non-residential schemes that we have parking data for, two exceeded the new parking standards. Nine schemes did not provide any onsite parking. The effect of stricter parking standards will take a number of years to become apparent. In 2001, 33% of trips were made by car, 17% were by foot and 6% by bike. New data will become available in 2011. At the same time data will also reveal whether there has been a rise or fall in car ownership.
Data on transport choices made by people from equalities groups is currently not complete.

It should be noted however, that changes in transport usage will be due to a number of factors in addition to the location of new development and the provision of parking. The council’s Transport Local Implementation Plan proposes a range of measures to achieve more sustainable transport use.

In terms of the safety of travel, the number of people involved in serious traffic accidents dropped last year.

4.7.2 Objective: Reduce congestion and pollution within Southwark by minimising the need to travel, especially by car.

Indicators: 4, 20, 84, 85, 27, 29, 86, 90, 43, 91
Reducing the need to travel, particularly by car, is influenced by the location and mix of land uses. For example, locating homes close to a mix of shops and other facilities and services will reduce the distance people need to travel and may encourage walking or cycling.

It is estimated that all new residential development is within 30 minutes by public transport to essential services and facilities such as shops, a GP and schools. A more refined analysis which looks at walking or cycling time would be more useful and this will be developed over the coming years.

For example, we already know that an estimated 82% of the population is within 20 minutes walk of at least three sport/leisure facilities.

As a starting point, Figure 8 on the following page illustrates the location of new residential development relative to local services and facilities.

Currently, just under 50% of all trips made by residents are under 2km. Trips for work tend to be longer than trips for other purposes.

The emerging Southwark Plan also aims to increase densities in areas more accessible by public transport and in proximity to a mix of land uses. The density of completed development has been discussed above (refer to section 4.5.4)

As well as increased levels of walking or cycling, success in achieving this objective can be measured by changes in traffic flows. Between 2001 and 2004, traffic levels in the borough have dropped. However, last year saw a slight increase in total vehicle km traveled. We will need to watch over the coming years to see if this trend continues.

It should be noted that changes in traffic levels are also due to measures such as the Congestion Charge, as well as the location and mix of new development.
Figure 8 – New residential development in relation to local services and links