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Introduction

What is the Annual Monitoring Report?

Prepared annually by the London Borough of Tower Hamlets, the Annual Monitoring Report is an important element of the Local Development Framework (LDF). Used to assess the performance and effectiveness of key policies in the LDF, the AMR is the primary tool for identifying policies are performing as intended but more importantly those which need to be reviewed.

Monitoring is a key component of an effective planning system. Under the plan-monitor-manage approach, monitoring plays a crucial role in understanding policy implications and formulating policies that are robust and effective, ensuring the planning system continues to deliver high quality, sustainable places.

The AMR also monitors the implementation of the Local Development Scheme which is the Council’s 3 year ‘project plan’ for the preparation of Development Plan Documents (DPD). It also monitors the implementation of the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), which sets out how the Council will engage with local communities in preparing planning documents and deciding planning applications.

This is the sixth iteration of the AMR. The information presented in this report relates to the monitoring period April 2009 to March 2010, unless otherwise stated.

The Indicators

Policies are assessed using a series of indicators covering a wide range of spatial planning matters. The indicators have been aligned to the Council’s Interim Planning Guidance (IPG) policies and include:

- **Contextual indicators**: These provide the background for the borough and the social, economic and environmental context in which development is occurring.

- **Core Output Indicators (COI)**: Required by the Department of Communities and Local Government, these indicators are used to monitor key areas of spatial planning.

- **Local Output Indicators (LOI)**: Identified by the Council, these indicators monitor the effectiveness and performance of a broad range of policies in the LDF in achieving the spatial vision set out in the 2010 Core Strategy.

- **Significant Effects Indicators (SEI)**: These indicators are linked to the LDF’s Sustainability Appraisal and measure the effects of implementing the policies in the 2010 Core Strategy.

A summary of indicator performance is set out in the Snapshot section, with a more detailed table in Appendix 1 setting out the current and past performance of the indicators.

Structure of the AMR

Section 1: Provides a brief introduction on the role of the AMR and describes the four sets of indicators used to assess planning policy.

Section 2: Sets out the context for the borough, providing information on employment, population, health etc.

Section 3: Explains the role of the Community Plan and its relationship with the Local Development
Framework. It also looks at the progress and achievements of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games within the borough.

Section 4: Provides an analysis of planning applications received by the Council as well as a breakdown of appeal decisions.

Section 5: Presents data on contextual, core output, local output and significant effects indicators, highlighting the key policies and findings. Additional information has been introduced in this iteration of the AMR, setting out the implications on policy. This is particularly important for policies that have been identified as not performing as intended.

The section is structured to reflect the overarching themes of the 2010 Core Strategy and is set out below:

- **Refocusing on our Town Centres**: Describes town centre activity, shopping and retail uses.

- **Strengthening Neighbourhood Well-Being**: Looks at housing, open space, flood management and dealing with waste management.

- **Enabling Prosperous Communities**: Analyses delivery of jobs and employment spaces as well as the provision of community and social facilities.

- **Designing a High Quality City**: Focuses on building and design quality, incorporating safe, secure and sustainable environments and heritage and conservation.

A traffic light system has been used to indicate the overall performance of the policy. These are highlighted using the following symbols:

- 🟢 Performance is on target
- 🟡 Performance is improved but remains off target
- 🟠 Performance has not changed or not enough data was provided to interpret results
- 🔴 Performance is off target

Section 6: Details the progress of the made on the delivery and implementation of Tower Hamlets master plans. This is now linked to the Core Strategy theme Delivering Placemaking.

Section 7: Reports on progress against the delivery of the LDF against the delivery of the Local Development Scheme (LDS).

Section 8: Provides an update on the transition from the adopted Unitary Development Plan (UDP) to the LDF in more detail.

Section 9: Reviews how the Council has consulted with communities in line with the Statement of Community Involvement.
Snapshot

The 2009/10 monitoring period has seen an overall improvement in policy performance with a large number of policies performing better than the 2008/09 period. As Fig 1 highlights, although the number of indicators assessed as ‘red’ has risen slightly, the number of indicators assessed as ‘green’ has risen considerably, from 32 to 44. Furthermore, a number of indicators assessed as ‘amber’ are also showing signs of improvement towards their target.

A summary of key findings from the report are provided below.

- Vacancy levels for majority of the borough’s town centres are between 0% and 7%, this is low in comparison to the London average of 10%
- 14 applications approved for change of use to A3 (restaurants and cafes), A4 (drinking establishments) and A5 (hot food takeaway) compared to 11 changes of use in the 08/09 monitoring period
- 2,452 net additional homes completed according to the London Development Database against 2,839 completions in the previous period
- Based on the Affordable Housing Team, 1,754 gross affordable homes completed, of which 1,219 (69%) are social rented and 535 (31%) intermediate
- 335 student bedrooms delivered, lower than the 447 completed in the last monitoring period
- New public open space created at Braham Street, Aldgate
- Open space standard of 1.20 hectares per 1,000 population continues to drop, currently at 1.05 hectares per 1,000 population.
- Recycling levels increased from 15% to 26.5%
- Net loss of 33,129 sqm across all employment use classes, almost offsetting the previous periods gain of 33,731 sqm
- 100% of major developments (10 units and more) approved are ‘car-free’, up from 96%
- Number of Travels Plans submitted with major applications increased to 75.93%, up from 32% in the 08/09 period
- Additional Conservation Area, Limehouse Cut, adopted
- Number of listed buildings at risk has risen from 37 to 49

Fig 1: Indicator Performance 2008/09 and 2009/10
### Core Output Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COI BD1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI BD2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI BD3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI BD4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI H1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI H2a</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI H2b</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI H2c</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI H2d</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI H3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI H4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI H5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI H6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI E1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI E2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI E3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI W1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI W2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Output Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOI 1 Satisfaction levels with the built environment</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 2 Number of new jobs created</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 3 Percentage of residents working outside the borough</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 4 Amount of vacant B1a office floor space</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 5 New business registration rate (NI 171)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 6 Vacancy levels in Strategic Industrial Locations and</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Industrial Locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 7 Number of new hotel rooms</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 8 Town Centre vacancy rates</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 9 Number of applications approved for changes of use to</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3, A4 and A5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 10 Percentage of social rented housing completed for</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 11 Percentage of intermediate and market housing</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completions for family housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 12 Ratio of affordable housing completions to</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>market housing completions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 13 Ratio of social rented completions to intermediate</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing completions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 14 Number of residential dwellings lost</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 15 Amount of eligible open spaces managed to Green Flag</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 16 Percentage of respondents satisfied with sports and</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leisure facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 17 Number of General Practitioners per 1,000 population</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 18 Percentage of population reporting good health, aged</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 19 Percentage of population aged 16-74 with no formal</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 20 Percentage of young people 16-18 not in education,</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment or training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 21 Enrollments on adult education courses per 1,000</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adult population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 22 Area of land designated as Open Space</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 23 Area of land designated as Local Nature Reserves</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Colors
- **Red**: High risk
- **Amber**: Medium risk
- **Green**: Low risk

**Fig 2: Indicator Performance Summary 2008/09 and 2009/10**

- COI BD1: Total amount of additional employment floorspace by type
- COI BD2: Total amount of employment floorspace on previously developed land by type
- COI BD3: Employment land available by type
- COI BD4: Total amount of floorspace for town centre uses
- COI H1: Plan period and housing targets
- COI H2a: Net additional dwellings in previous years
- COI H2b: Net additional dwellings for the reporting year
- COI H2c: Net additional dwellings in future years
- COI H2d: Managed delivery targets

**Local Output Indicators**

- LOI 1: Satisfaction levels with the built environment
- LOI 2: Number of new jobs created
- LOI 3: Percentage of residents working outside the borough
- LOI 4: Amount of vacant B1a office floor space
- LOI 5: New business registration rate (NI 171)
- LOI 6: Vacancy levels in Strategic Industrial Locations and Local Industrial Locations
- LOI 7: Number of new hotel rooms
- LOI 8: Town Centre vacancy rates
- LOI 9: Number of applications approved for changes of use to A3, A4 and A5
- LOI 10: Percentage of social rented housing completed for family housing
- LOI 11: Percentage of intermediate and market housing completions for family housing
- LOI 12: Ratio of affordable housing completions to market housing completions
- LOI 13: Ratio of social rented completions to intermediate housing completions
- LOI 14: Number of residential dwellings lost
- LOI 15: Amount of eligible open spaces managed to Green Flag Award status
- LOI 16: Percentage of respondents satisfied with sports and leisure facilities
- LOI 17: Number of General Practitioners per 1,000 population
- LOI 18: Percentage of population reporting good health, aged under 75
- LOI 19: Percentage of population aged 16-74 with no formal qualifications
- LOI 20: Percentage of young people 16-18 not in education, employment or training
- LOI 21: Enrollments on adult education courses per 1,000 adult population
- LOI 22: Area of land designated as Open Space
- LOI 23: Area of land designated as Local Nature Reserves

**Legend**
- **Red**: High risk
- **Amber**: Medium risk
- **Green**: Low risk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Effects Indicators</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEI 1 Life expectancy at birth</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 2 Percentage of all housing units that are affordable</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 3 Proportion of Local Authority homes which were non-decent at 1 April each year</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 4 Increase in the number of new or redeveloped primary care facilities</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 5 Number of physical visits to public library premises per 10,000 population</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 6 Number of visits to Leisure Centres</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 7 Percentage of new homes built on previously developed land</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 8 Percentage of proposal approved that would result in the loss of Listed Buildings of value in Conservation Areas</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 9 Number of domestic burglaries per 1,000 households</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 10 % of hate crimes cases investigated by Community Safety service resulting in formal action</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 11 Working age people on out of work benefits</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 12 Percentage of children living in households with relative low income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 13 Percentage of residents whose workplace is within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 14 Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 15 Number of noise related complaints to Environmental Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 16 Percentage improvement in domestic energy efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 17 Percentage of household waste recycled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 18 Number of SUDS installed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 19 Population of identified species in Tower Hamlets Biodiversity Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 20 Percentage of planning applications approved that do not meet the sequential test for managing flood risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 21 Percentage of residents that feel they can influence decisions affecting their local area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Colors:**
- **Red** indicates a low or negative impact.
- **Amber** indicates a neutral impact.
- **Green** indicates a positive impact.
This is Tower Hamlets

Located in the heart of the East End, Tower Hamlets is a borough defined by its diversity and its marked contrasts. Covering just over 8 square miles, Tower Hamlets is one of the smallest yet most densely populated of the London boroughs. And whilst the borough has experienced spectacular regeneration and economic growth, it still continues to suffer from high levels of deprivation.

Despite regeneration and the ongoing successes, Tower Hamlets still faces strong challenges. Foremost amongst these is the need to provide good quality affordable homes in places that are safe and encourage healthy and sustainable living. Continuing to improve education and skills as well as providing opportunities for employment and enterprise also continues to remain a high priority.

The borough is home to Canary Wharf, the UK’s second largest business district with more than 103,500 employees. Despite the impact of the financial recession across the UK, Tower Hamlets continued to have one of the strongest local economies in the country with 1.33 jobs per economically active resident.

Population

Tower Hamlets continues to have one of the fastest growing populations in London. Population estimates published by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) in July 2010 confirm this trend. The 2009 mid year population estimates indicate that Tower Hamlets currently has an estimated population of 234,800, an increase of about 8000 on the previous year’s estimates.

In addition, according to the latest (2009) round of GLA population projections published in June 2010, the population of Tower Hamlets is estimated at 235,215. This is expected to increase to 266,646 by 2015, rising to 338,382 by 2031. Of the current population, 118,030 are female and 117,185 are male. Fig 3 shows annual population projections to 2031.
The number of homes in the borough has increased almost two fold since the last population census in 2001. As of September 2009, there were over 100,995 homes in the borough, which is an increase of about 28%.

It is also worth noting that Tower Hamlets is the eighth most ethnically diverse borough in England and Wales, with White (British, Irish and Other White) making up 51.4% of the borough’s population compared to 71.2% of London’s population and 91.3% of the England and Wales population (2001 Census: Ethnicity Theme Tables). Fig 4 provides a breakdown of the borough’s population by ethnicity.

48.6% of the borough population is made of a diverse breakdown of Black and Minority Ethnic groups and people of mixed heritage. Of these, 36.6% are people of Asian or Asian British backgrounds compared to the London and England & Wales average of 12.1% and 4.4% respectively.

People of Bangladeshi origin make up the single largest minority ethnic group in the borough, accounting for 33.4% of all residents. This average is unequalled across the UK and sets Tower Hamlets apart in comparison to both London, which has 2.2% of the Bangladeshi population, and England and Wales which has only 0.5%.

Further details of the Borough’s statistics are discussed throughout the AMR and form part of the contextual indicators.

![Fig 4: Population Projection by Ethnicity](image)
Achievements in 2009/10

Tower Hamlets has had significant achievements and improvements over the last year, a few of which are outlined below.

In January 2010 the Council was assessed by the new Equality Framework for Local Government and awarded the highest rating level of ‘excellent’. The new framework assesses progress against five domains (including knowing your community and community engagement), and is the national measure of performance on equality for local authorities.

In addition, the Council has also received further recognition for its efforts to promote equality:

- The Council was ranked 7th nationally in the Stonewall Workplace Equality Index for the second consecutive year. The index identifies the top 100 employers in the country for fairness on lesbian, gay and bisexual issues. NHS Tower Hamlets was also ranked in the top 100 at number 45.

- In September the Council was ranked joint 5th nationally in the Employers’ Forum on Disability Standard. Strengths specifically identified in the assessment were in relation to providing an accessible built environment, accessible information and recruitment and selection.

As in previous years, the Council and Tower Hamlets NHS have continued to implement ‘Workforce to Reflect the Community’ strategies. For the Council, this included creating a Local Graduate Career programme and work-based apprenticeships to help give local people access to opportunities with the Council, as well as other initiatives. NHS Tower Hamlets will refresh its strategy later in 2010 in conjunction with local health and social care partners to improve representation of equalities groups at all levels within the organisation and Tower Hamlets Community Health Services.

‘You Decide’ Participatory Budgeting

The Tower Hamlets Partnership’s innovative participatory budgeting (PB) scheme ‘You Decide!’ was further developed and refined during 2009/10. Fairer local voting rules were introduced and the decision making process was more effectively planned and communicated. ‘You Decide’ has enabled local people to directly influence how £4.8m has been spent over the last two years with 1,585 local people taking part in the decision making process. The Council’s approach to PB has been recognised as best practice by the Government and was also identified as a national exemplar at the Local Government Information Unit National Empowerment Conference 2009/10.
Community Plan and the 2012 Games

Following the initial refresh and publication of the Community Plan in 2008 the Tower Hamlets Partnership has undertaken a second refresh. The 2020 Vision of the Community Plan is based on extensive consultation with local residents, businesses, the third sector and key stakeholders.

The Local Development Framework (LDF) has been developed alongside the Community Plan. This is to ensure the LDF reflects the ambitions, aspirations and priorities set in the Community Plan and the Local Area Agreements.

The new Community Plan retains the vision to “improve the quality of life for everyone living and working in Tower Hamlets”. The plan sets out the challenges and the priorities for the Borough to 2020, as well as specific targets from the Local Area Agreement which Tower Hamlets Partnership will focus on until 2011.

The Local Area Agreement sets key targets for the next three years through to 2012 on priority national indicators and is used to monitor the implementation of the Community Plan in Tower Hamlets.

The Community Plan
The four themes of the Community Plan are:
• A Great Place to Live
• A Healthy Community
• A Prosperous Community
• A Safe and Supportive Community

The overarching aspiration of One Tower Hamlets runs throughout the Community Plan. One Tower Hamlets is about reducing inequalities and poverty, strengthening cohesion and making sure communities continue to live well together with the emphasis on recognising everyone having a part to play in making this a reality.

The Tower Hamlets Partnership has begun to make progress against the ambitious targets and aspirations set out in the 2020 Community Plan.

Key achievements during 2009/10 include the launch of the Housing Strategy and the Overcrowding Strategy as well as reducing the number of households in temporary accommodation by over 1,000 to currently less than 2,000.

A Great Place to Live
Under this theme, major estate renewal programmes have continued across the borough with key partners and include:

• The demolition and refurbishment of the Ocean Estate which has so far delivered improvements to over 100 homes. A development consortia were appointed during 2009/10 and HCA gap funding of £40m has been secured for the project.

• The Council supporting the strategically important Blackwall Reach regeneration project by
providing an additional £13 million of funding over the next three years. The project will ensure the delivery of much needed new homes and the improvement of existing ones.

• The Council, by December 2009, successfully signing 20 legal agreements with developers securing investments worth £179,000 for affordable housing as well as strategic and local transport, education, health, leisure initiatives.

A Healthy Community
The latest available data showed that 2,716 people have been helped to quit smoking (4 week quits), well in excess of the 2009/10 target. The Council, in conjunction with NHS Tower Hamlets, has also issued 98 Smoke Free Awards to businesses which support smoking cessation programmes for staff. The Smoke Free Team was highly commended on its work under the partnership working strand of the 2009/10 Local Innovation Awards.

The borough has also seen the biggest reduction in teenage pregnancy in London, and the third biggest reduction in the country. Tower Hamlets under 18 conception rate in 2008 was 33.5% (per 1000 female 15-17) which compares well to both the London average of 44.6% and the England average of 40.4%.

A Prosperous Community
Tower Hamlets is one of the most improved education authorities in the country and is rapidly closing the gap with national averages on a number of key stages. Four of the borough’s secondary schools and seventeen primary schools are rated as ‘outstanding’, with none placed under special measures.

GCSE results in the Borough continue to improve faster than the national average. Nearly half of Tower Hamlets pupils achieved 5 A*-C GCSEs including English and Maths. The rate of improvement in Tower Hamlets was almost twice the national rate of change and the borough is making good progress towards the 2010 targets.

The latest performance data available for 2008 shows child poverty has reduced in the borough to 48%, a 3.4% point reduction from the baseline and 1.9% better than the 2008 target. This equates to 1,300 children lifted out of poverty in 2008.

The Council has continued to help local businesses by supporting 112 small and medium businesses in obtaining £4.95 million in contracts through the East London Business Place and the Compete For procurement system.

A Safe and Supportive Community
In terms of delivering a safe and supportive community, the Community Plan recognises two key aspects. The first is providing excellent services to everybody, including high quality housing, schools and healthcare. Such services form part of every theme in this plan. The second involves providing excellent services for our most excluded groups and to those at risk of becoming excluded. The Council’s priorities include empowering older and vulnerable people and supporting families; tackling and preventing crime and focussing on early intervention.

2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games
The Council’s London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games Legacy Strategy is now rooted in the 2020 Community Plan. The strategy is beginning to deliver a wide range of improvements, including a number of projects being delivered under one of four overarching themes - creating and sharing prosperity, a socially cohesive community, a transformed environment and the Games experience.
High Street 2012

High Street 2012 is an initiative that will use the Games as a catalyst for improvements to the A11/A118 corridor through Tower Hamlets (taking in Whitechapel High Street, Whitechapel Road, Mile End Road and Bow Road) and on into Stratford in Newham and the Olympic Park.

The vision for High Street 2012 is to create a world class and thriving ‘High Street’, where there is a balance between pedestrian and road uses, where people and places are connected, creating a sense of well being and community against a backdrop of historical assets.

Proposals for the route have been developed in consultation with local communities. They include a series of measures for the length of the street, such as better lighting and way-finding, more trees and restored historic buildings as well as short, medium and long term improvements to places along the route, including Aldgate, Whitechapel, Mile End and Bow.

Work on the first High Street 2012 projects began in 2009, including the new park at Braham Street and a programme of enhancements to historic buildings in Aldgate, Whitechapel and Mile End.

The first phase of improvement works in Aldgate has now completed, which saw the rejuvenation of six historic buildings. Restoration and improvement work has also begun on 15 listed buildings on Mile End Road and is scheduled to be complete in March 2011. Further improvements are scheduled for Whitechapel Market and Bow, which will see over 60 buildings restored.

In 2009/10 the Council secured £10.8m for delivery of High Street 2012 schemes. This includes over £6m for implementation of public realm improvements in Aldgate, Whitechapel, Mile End West, Mile End, Ocean Green and Bow; and £4.6m for the restoration and enhancement of four groups of historic buildings along the route. Delivery of the first works to historic buildings is now underway; detailed design of four public realm schemes has also begun and works are expected to begin by early 2011.
Planning in Tower Hamlets

During the 2009/10 monitoring period, a total of 2,161 planning applications were received by the London Borough of Tower Hamlets. This was lower than that recorded for the previous monitoring period when 2,507 applications were received. Fig 5 provides a breakdown by type of application. (A major application is defined as 10 residential units and above, or 1,000 sqm or above. Minor applications include applications below these thresholds (defined for major) and that do not feature in the other categories).

During the monitoring period 46 appeals were determined by the Planning Inspectorate relating to the decisions made by the London Borough of Tower Hamlets. This is an increase of 4 from 2008/09 when 42 appeals were determined.

Of the 46 appeals, 39 were dismissed and 7 were upheld by the Planning Inspectorate. The appeals are broken down by issue in Fig 6.
### Fig 6: Planning Appeals Decided 2009/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Dismissed</th>
<th>Allowed</th>
<th>Number of Appeals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amenity/Conservation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Provision</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Progress Against the LDF Core Strategy

Refocusing on our Town Centres

Town centres refer to those centres designated in the Interim Planning Guidance (IPG) Proposals Map. In 2008 the Council commissioned a Town Centre Spatial Strategy for the borough. This work was completed in summer 2009 and looked at the pattern of retail development in the borough, and provided recommendations on how the Council could better manage activity in the town centres to ensure they retain their vitality and viability. The IPG Policy CP16 seeks to direct new retail development to major, district and neighbourhood centres.

Retail, Office and Leisure Development in Town Centres

Policies monitored: CP15 Provision of a Range of Shops and Services
CP16 Vitality and Viability of Town Centres

Relevant indicators: COI BD4

Fig 7 shows the amount of completed retail, office and leisure development in the borough as a whole and in its town centres during the 2009/10 monitoring period (COI BD4). There was 5,333 sqm (gross) of such uses completed in the borough, however taking into consideration the existing use, there was a net loss of 11,026 sqm. Of this total, 186 sqm (gross) were completed in town centres, which once again taking into consideration existing use resulted in a net loss of 233 sqm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Borough</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>In Town Centres</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>B1a</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>-12,280</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-11,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3,607</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy Implications

With a significant net loss of retail, office and leisure floorspace across the borough and in its town centres, it is clear that existing policies were not performing as intended in maintaining and delivering such uses.

However, the policies have been strengthened in the Core Strategy with the rejuvenation of town centres now a key overarching spatial policy theme. The policy has been formulated to deliver a hierarchy of interconnected, vibrant and inclusive town centres, the key objective being to create town centres that act as hubs for a range of uses including retail, commercial and leisure. Furthermore, the policy also encourages, as a priority, the provision of 16,000 sqm of comparison retail floorspace by 2025 and 17,000 sqm floorspace of convenience retail by 2015 at a number of identified town centres across the borough.

The policy will be monitored in future AMRs to assess effectiveness.
Town Centre Vacancy Levels

Policies monitored: CP16 Vitality and Viability of Town Centres

Relevant indicators: LOI 8

Vacancy levels (LOI 8) in the borough’s town centres are summarised in Fig 8.

**Fig 8: Town Centre Vacancy Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town Centre Type</th>
<th>Town Centre</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Canary Wharf</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Bethnal Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Chrisp Street</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Roman Road East</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Roman Road West</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Whitechapel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Watney Market</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the slight increase in vacancy levels across the borough’s town centres, levels are still considered to be low in comparison to the London average (see Fig 9). The low level of vacancies indicate good occupancy levels for all the borough’s town centres, with the exception of Roman Road East, which has a vacancy rate of 17%. This itself is an improvement compared to the 19% reported the previous year (an implementation group has been established for Roman Road East to improve the vitality and viability of the town centre). The Town Centre Spatial Strategy provides recommendations on how to manage the performance of the borough’s town centres.

**Fig 9: Town Centre Vacancy Rates**
Policy Implications

The high rate of occupancy levels in all but two of the borough’s town centres is testament to the continuing effectiveness of the town centre policies.

The policy, as mentioned before, has been strengthened in the Core Strategy, where town centres now play a central role in achieving the long term vision for the borough. The new Core Strategy policy has applied a redefined hierarchy to the borough’s town centres which included designating new ones. The policy also provides greater emphasis on ensuring the scale and type of uses within town centres are consistent with the redefined hierarchy as well as identifying centres where additional floorspace needs to be provided.

Performance of the new policy in decreasing vacancy levels will continue to be monitored.

Town Centre Vitality

Policies monitored: CP15 Provision of a Range of Shops and Services and CP16 Vitality and Viability of Town Centres

Relevant indicators: LOI 9

Borough-wide, there were a total of 14 applications approved for changes of use to A3 (restaurants and cafes), A4 (drinking establishments) and A5 (hot food takeaway) (LOI 9) of which 3 were in town centres with a further 3 in Central Activities Zone (CAZ). This compares with 11 borough-wide in the previous monitoring period and 15 in the 2006/07 period.

Although this represents a slight increase from the previous monitoring period, the year on year decrease in previous monitoring periods might be reflective of the importance being placed on delivering a ‘healthier borough’.

This trend is monitored in spatial terms (see Fig 10) to ensure that these changes are occurring in appropriate locations, and the levels of concentration enhance the vitality and liveability of places, rather than lead to a detrimental impact.

Policy Implications

Despite a slight increase in the number of change of use applications in the 2009/10 monitoring period, this is against a steady reduction over the last 4 monitoring periods. Nevertheless, as mentioned earlier, town centre policies have been strengthened and expanded in the Core Strategy to maintain and increase the provision and range of shops and services available and ensure continued vitality and viability of all of the borough’s town centres.
Fig 10: Change of use applications in proximity to Town Centres

- Approved Change of Use Applications 2009/10
- Town Centres
- Borough Boundary

© Crown copyright. All rights reserved 100019288, 2010.
Issues and Actions

Whilst the borough’s town centres continue to experience low levels of vacancy in comparison to the London average, the priority is to ensure that there is a delivery of office, retail and leisure floorspace with the designated town centres.

With a continuing net loss of office, retail and leisure floorspace across the borough and its town centres, this is an issue that needs to be addressed with priority to ensure the borough’s town centres is able continue providing a wide range of shops and services and maintain and improve their vitality and viability.

Policy action to remedy this has already been taken in the Core Strategy. With the rejuvenation of town centres as an overarching theme running across the Core Strategy, the Council has strong policies in place to deliver successful town centres.
Strengthening Neighbourhood Wellbeing

Urban Living for Everyone

With a large and growing population in the borough, housing continues to remain the dominant land use in Tower Hamlets. In the last 24 years, the number of homes in the borough has increased from 62,000 in 1985 to 100,288 homes in 2009 (LBTH Housing Strategy, 2009).

Data from the last Household Survey carried out in 2009 suggests that the owner occupied and private rented sector have grown significantly since 2001. Despite the high demand for affordable housing in the borough, the affordable sector has reduced from 52.5% to 41.5% of the total stock. Approximately 59% of the borough's housing stock now in the market sector.

The need for affordable housing within the borough continues to be driven by the high cost of market housing and low household incomes. The average house price in Tower Hamlets in March 2010 was approximately £341,000, a rise of 10.7% from the previous year (Land Registry House Price Index). In contrast 32.5% of households have an income of below £20,000 per annum with 20% earning under £15,000 per annum.

Delivery of Housing Target

Policies monitored: CP19 New Housing Provision

Relevant indicators: COI H1, COI H2a, H2b, H2c, H2d, COI H3 and SEI 7

The replacement London Plan 2009 has revised the housing delivery targets for the borough downwards from those initially set in the 2007 London Plan. The new housing delivery target for Tower Hamlets for the plan period 2011 to 2021 is set at 28,850 (COI H1) which equates to 2,885 new homes being delivered each year. With a strong performance in delivering housing in the past, Tower Hamlets remains on track to meet the London Plan target over the plan period.

The Council’s performance in delivering homes against London Plan targets over the last 5 years is set out in Fig 11 (COI H2a).
The number of homes delivered in the 2009/10 monitoring period has decreased in comparison to the last monitoring period, with 2,452 net additional homes completed (COI H2b), 387 less than what was delivered last monitoring period and 433 less than the London Plan target of 2,885. However, around 4,932 additional homes are expected to be completed in the current monitoring period (20010/11), significantly above the revised London Plan target.

Appendix 2 contains a full list of homes delivered in the 2009/10 monitoring period and Fig 12 shows the spatial distribution of the 10 plus residential units.
Future delivery of housing is set out in Fig 13. This graph shows the 15 year housing trajectory, including previous and projected housing delivery (COI H2c), along with the managed delivery line (COI H2d).

Projections to 2014 show that the borough might fall short of meeting set targets. Beyond this period it is forecast the Council will deliver its overall target of 43,275 new homes.

The managed delivery line is an estimate of how much housing is expected to come forward over the plan period. It shows the annual number of completions needed to meet the London Plan target, taking into account any shortfalls or surpluses from previous and future years.

Fig 13 sets out in detail the net additional homes expected to come forward over the next five year period from 2010 to 2015. Appendix 3, Housing Trajectory (COI H2c) provides further detail on the number of homes expected to come forward each year.
Furthermore, despite the continued delivery of the high levels of housing, the Council has still managed to ensure that 100% of the housing delivered has been on brownfield sites, land that has previously been developed (COI H3 and SEI 7).

**Policy Implications**

The policy on delivery of housing target has been effective as reflected by Tower Hamlets’ strong past performance in delivering housing. The housing trajectory is also a strong indication of the Council continuing to deliver its housing targets over the lifetime of the new Core Strategy.

Building on the effectiveness of the existing policy in the IPG the housing policy has been updated in the Core Strategy to ensure Tower Hamlets can continue to deliver its annual targets. The policy sets out the revised target as well as indicating where the majority of new housing will be delivered in the borough. The policy also places greater emphasis on the need for housing to assist in creating sustainable places.

The performance of the updated policy will be monitored and reported in future AMRs.

**Delivering Affordable Housing**

**Policies monitored: CP19 New Housing Provision**

**Relevant indicators: COI H5, LOI 12, LOI 41 and SEI 2**

A key priority for the Council is continuing to ensure delivery of a wide mix of affordable housing. By maximising opportunities for affordable homes on all sites providing housing, the Council aims to ensure 50% of all housing across the borough is affordable. To achieve this the Council has stringent policies in place requiring all sites providing 10 or more residential units to ensure at least 35% of these are affordable, subject to financial viability.

In the past 5 iterations of the AMR, gross affordable housing figures were reported from the London Development Database (LDD), which derived its data from development completions certificate.
This monitoring period, along with the LDD figures the Council is also providing figures collated by the Council’s Affordable Housing Team (AHT). AHT figures are based on occupancy of affordable dwellings, as opposed to the completion of the entire scheme within a monitoring period.

According to the AHT, the Council in conjunction with its partners delivered a total of 1,754 gross affordable homes in the 2009/10 monitoring period, an increase of 790 from the previous monitoring period.

The LDD figures show a reversal with this monitoring period delivering 814 gross affordable homes compared to the previous years 1,555 (COI H5). Fig 13 shows delivery of affordable housing according to both the LDD and AHT over the last 5 monitoring periods. The inverse relation between the LDD and AHT trends as identified in Fig 14 shows the effect of the reporting time lag and does not necessarily reflect the situation on the ground.

As the AHT does not collect data for Market housing, the data for the following two indicators are based solely on the LDD. The percentage of affordable housing delivered equates to, 37% of all habitable rooms (affordable and market) delivered, (LOI 12) or 30% when calculated by total homes completed (SEI 2). This is a marked decline when compared to figures for 2008/09 when 1,555 (57% of the total by habitable rooms) affordable homes were completed.

Of the 1,754 affordable homes delivered according to the AHT, 1,499 of those were secured through obligations within the S106 agreements (LOI 41).
Policy implications
Based on the AHT, the IPG policy on affordable housing has performed strongly in the 2009/10 monitoring period.

The policy has been consolidated and strengthened further in the Core Strategy by the Council pledging to secure further affordable housing from a range of public sector initiatives directly with Registered Providers as well as bringing long term vacant properties back into use. The new policy will continue to be monitored closely to ensure the Council continues to deliver affordable homes.

Delivering a Mix of Housing Types

Policies monitored:  CP21 Dwelling Mix and Type
          CP22 Affordable Housing
          HSG2 Housing Mix

Relevant indicators: LOI 10, LOI 11 and LOI 13

During this monitoring period of the 1,754 homes delivered according to the AHT, 1,219 (69%) were social rented and 535 (31%) were intermediate. Percentages derived from the LDD are also similar, with 548 units (67%) delivered as social rented and 266 (33%) as intermediate. This represents progress towards the IPG policy requirements of 80% of affordable homes to be social rented and 20% intermediate.

When calculated by habitable rooms, 14% of homes were completed in the intermediate sector (LOI 13), with 86% in the social rented sector based on AHT figures and 28% and 72% respectively based on the LDD. This represents a significant improvement, over last year’s performance.

IPG policy further requires 45% of new social rented homes to be of a size suitable for families, with 25% in the intermediate and market sectors. This year 42% (LDD) and 46% (AHT) of social rented homes completed were suitable for families (i.e. 3 bedrooms or more) (LOI 10), compared with 35% (LDD) last year and 26% (LDD) the year before. This indicates a positive shift towards the policy target for social rented family housing of 45%.

Family housing delivered in the intermediate and market sector was low with units equating to only 6% in the intermediate sector (LDD and AHT) and 3.6% for the market sector (LDD) (LOI 11) as a percentage of the total homes completed in each sector. However, projections for the next monitoring period indicate a stronger performance, with the percentage of family housing in the intermediate sector set to rise to 28.6% according to the AHT.

Policy implications
Whilst policies for delivering a mix of dwelling, including 3 bed plus homes suitable for families, has shown a considerable improvement over the previous periods results, there is still concern over the number of family homes being delivered in the market and intermediate sectors in this and past monitoring periods. However, as mentioned above, projections show an improvement for the 2010/11 period.

Along with housing policies in general, the policies on housing mix and type have been consolidated into the Urban Living for Everyone Core Strategy policy, with the only alteration being the split in the social rented and intermediate sector for affordable homes, which has changed from an 80:20 split to 70:30 to reflect changing needs. The performance of the policy will continue to be monitored and reported on.
Gypsy and Traveller Site

Policies monitored: CP26 Gypsy and Traveller Site

Relevant indicators: COI H4

Tower Hamlets currently has 19 Gypsy and Traveller pitches all of which are located within the designated site at Eleanor Street. Whilst no additional pitches have been delivered in 2009/10 (COI H4) or the previous three monitoring periods the Core Strategy has developed policies to facilitate the identification of additional sites for pitches.

Policy implications
Whilst the current IPG policy has been effective in protecting the existing site and pitches for Gypsy and Travellers, the policy has not enabled delivery of additional sites. The policy has been updated in the Core Strategy to a criteria based policy to facilitate the identification and delivery of any additional sites effectively through the forthcoming Site and Placemaking DPD.

Specialist Housing

Policies monitored: CP24 Special Needs and Specialist Housing

Relevant indicators: LOI 43

The Student Accommodation Report published in September 2009 identifies the need to supply 2,700 bed spaces over the next 5 years to meet growing demand in the borough. Of this, 447 bed spaces have already been delivered in the 2008-09 monitoring period and a further 335 bed spaces in the 2009-10 monitoring period (LOI 43) on top of which over a 1,000 more bed spaces are still under construction or have received approval but not yet started. Fig 15 shows the spatial distribution of purpose built student accommodations in the 2009/10 monitoring period.

Policy implications
As highlighted by the indicator findings, the number of student rooms delivered in the current and past monitoring periods has been notably high. Continuing this high rate of delivery will result in exceeding the identified need significantly early, which may compromise delivery of other Council priorities, including affordable housing.

To ensure the continued sustainable delivery of student accommodation, policy in the Core Strategy has been strengthened, requiring the Council to work more closely with the borough’s universities in order that student accommodation continues to be delivered at the right time, right location and in the right quantity.
Maintaining Housing Quality

Policies monitored: CP23 Efficient Use and Retention of Existing Housing

Relevant indicators: LOI 14 and SEI 3

With a high demand for housing in the borough, the Council continues to be committed to efficiently using and retaining existing housing by resisting the loss of all residential dwellings, unless there are suitable plans for its full replacement. During the 2009/10 monitoring period, there was no net loss of dwellings, as the 214 residential dwellings lost (LOI 14) were replaced in the same development scheme.

The Council also endeavours to maximise the use of all existing stock by reducing the number of empty homes from both private and public sector stock and improve all existing housing by bringing them up to the Government’s Decent Homes Standard. This monitoring period has seen a continuation of the Council’s success in reducing the number of homes that are classified as non decent. The 2009/10 period saw the number of homes classified as non decent drop once more to 55.95% from 57.61% (SEI 3).
Policy Implications
The policy, as highlighted by the current and previous four AMRs, has proven to be valuable in not only resisting the net loss of dwellings in the borough, but also achieving a steady increase in the number of homes that meet the Decent Homes Standards.

With the policy still fit for purpose, it has been incorporated without any significant changes into the Core Strategy. The continued performance of the policy will be reported in future AMRs to ensure the positive trend continues.

Delivering Sustainable Housing Density

Policies monitored: CP20 Sustainable Residential Density

Relevant indicators: LOI 45

The high demand for all types of housing in the borough requires the Council to seek to maximise residential densities on individual sites, taking into consideration: the local context; site accessibility; housing mix and type as well as the need to achieve high quality, well designed homes; maximise resource efficiency; minimise adverse environmental impacts and also taking into consideration the capacity of social and physical infrastructure and open spaces; and to ensure the most efficient use of land within the borough.

The average density of new development in the borough is 406 habitable rooms per hectare (hr/ha) (LOI 45), lower than the 579 hr/ha reported in the 2008/09 monitoring period. This is based on the calculation used in previous AMRs, but shows a deviation from the pattern. The Council will be investigating this density result further in the new year.

Fig 16 shows the density of developments of over 10 units that were completed in the monitoring period. The map also distinguishes between areas of the borough that are central and urban in character, with central areas allowing for higher densities.

Policy Implications
Following an increase in housing density in the 2008/09 period, this monitoring period has seen a significant decrease by 173 habitable rooms per hectare. To ensure future housing density levels are at suitable levels the Core Strategy has strengthened the policy requiring new developments to not only optimise the use of land but ensure housing density corresponds to public transport accessibility levels and to the proximity and hierarchy of the nearby town centre.
Fig 16: Residential Density 2009/10
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Creating Liveable and Healthy Neighbourhoods

Life expectancy is one of the key measures of local health inequality. Life expectancy is an estimate of the average number of years an individual, born today, would be expected to live if current mortality rates continue to apply. According to the NHS Tower Hamlets’ Annual Report (2008/09), life expectancy in the borough, based on the latest available data is 75.3 years for men (compared to 73.9 for 2002/04) and 80.24 years for women (compared to 79.3 years for 2003/04). These figures are slightly lower than the average life expectancy in England which is 77.7 years for males and 81.8 years for females.

Furthermore, life expectancy also varies within the borough from ward to ward. For example life expectancy of a boy born in Bethnal Green North is 8.5 years less than that for a boy born in Millwall and that of a girl born in Limehouse is 5.7 years less than for a girl born in Bromley-by-Bow.

Healthy Living

Policies monitored: CP28 Healthy Living

Relevant indicators: LOI 17, LOI 42 and SEI 4

In partnership with NHS Tower Hamlets, the Council is consistently working to ensure good quality, appropriate, new and refurbished healthcare facilities continue to be provided to support current and growing populations.

For the 2009/10 monitoring period, Tower Hamlets had the equivalent of 62.1 whole time GPs per 100,000 population (LOI 17). Whilst this figure is higher than the target of 59 GPs per 100,000, this nevertheless does represent a fall for Tower Hamlets from the 2008/09 monitoring period of 74.6 GPs per 100,000 population.

Furthermore, although no new healthcare facilities have been created, major refurbishments of existing facilities has resulted in increased capacity and services, ensuring facilities are able to continue meeting demand (SEI 4).

Major refurbishments have included providing additional staff accommodation at the Bethnal Green Health Centre. Completed in December 2009, the centre is now DDA compliant and provides improved waiting and patient facilities.

The Mile End Hospital Therapy Unit has also been fully refurbished to provide extended clinical accommodation for both adult and children’s physiotherapy services.

The Docklands Medical Centre undertook their own major redevelopment, increasing the size and quality of the clinical space as well as providing space for a new dental practice.

A range of GP practices have also been upgraded to facilitate additional clinical training facilities and other improved patient environments.

Some of these refurbishments have been made possible through s106 agreements, which secured a total of £1,361 per residential unit for health purposes in 2009/10 (LOI 42). The amount secured has decreased from the previous monitoring period when £1,659 per residential unit was secured.
Policy Implications
Despite the decrease in the number of GPs per 100,000 population, most likely attributed to the growing population as opposed to an actual drop in the number of GPs, the policy is still performing well in ensuring the indicator remains above the target level. The policy has also been effective in facilitating the refurbishment of healthcare facilities.

The policy has been consolidated into a more holistic policy in the Core Strategy addressing the many factors which contribute to healthy living, from encouraging active lifestyle by providing high quality walking and cycling routes to providing high quality leisure centres.

Community Facilities

Policies monitored: CP27 High Quality Social and Community Facilities

Relevant indicators: LOI 16, SEI 5 and SEI 6

Accessible high quality social and community facilities play an important role in ensuring local people have the opportunity to lead active lifestyles. It also encourages participation in community activities, which can have positive outcomes for mental health and social cohesion.

According to the Council’s 2009/10 Annual Residents Survey, 47% of respondents were satisfied with sports and leisure facilities (LOI 16), up from 45% in the previous period. Visits to public libraries and Idea Stores also saw an increase, with 9,396 visits per 1,000 population (SEI 5) compared to the previous year’s figure of 9,285. Similarly, there has also been an increase in the number of visits to leisure centres, with figures going up from 1,722,240 to 1,855,324 annually (SEI 6).

Policy Implications
With all three indicators showing improvements over the previous monitoring period, it is clear the IPG policy has been effective in ensuring improvements continue to be delivered to community facilities, realised by increasing number of visits.

The policy has been developed in the Core Strategy to maximise opportunities to deliver facilities as part of new developments in accessible places.
Creating a Blue and Green Grid

Although the borough has a number of large open spaces such as Victoria Park, Mile End Park and Millwall Park, along with a number of smaller local parks, the provision of such publicly accessible open spaces does vary across the borough. Redressing this imbalance and increasing the provision of publicly accessible open space is one of the major challenges within the borough, but one the Council remains committed to overcome.

Open Space

Policies monitored: CP30 Improving the Quality and Quantity of Open Spaces

Relevant indicators: LOI 15 and LOI 22

Whilst the total amount of publicly accessible open space in the borough has increased slightly from 246 to 246.33 hectares (LOI 22) following the delivery of the Braham Street Park in Aldgate, the amount of open space per 1,000 population continues to see a steady decrease within the same period, dropping from 1.15ha per 1,000 population in the 2006/07 monitoring period to the current level of 1.05ha per 1,000 population. This decrease in the open space standard can be attributed to the continued population growth as opposed to actual loss of open space. Fig 16 shows the existing public open space in the borough.

The Council has developed a Green Grid for Tower Hamlets which consists of a network of interlinked high quality and multi functional open spaces, waterways and other corridors which will also increase accessibility to existing open spaces. The Council will also encourage new developments along the Green Grid to provide additional publicly accessible open spaces.

In addition to the Tower Hamlets Green Grid, the Council is also working with partners to deliver the wider East London Green Grid Programme and to ensure continued access to the Olympic Park for local residents after the 2012 Games.

The number of parks in the Borough awarded the Green Flag Award, which recognise a clear improvement to parks and green spaces and rely on independent verification, has remained constant. These are Island Gardens, King Edward Memorial Park, Mile End Park, Millwall Park, Trinity Square Gardens and Weavers Fields (LOI 15). This represents a third of the borough’s open space and are highlighted in the Fig 17.

Policy Implications

As indicated above, the current IPG policy has been effective in maintaining the amount of publicly accessible open space, however there are concerns as to whether it is feasible or even possible to maintain the open space standards of 1.20 ha per 1,000 population in the face of a growing population.

Acknowledging this, whilst the amended policy in the Core Strategy is still committed to delivering new publicly accessible open spaces, the emphasis has been shifted from the quantity of open space delivered, by removing the open space standard from the policy, to the quality, connectivity and accessibility of current and future spaces. The performance of the updated policy will continue to be monitored and reported in subsequent AMRs.
Flood Risk and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems

Policies monitored: CP37 Flood Alleviation
DEV21 Flood Risk Management
DEV8 Sustainable Drainage

Relevant indicators: COI E1, SEI 18 and SEI 20

Bordered by the Thames on the south and the River Lea on the east, large portions of the borough are susceptible to flooding. To reduce this risk, it is necessary for development permitted in flood zones to incorporate measures to mitigate the impact of flooding into their design.

In response to this requirement, no applications during the monitoring period were granted permission contrary to EA advice on flooding and water quality grounds (COI E1), nor were any...
applications approved that did not meet the sequential test for managing flood risk (SEI 20). Whilst incorporation of SUDS remains a continuing priority for the borough, there is currently no system in place to monitor the implementation of this policy. Arrangements are underway to ensure the information is captured (SEI 18) and will be reported on once data becomes available.

Policy Implications
As highlighted by the indicators, policies CP37 and DEV 21 in the IPG have both performed well in ensuring no applications were granted which would impact on flood risk. These policies have been consolidated in the Core Strategy to continue to improve upon flood prevention and mitigation through a number of measures, ranging from using the Sequential Test to assess and determine the suitability of land for development to ensuring all designs for development are flood resilient.

The policy on SUDS has been strengthened in the Core Strategy to encompass all developments as opposed to just those affecting watercourses. However, there is still no resolution on monitoring the implementation of SUDS. There is scope for this to be addressed in the forthcoming Development Management DPD.

Biodiversity and Local Nature Reserves

Policies monitored: CP33 Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation
CP36 Water Environment and Waterside Walkways

Relevant indicators: COI E2, LOI 23 and SEI 19

Areas of biodiversity importance in the borough have remained at the same level as the 2008/9 monitoring period (COI E2). Furthermore, information provided by Greenspace Information for Greater London also shows that there has been no loss or change in the population of species identified in the Local Biodiversity Action Plan (SEI 19).

The current amount of land designated as Local Nature Reserve is 441.2 ha. There has been no net loss in Local Nature Reserves within the Borough since annual monitoring began in 2005 (LOI 23).

Policy Implications
With no net loss of local nature reserves, areas of biodiversity importance and population of species, the policies are proving to be effective with no need for amendments or alterations. The policy has been adopted into the Core Strategy with little amendment and will continue to be monitored.

Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation

Policies monitored: CP33 Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation

Relevant Indicator: LOI 24

The amount of land designated as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) remains at 24.80 ha with no net loss since the first iteration of the AMR (LOI 24).
Policy Implications
Similar to local nature reserves, there has been no net loss in Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation over the last 5 monitoring periods. It is clear therefore that the policy is continuing to prove effective with no need for amendments or alterations. The policy has been adopted into the Core Strategy with little amendment and will continue to be monitored.

Green Chains

Policies monitored: CP34 Green Chains

Relevant indicators: LOI 25

The amount of land designated as Green Chain has also remained constant at 16.84 ha with no net loss over the last 5 monitoring periods (LOI 25). Furthermore, the Council plans to increase the Green Chain through the implementation of the Tower Hamlets Green Grid project.

Policy Implications
Similar to the policy on SINCs, this policy is also proving effective in preventing the loss of Green Chains and does not require any intervention. However, with uneven provision of open space across the borough, accessibility is an issue in parts of the borough.

To redress this the Green Chain policy, renamed the Green Grid in the Core Strategy, has been expanded and strengthened to not only increase the land designated for Green Grid, but to also protect, enhance and connect existing spaces and increase accessibility. Progress on the policy’s performance will be reported in future AMRs.

River Quality

Policies monitored: CP36 Water Environment and Waterside Walkways

Relevant indicator: LOI 26

Biological river quality is monitored by the Environment Agency. The survey site for the Grand Union Canal in Tower Hamlets is at Solbay Street, Mile End.

The biological general quality assessment grade for this stretch for the 2009/10 monitoring period remains the same as the previous period at E, reflecting a poor quality with biology restricted to pollution tolerant species (LOI 26).

Policy Implications
With no improvement in water quality at the Mile End survey site, it is clear that more needs to be done to improve the river quality. Existing IPG policy has been consolidated into the Core Strategy to provide a more holistic policy to ensure waterways are of a high quality, usable and accessible.
Dealing with Waste

Waste Management

Policies monitored: CP39 Sustainable Waste Management and Development Control
DEV 15 Waste and Recyclables Storage

Relevant Indicators: COI W1, COI W2, LOI 27 and SEI 17

As in the previous monitoring period, no new waste facilities have been developed in the borough (COI W1).

As the table below shows, the borough produced 106,420 tonnes in the 2009/10 monitoring period, a slight rise from 105,198 tonnes produced in the 2008/09 period. Waste recycling has also increased by 5,000 tonnes with the amount going to landfill decreasing by almost 20,000 tonnes (COI W2). Fig 18 provides a breakdown of all waste managed by type.

Fig 18: Household Waste Generated and Managed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator COI W2</th>
<th>Recycled, Reused, Composted</th>
<th>Landfill</th>
<th>Reuse Derived Fuel / Energy from Waste</th>
<th>Moisture Loss through Mechanical Biological Treatment</th>
<th>Total waste arising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of waste arising in tonnes</td>
<td>20,566.11</td>
<td>66,007.93</td>
<td>8,710.77</td>
<td>11,135.93</td>
<td>106,420.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2009/10 monitoring period has seen a significant increasing in the percentage of household waste recycled, reused or composted, increase from 15% to 26.52% towards the target of 30% by 2016 since the previous monitoring period (LOI 27 and SEI 17).

Policy Implications
As highlighted by the indicator findings, the policy is proving to be effective in increasing the amount of waste being recycled and reducing the amount of waste directed to landfill sites. The improvement in recycling can also be attributed to the proactive effort of the Council to raise awareness of recycling through adverts, press releases and other high profile campaigns.

The policy has been expanded in the Core Strategy, providing greater detail as well as identifying potential sites for a new waste management facility to be detailed in the forthcoming Site and Placemaking DPD. As with other policies, waste policies will continue to be monitored and reported on for continued effectiveness.
Issues and Actions

Whilst the majority of the policies have continued to perform well, analysis of the indicator findings have identified some issues that require further consideration and action to resolve.

Despite continuing to deliver a high number of housing, the number of net additional dwellings completed in the 2009/10 monitoring period has declined in comparison with the previous period. However, as indicated by the housing trajectory the Council expects to deliver significantly more new housing in the 2010/11 period, exceeding the London Plan target. The Council is also on track to deliver its full housing target over the lifetime of the Core Strategy. Any review of annual housing delivery needs to be considered in relation to the longer term trend.

Whilst the Council recognises the importance of continuing to provide student accommodation, the rate at which these are being delivered (782 bed spaces over the last two monitoring periods) is becoming a cause for concern. Continuing such a high rate of delivery is unsustainable and may compromise delivery of the Council’s other commitments. The Council is therefore closely monitoring delivery of student housing.

Despite open space policy proving to be effective in maintaining and increasing the quantity of open space, in the face of a growing population maintaining the standard of 1.2ha per 1,000 population is proving to be extremely difficult, the standard slipping year on year.

Actions to remedy the issues set out above have already been implemented by strengthening or amending the related policies in the Core Strategy. These have included:

• Prioritising the delivery of additional housing at identified locations in the borough
• Increasing the percentage of affordable housing delivered on sites
• Ensure the right quantity of student housing is delivered at appropriate locations through closer working with the borough’s universities
• Shifting the emphasis on open space from quantity to quality by removing the open space standard from the policy and developing a sophisticated and deliverable programme of works for improving quality, connectivity and accessibility of existing open spaces
Enabling Prosperous Communities

Delivering Successful Employment Hubs

Both the latest Annual Business Inquiry (ABI, 2008) and the Annual Population Survey (APS, Dec 2009) indicates that the number of businesses and jobs created in the borough have continued to grow. However, the labour market remains fragile in Tower Hamlets and London as the economy slowly recovers from recession and downturn. It is important to note that there does exist a one year time lag from data collection to the publication of the ABI.

In 2008 there were approximately 204,000 jobs and 11,789 businesses in the borough. The ABI data results confirm the continuing growth of employment in Tower Hamlets. The number of jobs reflects as an increase of 1.5% compared to the previous year. The majority of this job growth has centred around Canary Wharf, where around 3,500 additional jobs were created.

The Banking, Finance and Insurance sectors continue to be the largest employers in the borough, providing approximately 112,900 jobs. However, the number of jobs in this sector has slowed down, increasing by only 1.4% (1,524 jobs) between 2007 and 2008.

The second largest employer in the borough is the Public Administration, Education and Health sector, which now provides 34,000 jobs and which demonstrated a growth of above average 3.3% between 2007 and 2008.

According to the Annual Population Survey, Tower Hamlets has one of the lowest employment rates in the country at 59.6% compared to the national average of 70.7% and the regional average of 68.3%. However, this is still above the national target of 55.7%.

Furthermore, there also exists a 25% point gap between the employment rate of ethnic minority groups (48.6%) and the white ethnic group (73.4%) with the Pakistani and Bangladeshi employment rate continuing to remain the lowest, as it has done so for the last 5 years.

Despite a recent drop in the overall employment rate of all ethnic minority group in the 2009/10 monitoring period, this is against a backdrop of long term increases. The employment rate for the White ethnic group has improved between 2004 and 2008 and has remained stable in 2009.

Unemployment and levels of economic inactivity continue to be considerably higher than the London average. For the period January 2009 to December 2009, Tower Hamlets had an unemployment rate of 14.7%, the highest in London.

Analysis of Jobseekers Allowance (JSA) claimants provides a more up to date indication of the likely impact of the economic downturn on the borough’s labour market. In Tower Hamlets the number of JSA claimants has increased from 9,880 in April 2009 to 10,365 in March 2010. This represents an increase of 5%, lower than the London increase of 8.6% over the same period.

The majority of JSA claimants state that they are seeking employment in sales and customer service, elementary, administrative & secretarial and skilled trades occupations.
Job Creation

Policies monitored: CP7 Job Creation and Growth

Relevant indicators: LOI 2 and SEI 11

Whilst past iterations of the AMR provided the absolute percentage of the people claiming out of work benefits for indicator SEI 11, the indicator target has been revised to reflect how the borough is performing in comparison to national levels.

Therefore, the data provided is no longer an absolute percentage, rather it is presented as a percentage point gap, for which the target is below 5.7%. The percentage point gap for this monitoring period is 4.9%, lower than the previous monitoring period of 5.4% point gap (SEI 11).

Furthermore, according to the most recent figures from the Annual Business Inquiry there were 3,109 new jobs in the borough (for 2007/08) (LOI 2), 3,046 less than the previous year which was 6,155 jobs.

Policy implications
Whilst the policy has performed well with regards to reducing the gap between number of people claiming out of work benefits between national levels and borough level, its performance with regards to the number of new jobs created has dropped in comparison to the previous monitoring period.

The policy has been consolidated in the Core Strategy to a more holistic policy addressing the range of matters required to delivering successful employment hubs, including the need to create jobs and improve education and skills to increase the chances of those residents who are out work to secure employment.

Working in the Borough

Policies monitored: CP7 Job Creation and Growth

Relevant indicators: LOI 3 and SEI 13

Due to the source of the data being the 2001 Census, there is no updated data for indicator LOI 3, and the 61% quoted as the percentage of residents working outside of the borough in this and past AMR cannot be verified. (LOI 3, SEI 13)).

Policy Implications
Due to a lack of up to date data, it has not been possible to analyse of the findings to understand any implications on policy. However, as mentioned in the previous section, the policy has been consolidated into the Core Strategy.
Employment Floorspace

Policies monitored: CP10 Strategic Industrial Locations and local Industrial Locations

Relevant indicators: COI BD1

Following a net increase of 33,731 sqm across all employment use classes in the past monitoring period, this period has seen a net loss of 33,129 sqm (COI BD1). Fig 19 provides a breakdown by use classes.

Fig 19: Gain/Loss of Employment Floorspace 2009/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use class</th>
<th>Gross (sq m)</th>
<th>Net (sq m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1a</td>
<td>9,607</td>
<td>-12,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1c</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>-16,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,987</strong></td>
<td><strong>-33,129</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The net loss of B1a floorspace is primarily due to the change of use from employment to residential, with the largest loss of 11,103 sqm in Marsh Wall where two towers providing 763 residential units along with some other uses were developed. A further loss of 6,085 sqm occurred at Whitechapel at the former Goodmans Fields site which, saw a change of use from employment to delivering 252 residential units.

There was also a loss of 2,918 sqm at Anchorage House in Blackwall where one floor has been changed from B1a employment to tribunal hearing rooms.

The biggest loss of B8 employment space occurred at Wick Lane, Fish Island, which saw a loss of 4,650 sqm following the development of a 7 storey building comprising 104 live/work units. Further losses occurred at Millharbour, Millwall, where 512 residential units replaced the 4,421 sqm of B8 space. Smaller losses also took place at locations throughout the borough. Fig 20 shows the locations for office floorspace completions (gain/loss) for 2009/10.

Policy implications

Despite the large loss of employment space in this monitoring period, this is not a reflection of the performance of the policy, as the priority is to protect employment space in the Strategic Industrial Locations (SIL) and Local Industrial Locations (LIL). These losses have occurred at locations outside of SILs and LILs, however, this is still a matter which needs to be given further consideration.

The Core Strategy for example, has expanded the IPG policy to more effectively manage employment land. The policy has retained some existing SIL and LIL designations whilst introducing new ones. There are also designations for Preferred Office Locations and Local Office Locations as well as encouraging employment uses in town centres, edge-of-town centres and along main street locations. The performance and effectiveness of the policy will be monitored to ensure the quantity of employment floorspace is not lost to other uses.
Workspace for Small Businesses

Policies monitored: CP9 Employment Space for Small Businesses

Relevant indicators: LOI 5

New business rate registration in the borough for the 2009/10 monitoring period has fallen just below the target with 117.5 new businesses registered per 10,000 adult residents (LOI 5). This is a slight decrease from the 124.6 businesses registered the previous monitoring period.

Policy Implications
Despite only a slight decrease in the number of new businesses registered, the policy is still performing well especially taking into consideration the economic downturn. The policy has been strengthened and expanded in the Core Strategy to support for micro businesses and this will continue to be reported on.
**Employment Land Availability**

**Policies monitored:** CP10 Strategic Industrial Locations and local Industrial Locations

**Relevant indicators:** COI BD3

Land available for employment uses is made up of designated employment sites (Local and Strategic Industrial Locations), sites allocated in the Interim Planning Guidance and sites for which planning permission has been granted for B1 (a), (b), and (c), B2 and B8 uses but not yet completed. The Borough seeks to protect key locations to keep in industrial use.

Following three periods of steady decrease in employment land, this monitoring period has seen a slight increase with the amount of employment land available going up from 84.6 hectares to 86.5 hectares. The increase may be a reflection of small employment spaces being delivered across the borough in mixed use developments such as at Caspian Wharf in Bromley by Bow, Rodwell House in Spitalfields and Parmiter Industrial Estate in Bethnal Green.

A number of schemes in designated employment sites are delivering large quantities of employment space such as in Wood Wharf and Westferry Circus, and so are accounted for this way when calculating land availability.

**Policy Implications**

Despite the slight increase in availability of employment land in the current period, this needs to be understood in context with the past year on year decrease.

To ensure the borough has sustainable levels of employment land, the Core Strategy has developed comprehensive policies on maintaining and delivering land suitable for a range of employment uses by identifying Strategic Industrial Locations and Local Industrial Locations as well as designating parts of the borough as Preferred Office Locations and Local Office Locations. Employment land availability will continue to be monitored closely to ensure the Core Strategy policy is performing as expected.

**Employment Space on Previously Developed Land**

**Policies monitored:** CP9 Employment Space for Small Businesses

**Core Strategy:** SP06.3c

**Relevant indicators:** COI BD2

Similar to previous AMRs, all floorspace developed for employment uses in the borough during the 2009/10 monitoring period was completed on brownfield, previously developed on land (COI BD2).

**Policy Implications**

Given that all floorspace developed in the borough has been on previously developed land, no further amendment is required to this policy. Whilst there is no specific policy addressing this issue in the Core Strategy, there is scope to incorporate this in to the Development Management DPD to ensure this positive achievement continues.
Office Development

Policies monitored: CP8 Tower Hamlets’ Global Financial and Business Centre and the Central Activities Zone

Relevant indicators: COI BD1

For detailed breakdown of employment floorspace gain/loss please refer to the Employment Floorspace section on page 42.

It should be noted that due to existing permissions granted by the London Docklands Development Corporation, not all changes to office floorspace in Canary Wharf can be captured. The monitoring team are looking for better ways to monitor this data so that it can be included in future AMRs.

Fig 20 shows changes in office floorspace in the borough (excluding Canary Wharf Estate) during the monitoring period. This also makes reference to the Central Activities Zone (CAZ), which is an area designated in the London Plan and local planning policy (CP8) as making an important contribution to regional employment growth. CAZ uses are primarily commercial office and associated business and the Council promotes the expansion of these uses in local planning policy. The map shows there was no loss of office floorspace in the CAZ.

Policy Implications
Please see Employment Floorspace section on page 42.

Vacant Employment Floorspace

Policies monitored: CP10 Strategic Industrial Locations and local Industrial Locations

Relevant indicators: LOI 4 and LOI 6

Vacant B1a floorspace was recorded in Bromley by Bow, Canary Wharf South and Bethnal Green South (LOI 4). This information was collected qualitatively and not quantitatively for the 2009 Employment Land Study. No vacant land was recorded in designated employment areas (LOI 6).

Local Industrial Locations (LIL) and Strategic Industrial Locations (SIL) are policy designations in local planning policy to retain, expand and intensify industrial employment (B1c, B2, B8) and associated industrial activities. No vacant land was recorded in designated employment areas Fish Island SIL, Empson Street/St. Andrew’s Way SIL, Gillender Street SIL and Poplar Business Park LIL (LOI 6). This information will be used to inform the forthcoming Site and Place-Making DPD.

Policy Implications
The Delivering Successful Economic Hub policy in the Core Strategy has consolidated, expanded and strengthened the numerous existing policies in the IPG to address issues of vacant floorspace. Amongst other things, the policy encourages the retention and promotion of flexible workspaces in town centres and along main streets, locations where vacancies have been reported in LOI 4.
Hotel Development

Policies monitored: CP13 Hotels, Serviced Apartment and Conference Centres

Relevant indicators: LOI 7

This monitoring period saw no new hotel rooms being delivered (LOI 17), in stark contrast to previous monitoring periods which saw between a high of 445 (2006/07) new room being delivered to 168 (2008/09) within one monitoring period.

Policy Implications
The wide swing in the delivery of hotel rooms needs to be addressed to ensure that delivery of new hotel rooms in the future are neither too high nor too low. Whilst the policy on hotels has been incorporated in the Core Strategy, the policy is limited to identifying broad locations suitable for hotels as the remit of the Core Strategy does not extend to providing guidance on the quantity of rooms being delivered. Such details will be addressed in the Site and Placemaking DPD and Development Management DPD.
Improving Education and Skills

In 2009 66.3% of pupils achieved 5 A* to C grades at GCSE level, exceeding the national target of 60% and closing in on the England average of 70%. The achievement represents a substantial increase of 7.2% points on the previous year (59.1%).

Many job opportunities in Tower Hamlets’ growth industries require NVQ4+ level qualifications. Tower Hamlets averages are constantly improving and the borough average of 36.8% is now relatively close to the London average of 39.7%.

Policies monitored: CP29 Improving Education and Skills

Relevant indicators: LOI 19, LOI 20, LOI 21 and LOI 40

The percentage of residents aged 16-74 with no formal qualifications in the borough continues to fluctuate annually. Whilst last year the figure rose from 19.2% to 23.7%, this monitoring period has seen a significant drop to 15.2%, nearly 10% lower than the target of no more than 25% (LOI 19).

In contrast to the fluctuation for indicator LOI 19, the percentage of young people aged 16-18 not in education, employment or training has seen a steady reduction over the last five monitoring periods, falling from 11.00% in 2006/07 to the current figure of 6.00% (LOI 20).

Whilst the number of young people in education, employment or training has been increasing, the number of enrolments on adult education courses has seen a slight drop, with the figure falling to 54.5 per 1,000 adult population (LOI 21), from 56.1 per 1,000 population in 2008/09. The current number falls significantly short of the 80 per 1,000 target.

Planning obligations has secured £1,753 per residential unit for educational purposes, an increase from the last monitoring period of £1,590 per residential unit (LOI 40).

Policy Implications

As indicator data shows, the policy has demonstrated a varied performance, performing exceptionally well in some regards and less so in others. Nonetheless, the entire policy has been rewritten and expanded upon in the Core Strategy to improve education and skills through addressing a wide range of matters from increasing the provision of primary and secondary education facilities to supporting the skills training and education of residents. The policy will continue to be monitored for effectiveness.
Reducing Poverty

Policies monitored: CP2 Equality of Opportunity

Relevant Indicators: SEI 12

The percentage of children living in households with relative low income has seen a steady decrease over the last 4 years, dropping from 63.6% in 2006/07 to 48% in the current monitoring period (SEI 12), a 15.6% reduction.

Policy Implications
The policy has been performing well over the past 4 years. Whilst policies in the Core Strategy do not specifically address low income families, the policies in the Improving Education and Skills section of the Core Strategy will contribute to ensuring the figure continues to drop.
Issues and Actions
Analysis of indicator data for the Enabling Prosperous Communities section has highlighted a number of issues which require action to resolve.

Key amongst these is the net loss of B1a employment floorspace, which, following a net increase of 13,142 sqm in the previous monitoring period, has seen a net loss of 12,280 sqm, almost offsetting the previous period's gain.

Although there is no direct evidence with loss of employment floorspace, the number of new jobs created in the borough has also dropped. Whereas in the previous monitoring period 6,155 new jobs were created, in this period there was only 3,109 new jobs created, a drop of 3,046.

Despite the delivery of hotel rooms taking a wide swing from delivering too many rooms in the last monitoring period to none at all in the current period, the differences are balanced out over the longer term. The Council will continue to monitor and manage this closely to ensure the right amount of rooms are delivered annually.

There is also concern with the drop in the number of enrolments on adult education courses. From a high of 74.87 per 1,000 population in 2006/07, the number of enrolments has dropped to 54.5 per 1,000 population, significantly lower than the target of 80.

Some actions have already been taken in the Core Strategy to redress the under performance of policies including:

• Designating certain areas in the borough either as Preferred Office Location suitable for large floor plate offices, or as Local Office Locations suitable for a range and mix of employment to deliver additional employment floorspaces.

• Supporting the retention and promotion of flexible workspaces in town centres, edge of town centres and along main streets to cater for the needs of small and medium enterprises.

• Developing a comprehensive policy dedicated to improving education and skills in the borough amongst young people and the adult population to address the drop in the number of enrolments in adult education courses.

• Expanding Core Strategy policy on new hotels in the forthcoming Site and Placemaking DPD and Development Management DPD, to ensure the right quantity of hotel rooms are delivered at the right locations at the right time.
Designing a High Quality City

Making Connected Places

Car-free Developments and Travel Plans

Policies monitored:  CP40 A Sustainable Transport Network
                  CP42 Streets for People
                  DEV18 Travel Plans

Relevant indicators: LOI 28 and LOI 29

Car free developments help to tackle climate change and promote healthier, less car dependant lifestyles whilst also encouraging more sustainable, greener-city living. The borough has performed exceptionally well in securing car-free agreements, with 100% of approved major residential developments (LOI 28) being car free.

There has also been a significant increase in the number of travel plans that have been submitted with major applications, from a low of 5% in 2006/07 to 75.93% in the 2009/10 monitoring period (LOI 29) against 32% in the previous monitoring period.

Fig 21 shows the location of developments that are car free and those with submitted travel plans.

Policy Implications
The policy on both car free developments and travel plans have been performing strongly in the current and the past three monitoring periods, with no need for further intervention. As a result they have been adopted in to the Core Strategy with no alterations.
Fig 21: Car Free Agreements and Travel Plans 2009/10
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Cycle and Pedestrian Network

Policies monitored: CP40 A Sustainable Transport Network  
CP42 Streets for People  
DEV18 Travel Plans

Relevant indicators: LOI 30

Whilst there has been no increase in the total distance of dedicated cycle routes (standing at 53.3km) or pedestrian walkways (consisting of riverside walkways and green chains totalling 32.5km) (LOI 30), there have been significant improvements to the quality of routes and connections through projects such as the Cycle Superhighway and Meath Bridge over the Regents Canal at Bethnal Green.

Policy Implications
Despite the improvement to the quality of cycle and pedestrian networks, there has still been no increase in the total distance. Furthermore, whilst the Core Strategy policy places great importance in attractive and safe streets that prioritise cyclists and pedestrians, there is still no explicit policy to increasing the total distance. There is scope to address the matter in the forthcoming Development Management DPD and the Site and Placemaking DPD.

Public Transport

Policies monitored: CP40 A Sustainable Transport Network  
CP43 Better Public Transport

Relevant indicators: LOI 31

Following a 4% drop in the 2008/09 monitoring period, satisfaction levels with public transport according to the Annual Residents Survey has increased from 65% to 67% (LOI 31).

Policy Implications
The policy is performing well as indicated by the increase in satisfaction levels in the current and preceding years. Building on this performance, the Core Strategy has developed the policy further by setting out a hierarchy of interchanges, commitment to increasing capacity through a range of projects as well as increasing accessibility, all of which combined will assist in delivering a high quality public transport network.
Creating Attractive and Safe Streets and Spaces

Accessible and Inclusive Design

Policies monitored: CP46 Accessible and Inclusive Environments
DEV3 Accessibility and Inclusive Design
DEV24 Accessible Amenities and Services

Relevant Indicators: LOI 33

The Council is committed to ensuring all development is accessible to the whole population. To enable this, the Council dedicates an Access Officer to comment on and provide direction to planning applications. The number of applications which have received comments from the Access Officer has seen a significant improvement, going up to 61% (LOI 33) 41% from the 2008/09 monitoring period.

Policy Implications

Whilst all the policies monitored in relation to the indicator support the creation of inclusive and accessible designs and environments and have performed well in this regard, none of them specifically require comments from an Access Officer. Neither is this matter addressed in the Core Strategy, however there is scope to address this in the detailed policies of the Development Management DPD and Building Control practice that is currently being prepared to ensure the continuation of the positive trend.

Public Safety

Policies monitored: CP47 Community Safety and DEV4 Safety and Security

Relevant indicators: LOI 35, SEI 9 and SEI 10

The borough has a good track record in preventing domestic burglaries. The last four years has seen a steady drop in the number of such burglaries, dropping from 16.95 per 1,000 households in 2006/07 to 10.3 per 1,000 households in the 2009/10 monitoring period (LOI 35, SEI 9), lower than the target of 18.5 per 1,000 households.

However, the percentage of hate crime investigated resulting in formal action has seen a significant drop from a high of 68% in the 2008/09 monitoring period to a low of 25% in the 2009/10 period, against a target of 80% (SEI 10).

Policy Implications

Given the contrasting performance of the two indicators, it is clear that the policies need to be reviewed to ensure positive performance for both indicators. To achieve this, the policy has been incorporated into a more overarching policy on creating attractive and safe streets and places in the Core Strategy to provide a more comprehensive approach to community safety. The indicator will continue to be reported upon to ensure the positive trend continues.
**Environmental Well-being**

**Policies monitored:** CP46 Accessible and Inclusive Environments  
CP47 Community Safety  
DEV3 Accessibility and Inclusive Design  
DEV4 Safety and Security

**Relevant Indicators:** SEI 15 and SEI 21

The number of noise related complaints, having seen a rise in the 2008/09 monitoring period, has now seen a decrease in the 2009/10 period, falling from 8,015 complaints to 7,609 (SEI 15).

Also, the number of residents who feel they can influence decisions affecting their local area has seen a rise, going up to 53% (SEI 21) from 46% in the previous monitoring period.

**Policy Implications**

With both indicators showing an improved performance the policy will continue to be monitored to ensure performance is sustained.
Creating Distinct and Durable Places

The Built Environment

Policies monitored: CP4 Good Design and DEV2 Character and Design

Relevant indicators: LOI 1

The level of satisfaction with the built environment continues to increase as highlighted by the 2009/10 Annual Residents Survey. The survey showed that 70% of the residents surveyed were satisfied with the built environment (LOI 1), up from 61% the previous year.

Fig 22 shows the levels of satisfaction within the borough by Local Area Partnership areas.

Policy Implications

As the current and past AMR's have highlighted, testament to the Council’s continuing commitment to improvements in all aspects of the built environment, satisfaction levels have continued to increase. The policy has been significantly expanded in the Core Strategy to be more comprehensive, covering the many aspects of the built environment such as the London Squares, locally listed buildings and local landmarks.

Fig 22: Satisfaction with the Built Environment 2009/10
Building for Life

Policies monitored: CP4 Good Design
DEV5 Sustainable Design
DEV8 Sustainable Drainage
DEV9 Sustainable Construction Materials

Relevant indicators: COI H6

The quality of residential buildings has been assessed in line with the Building for Life criteria developed by the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE). Building for Life is the national standard for well designed homes and neighbourhoods. Planning Officers from the Council completed 24 assessments of residential development of 10 units and above in the monitoring period.

The results are shown in Fig 24, with Fig 23 showing the comparison between this and last period’s assessment (COI H6). Fig 25 shows the location of the residential developments assessed.

Fig 23: Building for Life Assessment 2008/09 and 2009/10
### Fig 24: Building for Life Summary 2009/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score and Grade</th>
<th>No of Schemes</th>
<th>Schemes</th>
<th>Number and Percentage of dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Good</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Dwellings: 0 Percentage: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aylward Street, Chicksand Street, Parnham Street, New Road, Gun Street, Duke of York Public House, Burdett Road, Arbour Street, Hackney Road, Tredegar Estate, Indescon Court, Millharbour</td>
<td>Dwellings: 630 Percentage: 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Goodmans Fields, Calvert Avenue, Copenhagen Place, Ability Place, Millharbour, 70 Marsh Wall, Chrisp Street, Mary Jones House, John Lawder House, Commercial Street, Cheshire Street</td>
<td>Dwellings: 1,765 Percentage: 69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 to 15.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Blondin Street, Wick Lane, Gladstone House</td>
<td>Dwellings: 145 Percentage: 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 13.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy Implications**

To ensure developments are of a high quality, the policies related to design have been strengthened in the Core Strategy including making clear reference to the need to ensure design meets Lifetime Homes standards as well as other design requirements. Further detailed policies addressing this issue will be developed through the Development Management DPD and other planning documents including Supplementary Planning Guidance.
Conservation and Local Heritage

Policies monitored: CP49 Historic Environment
DEV2 Character and Design

Relevant indicators: LOI 36, LOI 37, LOI38, LOI 39 and SEI 8

Following the adoption of 7 Conservation Areas in the 2008/09 monitoring period, a further Conservation Area, Limehouse Cut, has been adopted during this monitoring period bringing the total number to 58 (LOI 36). The designations allow the borough to increase protection of its local heritage and historic environment. Fig 26 highlights the location of the new and existing Conservation Areas.

The number of up to date Character Appraisals and Management Proposals for the conservation areas have also increased to 57, leaving just one character appraisal to be prepared for Limehouse Cut (LOI 37, LOI 38).
However, the number of listed buildings at risk has risen from 37 to 49 in the 2009/10 monitoring period (LOI 39). This could be for a number of reasons including better reporting as well as the fact that no planning applications were approved that would result in the loss of Listed Buildings or buildings of value in Conservation Areas (SEI 8).

**Policy Implications**

With the number of conservation areas and areas with up to date Character Appraisals and Management Proposals increasing during the 2009/10 monitoring period, it is clear that the policy on Historic Environment is performing strongly.

However, whilst no applications have been approved that would result in the loss of Listed Buildings within the borough, the number of listed buildings at risk have risen to 49. Building on the successful elements of the policy and to counter elements not performing as intended, the policy has been incorporated in to the Core Strategy to cover all elements of the historic environment and ensure the continuation of the preservation and enhancement of the borough’s built heritage.

**Fig 26: Existing and New Conservation Areas**

![Map of Existing and New Conservation Areas]
Working Towards a Zero Carbon Borough

Renewable Energy

Policies monitored: CP3 Sustainable Environment
CP38 Energy Efficiency and Production of Renewable Energy
DEV6 Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy

Relevant indicators: COI E3

Information on the installation of renewable energy technologies is currently taken at the planning application stage. The data provided for the indicator in Fig 27 is therefore based on a different unit of measurement (COI E3). As the information is obtained during the planning application stage, developments may be subject to further detailed design and value engineering later in the development process. Therefore the actual installed capacity could be different to that expressed within the planning application.

With regards to renewable energy generation, the borough does not have large installed capacity of wind or hydro technologies due to factors such as wind speeds and site constraints. It is also considered that future Biomass proposals will be limited due to air quality and supply/delivery implications.

Whilst guidance for COI E3 requires indicator data to be reported in megawatts, the information provided in planning applications are in different formats. There is difficulty in identifying the capacity of the systems, partly due to the planning application information providing insufficient detail, with the further details to follow as conditions.

It should also be noted that in line with the London Plan Energy Hierarchy, the London Borough of Tower Hamlets encourages the installation of decentralised energy systems. These systems can inhibit the choice of renewable energy technologies as they use the baseload of the development to be viable. Within the borough we have seen an increasing number of proposed Combined Heat and Power (CHP) systems. The installation of a CHP system will inhibit the choice of renewable energy technologies on site to those that do not compete for the thermal load. Therefore the level of installed capacity of renewable energy technologies is also restrained through the requirement to consider a decentralised approach as part of the Energy hierarchy.
Fig 27: Renewable Energy Capacity Installed by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Solar Thermal</th>
<th>PV</th>
<th>GSHP</th>
<th>ASHP</th>
<th>Biomass</th>
<th>Wind</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Resi Approvals</strong></td>
<td>180m² array</td>
<td>2114m² 12kw pv</td>
<td>55no. 100m deep bore holes</td>
<td>8930kgC/yr displaced</td>
<td>4100kw</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100kw Hydrogen fuel cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Resi Completions</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resi Approvals</strong></td>
<td>74m²</td>
<td>4790m² array to displace 12110kw/year</td>
<td>46kw</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>605kw</td>
<td>20 micro turbines 1.25 kw each</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resi Completions</strong></td>
<td>220m² + 18 other panels</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Potential?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>474m² + 18 panels</td>
<td>6,904m² 46kw</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>4705kw</td>
<td>25kw</td>
<td>100kw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy Implications**

It is proposed that a checklist is produced for developers to complete at the application stage and for evidence (photographs) to be provided from the developer following completion of the scheme to ensure the renewable energy technologies proposed at the planning application stage have been integrated into the scheme. This verification method is required in order to fully comply with E3 and enable reporting in the appropriate format (megawatts). As stated this occurs at the planning application stage and further consideration for how this is written into policy will need to be considered.

From a review of consented schemes and completed development information for 09/10 the following technologies are proposed:

- Solar Thermal – 474m²
- PV – 6904m²
- GSHP – 46kW
- Biomass - 4,705kW
- Turbines – 25kW
- Hydrogen Fuel Cell – 100kW
Energy Efficiency

Policies monitored:
CP3 Sustainable Environment
CP38 Energy Efficiency and Production of Renewable Energy
DEV6 Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy

Relevant indicators: SEI 16

The Home Energy Conservation Act (HECA) came into force in 1996 requiring all local authorities to report on improvement in domestic energy efficiency. From 1996 to March 2008 the Council achieved an overall improvement in energy efficiency of 9.71% from existing homes. Since March 2008 local authorities were not requested to submit any further HECA reports due to the introduction of National Indicators.

National Indicator 186: Per capita reduction in CO2 emissions in the local authority area measures end user CO2 emissions in the Local Area from the Industry and Commercial Sector, Domestic Housing and Road Transport. This data is centrally collected and published by Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC), data is currently available for the period of 2005 - 2008. Tower Hamlets CO2 emissions in the local authority area were as follows;

Fig 28: Tower Hamlets CO2 Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry and Commercial (000's tonnes)</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>1,603</td>
<td>1,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic (000's tonnes)</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Transport (000's tonnes)</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (000's tonnes)</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>2,311</td>
<td>2,291</td>
<td>2,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (000's midyear estimates)</td>
<td>214.1</td>
<td>217.2</td>
<td>221.8</td>
<td>226.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita emissions (tonnes)</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% per capita reduction since 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council continues to work closely with Tower Hamlets Homes (THH) and social landlords in the borough to ensure external funding for carrying out energy efficiency improvements to domestic housing sector is secured. Last year THH were able to secure £2.07 million from the Social Housing Energy Savings Programme fund for insulating hard to reach cavity walls. In October 2010 DCLG announced the immediate end of National Indicators. A comprehensive ‘list’ of data that central government will expect local government to report on will replace the National Indicators. This will be worked up by April 2011.
Air Quality

Policies monitored: CP3 Good Design
DEV2 Character and Design

Relevant indicators: SEI 14

A key indicator of air quality is the level of particulate matter present. Particulate matter or PM10 has been measured in terms of the number of days where levels are high or moderate. In the monitoring period there were 4 days recorded at moderate or high levels - 3 days at Poplar and 1 day at Bethnal Green (SEI 14). This is an improvement from 2007/08 when 5 days were recorded. The Borough remains well within its target of no more than 30 days.

Policy Implications
Whilst it is encouraging to note that the continued reduction in the number of days where particulate matter has been high or moderate in Poplar, there clearly are not enough measuring sites - particularly with the closure of the Bethnal Green site in November 2009 - to comprehensively measure particulate matter throughout the borough.
Issues and Actions

Overall, the majority of the policies monitored in this section have performed well, either exceeding the target or showing strong evidence of improvement.

However, there are two areas where policy is not performing as intended. The first is with regards to the distance of cycling routes and pedestrian walkways. Whilst there has been a marked improvement in the quality of cycle routes and pedestrian walkways there has not been any increase in the total distance of the routes and walkways, neither has there been any in the past three monitoring periods.

The second relates to the number of listed buildings at risk. Following a slight drop in the previous monitoring period, this period has seen a large increase in the number of listed buildings at risk, rising from 37 buildings to 49.

Lastly, although the indicator data for Air Quality has shown a drop in the number of days when air pollution has been high or moderate, the closure of the Bethnal Green monitoring site means that there is now only one site measuring air quality in the borough. With a number of major arterial commuter roads coming into the borough, one site is clearly not sufficient to provide a comprehensive measurement of air quality.

Although the Core Strategy addresses the above concerns somewhat, further action needs to be taken through the forthcoming Development Management DPD and Site and Placemaking DPD to address the above issues. Proposed actions include:

- Expanding on the Core Strategy policies in the Development Management DPD to encourage the delivery of further cycle routes and pedestrian walkways
- Strengthen generic policies on listed buildings in the Core Strategy through the Development Management DPD
- Investigate opportunities to increase sites in the borough to measure air quality
**Delivering Placemaking**

Masterplans set out a commitment to monitor development and progress on delivering key infrastructure within their boundaries. This section reports on key implementation projects identified in each of the masterplan areas. Fig 29 shows masterplan areas and other key implementation projects areas.

### Aldgate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>256 completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Net gain of 170 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Movement</td>
<td>Final works to remove Aldgate Gyratory were completed. Public Realm Improvements to Alie Street. 5 new Cycle Hire stations were approved, ready for opening in July 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Provision</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Provision</td>
<td>Planning application submitted for Goodmans Fields including new health facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Open Space</td>
<td>The new Braham Street park has now opened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure, Services and Waste</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Millennium Quarter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1,346 completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Net loss of 6,682 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Movement</td>
<td>The new South Quay station has reopened accommodating the DLR 3-car extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Provision</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Provision</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure, Services and Waste</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Whitechapel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>27 completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Movement</td>
<td>The new East London Line Station was refurbished and opened in June 2010. 3 New Cycle Hire stations were approved and opened in July 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Provision</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Provision</td>
<td>The Royal London Hospital redevelopment continues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Open Space</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure, Services and Waste</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bromley-by-Bow
The Council has commenced work on consolidating the additional work in the Bromley-by-
Bow area to produce a new Masterplan. This will build upon work undertaken to date, including
the existing draft Masterplan and the Bromley-by-Bow Land Use and Design Brief, which was
approved by the Council’s Cabinet as Interim Planning Guidance (IPG) in February 2009.

In addition, connectivity studies such as the Bromley-by-Bow Station Integration and Improvement
Study and South-East Quadrant Development Framework and Accessibility Strategy are nearly
complete. These studies were commissioned by London Thames Gateway Development
Corporation (LTGDC) with the London Borough of Tower Hamlets as a partner organisation. The
Council has been working closely with LTGDC and has been feeding into the preparation of these
studies, which will be used to help develop the Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan.

Fish Island
Pending agreement through the Core Strategy with regard to the amount of Strategic Industrial
Location to be retained in the Fish Island area, the Council decided to progress with an Area Action
Plan (AAP) for the area. The previous masterplanning work for the area has been used to inform
further work areas and the development of the AAP.

The Council has been working with key partner agencies, such as the LTGDC, the London
Development Agency and Design for London to develop and deliver a number of ‘quick win’
projects, particularly around public realm and connections which could be delivered pre-2012.

Marsh Wall East
The Council will soon be commencing work on the production of a masterplan for Marshwall East,
in the Isle of Dogs. This will prepare a framework to guide future development in and around the
eastern end of Marsh Wall. It will ensure that the development of individual sites can create a
sustainable urban quarter in which residential density is optimised and that the infrastructure to
support development can be delivered, as well as appropriate connections put in place.

This document will be a delivery tool for realising the objectives of the Core Strategy, and set out
a form of development that does not result in unacceptable cumulative impacts. It will also provide
a planning contribution mechanism to ensure the programming and delivery of the necessary
supporting infrastructure.
Fig 29: Masterplans and Areas of Significant Change

- Fish Island
- Roman Road
- Bromley by Bow
- Ailsa Street
- St Paul's Way
- Blackwall Reach
- Wood Wharf
- Marsh Wall
- Millennium Quarter
- Aldgate
- Whitechapel

Legend:
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- Areas Of Significant Change
- Existing Masterplan Boundaries
- Borough Boundary
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Progress on the Local Development Scheme

Local Development Scheme
The Local Development Scheme (LDS) is a live public ‘project plan’ setting out, over a period of three years, which Development Plan Documents will be produced and when.

As a live project plan, the LDS will be reviewed as and when required to reflect changing local priorities. The LDS was reviewed for the third time in November 2009 following the approval of the initial LDS in May 2005.

Compliance with the LDS
Preparation and adoption of the 2010 LDF Core Strategy was in general compliance with the timetable set out in the LDS.

The timetable for the preparation of the Site and Placemaking DPD, Development Management DPD and Fish Island AAP have been revised, with the Options consultation now scheduled to take place in April 2011.

The revision is due to a number of reasons, including the need to align the preparation of all three documents to ensure more efficient use of resources as well as better coordination between the three documents. The Mayoral election and the emerging Localism Bill were also factors which have influenced the revision of the document preparation timetable.

The 2009 LDS timetable (Fig 30) will be revised to reflect the changing timetable.

![Fig 30: 2009 Local Development Scheme Timeline](image)
Unitary Development Plan 1998 and LDF Development Plan Documents

UDP Saved Policies
Following the introduction of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Local Planning Authorities were provided with the opportunity to save the policies in their adopted UDPs for a period of 3 years or until the planning authority adopts its relevant LDF Development Plan Documents. If Local Planning Authorities need to save policies beyond the three year period then they are required to seek approval from the Secretary of State.

In order to ensure the Council retains appropriate, robust, local planning policies to manage sustainable development, an assessment of the UDP policies was undertaken. As a result of this assessment, recommendations were made to the Council to retain and delete certain policies. These recommendations were based upon the relevance to the national, regional and local policy context and an explanation as to why a policy is to be retained or deleted.

The policies named in the Direction on Saving UDP have been saved as of 27 September 2007. All other UDP policies have been deleted and are not considered in planning decisions.

LDF Development Plan Documents
Following the adoption of the LDF Core Strategy in September 2010, a number of UDP saved policies and IPG policies have been superseded by the policies in the Core Strategy. A list of the superseded policies can be found in the Core Strategy Appendix 5.

The remaining UDP saved policies will continue to be used to determine planning applications until they are superseded by the policies in the emerging Development Management DPD and site allocations in the Site and Place-making DPD.
Monitoring the Statement of Community Involvement

Formal Consultation on the Core Strategy
As part of the continuous engagement process, two periods of formal public consultation were undertaken for the two consultation documents.

These were:
- Options and Alternatives (summer 2008) - set out high-level options for strategic development in the Borough; and
- Options and Alternatives for Places (winter 2009) - set out preferred options in a place shaping context.

The commentary from both these documents was used to inform the Proposed Submission Version of the Core Strategy.

A final period of ‘Call for Representations’ consultation was undertaken for the Proposed Submission version of the Core Strategy.

To ensure the views of local people, community groups and stakeholders were acknowledged, those detailed as Specific Consultees, General Consultees and Interested Parties were directly invited to take part in both rounds of public consultation. In addition to direct invitations, the council also asked the general public to comment.

Core Strategy Options and Alternatives
On 21 July 2008 the Council published its Core Strategy Options and Alternatives paper for public consultation. The six-week consultation period ended on 2 September 2008. 1,252 identifiable comments were received (including late responses) from 88 public, private and community organisations and individuals. Fig 31 provides a breakdown of the responses received.

51% of responses were given by the private sector, 37% from the public sector, 11% from the community sector and 1% from others (residents, LBTH employees, etc).

Fig 31: Options and Alternatives Responses
Options and Alternatives for Places


The Options and Alternatives for Places provided an update of the themes previously consulted on and placed them in a spatial context. It did this by setting out the themes at a Borough-wide level and at a local 'place' level. It developed the themes by applying them locally to the 24 places of the Borough, identifying delivery options and setting out a proposed implementation and monitoring methodology.

For this consultation phase, 39% of responses were given by the private sector, 41% from the public sector, 13% from the community sector and 7% from others (residents, LBTH employees, etc.).

Core Strategy Proposed Submission Version Call for Representation Consultation

On 14 September 2009 the Council undertook a final round of consultation, known as ‘Call for Representations’ on the proposed submission version of the Core Strategy. This provided the opportunity for anyone to comment on the Core Strategy prior to submission for examination. The consultation period ran for six weeks, ending on 26 October 2009.

1371 identified duly made representations were received from 105 representors. Representations were submitted by residents and by private, public and community organisations.
### Appendix 1: Summary of Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Traffic Light</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>Preferred Direction</th>
<th>Direction of Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **BD1**  | Total amount of additional floorspace by type | LBTH Planning Applications Database | No specific target | RED | • B1a: 7,211 sqm  
• B2: None  
• B8: 165 sqm | | | | | | |
|          |             |             |        |               | • B1a: 4,020 sqm  
• B1b: None  
• B1c: -455,  
• B2: -3617sqm  
• B8: -25,757 sqm | | | | | |
|          |             |             |        |               | GROSS:  
• BA1:16,495 sqm  
• B1b: no  
• B1c: 774 sqm  
• B2: 2,732 sqm  
• B81,720 sqm | | | | | |
|          |             |             |        |               | NET:  
• B1a: 13,142 sqm  
• B1b: no  
• B1c: 774 sqm  
• B2: -7,724 sqm  
• B8: -12,418 sqm | | | | | |
|          |             |             |        |               | GROSS:  
• B1a: 9,607 sqm  
• B1b: no  
• B1c: 0 sqm  
• B2: 0 sqm  
• B8: 380 sqm | | | | | |
|          |             |             |        |               | NET:  
• B1a: -12,280 sqm  
• B1b: -678  
• B1c: 0 sqm  
• B2: -3,587 sqm  
• B8: -16,584 sqm | | | | | |

**CORE OUTPUT INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Traffic Light</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>Preferred Direction</th>
<th>Direction of Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BD2</strong></td>
<td>Total amount of employment floorspace on previously developed land - by type</td>
<td>LBTH Planning Applications Database</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Traffic Light</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>Preferred Direction</th>
<th>Direction of Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BD3</strong></td>
<td>Employment land available - by type</td>
<td>LBTH Planning Applications Database</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>AMBER</td>
<td>121.67</td>
<td>104.64</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### BD4

**Completed floorspace for ‘town centre uses’ (A1, A2, B1a, and D2)**

- LBTH Planning Applications Database
- No specific target
- RED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Within Town Centres</th>
<th>Boroughwide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Net:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1: -13sqm</td>
<td>A1: 1,973sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2, B1a, D2: 0 Total: 13sqm</td>
<td>A2: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2, B1a, D2: 0 Total: 62sqm</td>
<td>D2: 540sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 62sqm</td>
<td>Total: 15,655sqm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gross:**
- A1: 62sqm
- A2, B1a, D2: 0
- Total: 62sqm

Within Town Centres
- A1: 1,028 sq m with 632 in town centres
- A2, B1a, D2: 0
- Total: 1,028 sq m

Boroughwide
- A1: 10,288 sq m with 632 in town centres
- A2, B1a, D2: 0
- Total: 10,288 sq m

#### H1

**Plan period and housing targets**
- LBTH Planning Applications Database
- 31,500
- N/A
- 31,500
- 31,500
- 31,500
- 28,850
- N/A
- N/A

#### H2(a)

**Net additional dwellings in previous years**
- LBTH Planning Applications Database
- N/A
- N/A

- 1,630 dwellings (01/02)
- 1,108 dwellings (02/03)
- 2,181 dwellings (03/04)
- 2,465 dwellings (04/05)
- 2,477 dwellings (05/06)
- 1,179 dwellings (02/03)
- 2,992 dwellings (03/04)
- 2,465 dwellings (04/05)
- 2,575 dwellings (05/06)
- 2,370 dwellings (06/07)
- 2,992 dwellings (03/04)
- 2,465 dwellings (04/05)
- 2,575 dwellings (05/06)
- 2,370 dwellings (06/07)
- 2,335 dwellings (07/08)

- Net: 2,037 dwellings (02/03) (Gross)
- 2,465 dwellings (04/05) (Gross)
- 2,575 dwellings (05/06) (Gross)
- 2,370 dwellings (06/07) (Gross)
- 2,335 dwellings (07/08) (Gross)

- 2,254 dwellings (2006-2007)
- 2,037 dwellings (2006-2007) (Gross)
- 2,465 dwellings (2006-2007) (Gross)
- 2,575 dwellings (2006-2007) (Gross)
- 2,370 dwellings (2006-2007) (Gross)
- 2,335 dwellings (2006-2007) (Gross)

- 2,254 dwellings (2006-2007)
- 2,037 dwellings (2006-2007) (Gross)
- 2,465 dwellings (2006-2007) (Gross)
- 2,575 dwellings (2006-2007) (Gross)
- 2,370 dwellings (2006-2007) (Gross)
- 2,335 dwellings (2006-2007) (Gross)

- N/A
- N/A

#### H2(b)

**Net additional dwellings for the reporting year**
- LBTH Planning Applications Database
- 3,150 Annual London Plan delivery target
- AMBER

- Net: 2,037 dwellings (2007-2008) (Gross)
- 2,115 dwellings (2007-2008) (Gross)
- Net: 2,839 dwellings (2008-2009) (Gross)
- 2,979, (2008-2009) (Gross)
- Net: 2,452 dwellings (2009-2010) (Gross)

- 2,254 dwellings (2006-2007)
- 2,037 dwellings (2006-2007) (Gross)
- 2,465 dwellings (2006-2007) (Gross)
- 2,575 dwellings (2006-2007) (Gross)
- 2,370 dwellings (2006-2007) (Gross)
- 2,335 dwellings (2006-2007) (Gross)

- 2,254 dwellings (2006-2007)
- 2,037 dwellings (2006-2007) (Gross)
- 2,465 dwellings (2006-2007) (Gross)
- 2,575 dwellings (2006-2007) (Gross)
- 2,370 dwellings (2006-2007) (Gross)
- 2,335 dwellings (2006-2007) (Gross)

- N/A
- Higher
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H2(c) Net additional dwellings in future years</th>
<th>LBTH Planning Applications Database</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,370 dwellings (07/08)</td>
<td>2,037 dwellings (08/09)</td>
<td>2,969 dwellings (09/10)</td>
<td>2,969 dwellings (10/11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,969 dwellings (11/12)</td>
<td>2,969 dwellings (12/13)</td>
<td>2,969 dwellings (13/14)</td>
<td>2,969 dwellings (14/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,969 dwellings (15/16)</td>
<td>2,969 dwellings (16/17)</td>
<td>1,970 dwellings (17/18)</td>
<td>1,970 dwellings (18/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,970 dwellings (19/20)</td>
<td>1,970 dwellings (20/21)</td>
<td>1,970 dwellings (21/22)</td>
<td>1,970 dwellings (22/23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,970 dwellings (22/23)</td>
<td>2,503 average dwellings per year</td>
<td>2,891 average dwellings per year</td>
<td>See Figure 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2(d) Managed Delivery Target</td>
<td>LBTH Planning Applications Database</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,891 average dwellings per year</td>
<td>2,503 average dwellings per year</td>
<td>See Figure 10</td>
<td>1,860 average dwellings per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3 New and converted dwellings -on previously developed land</td>
<td>LBTH Planning Applications Database</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97.48%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97.48%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H4 Net additional pitches (Gypsy and Traveller)</td>
<td>LBTH Planning Applications Database</td>
<td>No net loss</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>No new sites (19 existing sites)</td>
<td>No new sites (19 existing sites)</td>
<td>No new sites (19 existing sites)</td>
<td>No new sites (19 existing sites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No new sites (19 existing sites)</td>
<td>No new sites (19 existing sites)</td>
<td>No new sites (19 existing sites)</td>
<td>No new sites (19 existing sites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross affordable housing completions</td>
<td>LBTH Planning Applications Database</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>1047 (LDD)</td>
<td>534 (LDD)</td>
<td>1,555 (LDD)</td>
<td>• 1,754 (AHT) • 814 (LDD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Housing Quality-Building for Life Assessment</td>
<td>LBTH site visits</td>
<td>Scores of Over 14/20</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>Not collected</td>
<td>• Very Good: 1 • Good: 1 • Average: 5 • Poor: 5</td>
<td>• Very Good: 5 • Good: 6 • Average: 10 • Poor: 5</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Number of planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on flooding and water quality grounds</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Fewer than previous year</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>4 permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency</td>
<td>3 permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency</td>
<td>No application was granted contrary to Environment Agency’s advice</td>
<td>No application was granted contrary to Environment Agency’s advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Changes in areas of biodiversity importance</td>
<td>Greenspace Information for London</td>
<td>No Loss</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>No recorded change</td>
<td>No recorded change</td>
<td>No recorded change</td>
<td>No recorded change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Renewable energy generation</td>
<td>LBTH Planning Applications Database</td>
<td>Need to set a target</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>Manchester Road - solar panels installation - up to 0.8KW capacity</td>
<td>Elektron Development Aspen Way - 3 wind turbines (12,000 kWh/annum) and photo voltaic modules (4,993 kWh/annum)</td>
<td>7 sites across the Borough</td>
<td>36 renewable energy technology systems integrated into completed and consented projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>Capacity of new waste management facilities by waste planning authority</td>
<td>LBTH Waste Management</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>No new waste management facilities</td>
<td>No new waste management facilities</td>
<td>No new waste management facilities</td>
<td>No new waste management facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Local Development Framework

#### W2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of municipal waste arising, and managed by management type by waste planning authority</th>
<th>Need to set a target</th>
<th>GREEN</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Recycling (9,866 tonnes) 11.72%  
• Composting or Treatment by Anaerobic Digestion (154 tonnes) 0.18%  
• Used to recover heat, power and other energy sources (7,712.48 tonnes) 9.16%  
• Landfill (66,445 tonnes) 78.94%  |  |  |
| • Recycling (11,147 tonnes) 13.61%  
• Composting or Treatment by Anaerobic Digestion (100 tonnes) 0.12%  
• Used to recover heat, power and other energy sources (0 tonnes) 0%  
• Landfill (70,146 tonnes) 85.62%  |  |  |
| • Recycled, composted, reused – 15,389 tonnes;  
• Landfill – 87,612 tonnes  
• Energy from waste 237 tonnes  |  |  |
| • Recycled, reused, composted – 20,566 ton  
• Landfill – 66,007 ton  
• Reuse Derived Fuel/ Energy from Waste – 11,135 ton  
• Moisture Loss through Mechanical Biological Treatment – 11,135 ton  |  |  |

#### Local Output Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOI 1</th>
<th>Level of satisfaction with Built Environment</th>
<th>LBTH Annual Residents Survey</th>
<th>Monitor trend</th>
<th>GREEN</th>
<th>66%</th>
<th>61%</th>
<th>63%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>Higher</th>
<th>▲</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOI 3</td>
<td>Percentage of residents working outside of the Borough</td>
<td>Census 2001</td>
<td>Reduction in the percentage of residents from the previous year</td>
<td>AMBER</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>◀▶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 4</td>
<td>Amount of vacant B1a office floor space</td>
<td>LBTH Council Revenue Support</td>
<td>Not more than 25%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not collected</td>
<td>Not collected</td>
<td>Not collected - can refer to qualitative assessment from Employment Land Review 2009 report. Vacant B1a floorspace in Bromley-by-Bow, Canary Wharf South and Bethnal Green South source</td>
<td>Not collected - Refer to qualitative assessment from Employment Land Review 2009 report. Vacant B1a floorspace: Bromley-by-Bow, Canary Wharf South and Bethnal Green South - check</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 5</td>
<td>NI 171 New business registration rate - Registration rate per 10,000 resident adults</td>
<td>BERR New business registration rate</td>
<td>124.6</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>103.1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>117.5</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 6</td>
<td>Vacancy levels in Strategic Industrial Locations and Local Industrial Locations</td>
<td>LBTH Industrial Land Review</td>
<td>Not more than 25%</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>Some vacancies were recorded at: Fish Island. Low vacancy levels were recorded for Empson Street/St. Andrew’s Way, Gillender Street and Poplar Business Park.</td>
<td>Some vacancies were recorded on Bethnal Green Rd, Chrisp St (Market Rd and East India Dock Rd), and Roman Rd East and West.</td>
<td>No vacancy levels were recorded for Fish Island, Empson Street/St. Andrew’s Way and Gillender Street or Poplar Business Park.</td>
<td>Vacancies were recorded at: • Fish Island (21) • Low vacancy levels were recorded for Empson Street/St. Andrew’s Way • No vacancys were recorded at Gillender Street • Approximately 6 vacancies were found at Poplar Business Park.</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 7</td>
<td>Number of new hotel rooms</td>
<td>LBTH Planning Applications Database</td>
<td>100 rooms per year</td>
<td>RED</td>
<td>445 new hotel bedrooms completed</td>
<td>238 new rooms</td>
<td>168 new rooms</td>
<td>0 new rooms</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 8</td>
<td>Town Centre Vacancy rates</td>
<td>LBTH Town Centre Health Checks</td>
<td>Not more than 8%</td>
<td>AMBER</td>
<td>District Centres: • Bethnal Green: 0% • Chrisp Street: 0% • Crossharbour: 0% • Roman Road West: 2.7% • Roman Road East: 0% • Watney Market: 0% • Whitechapel: 0%</td>
<td>Major Centre: • Canary Wharf: 0%</td>
<td>District Centres: • Bethnal Green: 0% • Chrisp Street: 0% • Crossharbour: 0% • Roman Road East: 14.9% • Roman Road West: 6.5%</td>
<td>Major Centre: • Canary Wharf: 0%</td>
<td>District Centres: • Bethnal Green: 0% • Chrisp Street: 4% • Crossharbour: 0% • Roman Road East: 17% • Roman Road West: 3.1%</td>
<td>Major Centre: • Canary Wharf: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI</td>
<td>Number of applications approved for changes of use to A3, A4 and A5</td>
<td>Percentage of social rented housing completions for family housing</td>
<td>Percentage of intermediate and market housing completions for family housing</td>
<td>Percentage of total housing completions that are affordable (calculated by habitable rooms)</td>
<td>Number of residential dwellings lost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LBTH Planning Applications Database and London Development Database</td>
<td>356.45%</td>
<td>11.96%</td>
<td>20.98%</td>
<td>356.45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LBTH Planning Applications Database and London Development Database</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>15.84%</td>
<td>40.98%</td>
<td>356.45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>LBTH Planning Applications Database and London Development Database</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12.53%</td>
<td>29.36%</td>
<td>356.45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>LBTH Planning Applications Database and London Development Database</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>56.63%</td>
<td>356.45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LBTH Planning Applications Database and London Development Database</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15.84%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>356.45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>LBTH Planning Applications Database and London Development Database</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>11.33%</td>
<td>356.45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 15</td>
<td>Amount of eligible open spaces managed to Green Flag standard</td>
<td>Green Flag Award website: <a href="http://www.greenflagaward.org.uk/award/">http://www.greenflagaward.org.uk/award/</a></td>
<td>1 additional park/year</td>
<td>AMBER</td>
<td>5 Parks • Island Gardens • King Edward Memorial Park • Mile End Park • Trinity Square Gardens • Weavers Fields</td>
<td>6 Parks • Island Gardens • King Edward Memorial Park • Mile End Park • Millwall Park • Trinity Square Gardens • Weavers Fields</td>
<td>6 parks • Island Gardens • King Edward Memorial Park • Mile End Park • Millwall Park • Trinity Square Gardens • Weavers Fields</td>
<td>6 parks • Island Gardens • King Edward Memorial Park • Mile End Park • Millwall Park • Trinity Square Gardens • Weavers Fields</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>►►</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 16</td>
<td>Percentage of people asked who think that leisure and sports facilities are good, very good or excellent</td>
<td>TH Indicator: Annual Residents’ Survey</td>
<td>At least 50%</td>
<td>AMBER</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 17</td>
<td>Number of General Practitioners per 1,000 population</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets Primary Care Trust</td>
<td>At least 59 per 100,000 population</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>Not collected</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 18</td>
<td>Percentage of population reporting good health, aged under 75</td>
<td>Census 2001</td>
<td>At least 92%</td>
<td>AMBER</td>
<td>67.90%</td>
<td>67.90%</td>
<td>67.90%</td>
<td>67.90%</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>◄►</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 19</td>
<td>Percentage of population aged 16-74 with no formal qualifications</td>
<td>Annual Population Survey (NOMIS)</td>
<td>No more than 25%</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 20</td>
<td>Percentage of young people aged 16-18 not in education, employment or training</td>
<td>Local Area Agreement (Connexions)</td>
<td>No more than 10%</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 21</td>
<td>Enrolments on adult education courses per 1,000 adult population</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets Index Indicator 042</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>RED</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 22</td>
<td>Area of land designated as Open space</td>
<td>LBTH Parks Team and GIS</td>
<td>1.20 ha/1000 population</td>
<td><strong>RED</strong></td>
<td>244 ha; 1.15 ha/1000 pop</td>
<td>246 ha; 1.14 ha/1000 pop</td>
<td>246 ha; 1.12 ha/1000 pop</td>
<td>246 ha; 1.05 ha/1000 pop</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 23</td>
<td>Area of land designated as Local Nature Reserves</td>
<td>LBTH GIS Team</td>
<td>No net loss</td>
<td><strong>GREEN</strong></td>
<td>24.8 ha</td>
<td>24.8 ha</td>
<td>24.8 ha</td>
<td>24.8 ha</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>◀▶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 24</td>
<td>Area of land designated as Sites of Nature Conservation Importance</td>
<td>LBTH GIS</td>
<td>No net loss</td>
<td><strong>GREEN</strong></td>
<td>441.2 ha</td>
<td>441.2 ha</td>
<td>441.2 ha</td>
<td>441.2 ha</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>◀▶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 25</td>
<td>Area of land designated as Green Chain</td>
<td>LBTH GIS</td>
<td>No net loss</td>
<td><strong>GREEN</strong></td>
<td>16.8 km</td>
<td>16.8 km</td>
<td>16.84</td>
<td>16.84</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>◀▶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 26</td>
<td>Biological River Quality</td>
<td>Dept for Env, Food and Rural Affairs</td>
<td>No drop below 2004 levels</td>
<td><strong>AMBER</strong></td>
<td>Data not available</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
<td>GQA Grade E – Poor quality, biology restricted to pollution tolerant species</td>
<td>GQA Grade E – Poor quality, biology restricted to pollution tolerant species</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 27</td>
<td>% of household waste which has been sent by the authority for recycling, re-use and composting</td>
<td>NI Indicator 192</td>
<td>30% by 2016</td>
<td><strong>GREEN</strong></td>
<td>11.72%</td>
<td>13.61%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26.52%</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 28</td>
<td>Number of Car-free agreements signed</td>
<td>LBTH Planning applications database</td>
<td>At least 60% of all major residential applications</td>
<td><strong>GREEN</strong></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 29</td>
<td>Number of travel plans submitted with applications</td>
<td>LBTH Planning applications database and London development agency</td>
<td>100% of all major applications</td>
<td><strong>GREEN</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>75.93%</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 30</td>
<td>Total distance of cycle and pedestrian networks</td>
<td>LBTH Geographic Systems</td>
<td>Increase of at least 1% per annum</td>
<td><strong>AMBER</strong></td>
<td>• Pedestrian - 32.5 km&lt;br&gt;• Cycle - 53.3 km</td>
<td>• Pedestrian - 32.5 km&lt;br&gt;• Cycle - 53.3 km</td>
<td>• Pedestrian - 32.5 km&lt;br&gt;• Cycle - 53.3 km</td>
<td>• Pedestrian - 32.5 km&lt;br&gt;• Cycle - 53.3 km</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>◀▶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 31</td>
<td>Level of satisfaction with public transport</td>
<td>LBTH Annual Residents Survey</td>
<td>At least 80%</td>
<td><strong>AMBER</strong></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Current Value</td>
<td>Target Value</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 32</td>
<td>Percentage of Authority buildings in which all public areas are suitable for and accessible to disabled people</td>
<td>Best Value Performance Indicator BV156</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>54.32%</td>
<td>Indicator deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 33</td>
<td>Percentage of major applications with comments from Council’s Access Officer</td>
<td>LBTH Planning Applications Database</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>AMBER</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 34</td>
<td>Perception of Safety</td>
<td>LBTH Annual Survey</td>
<td>10% improvement over the lifetime of the plan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 35</td>
<td>Number of domestic burglaries per 1,000 households</td>
<td>National Indicator NI 16</td>
<td>No more than 18.5</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 36</td>
<td>Total Number of Conservation Areas</td>
<td>LBTH Conservation and Design Team</td>
<td>Not below 50</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 37</td>
<td>Conservation Areas with up-to-date appraisals</td>
<td>LBTH Conservation and Design Team</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 38</td>
<td>Conservation Areas with published management proposals</td>
<td>LBTH Conservation and Design Team</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 39</td>
<td>Proportion of Listed Buildings at Risk</td>
<td>English Heritage Buildings at Risk Register</td>
<td>Less than previous year</td>
<td>AMBER</td>
<td>30 Buildings</td>
<td>39 Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI 40</td>
<td>Financial contribution for education per residential unit</td>
<td>S106 records</td>
<td>Increase the amount</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>£588 per residential unit</td>
<td>£969 per residential unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: AMBER indicates lower than expected, GREEN indicates higher than expected, N/A indicates data not available.
| LOI 41 | Number of affordable housing units secured | LBTH Development Schemes team and LBTH Planning Applications Database | Increase in the number of units secured the previous years | GREEN | 550 units | 1,489 units | 1,311 units | 1,499 units | Higher | ▲ |
| LOI 42 | Financial contribution for health per residential unit | S106 records | Increase the amount | RED | £1,226 per residential unit | £2,957 per residential unit | £1,659 per residential unit | £1,361 per residential unit | Higher | ▼ |
| LOI 43 | Student | London Development Database | 200 | RED | Not previously recorded | Not previously recorded | 447 Bed spaces | 335 Bed spaces | — | ▼ |
| LOI 44 | Wheelchair accessible homes completed | London Development Database | N/A | N/A | Not previously recorded | Not previously recorded | Not recorded | Not recorded | N/A | N/A |
| LOI 45 | Residential Density | LBTH Planning Applications Database and London Development Database | Monitor trend | TBC | 570 hr/ha | 528 hr/ha | 579 hr/ha | 406 hr/ha | Monitor trend | ▼ |

**SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS INDICATORS**

| SEI 1 | Life Expectancy at Birth | London Health Observatory | 10% reduction in the gap between Tower Hamlets and the England average | AMBER | • Male 74.9 (Period 2003-2005) | • Male 75.2 (Period 2004-2006) | • Male 75.3 (Period 2005-2007) | • Male 75.3 (Period 2006-2008) | Reduce gap | ◄► |
| SEI 2 | Percentage of all housing units that are affordable (calculated by dwellings) | LBTH Planning Applications Database | 50% | RED | 39.20% | 25.25% | 52.19% | 30.00% | — | ▼ |
| SEI 3 | Proportion of Local Authority homes which were non-decent at 1 April each year | Best Value Performance Indicator 184a | No more than 60% | GREEN | 61.74% | 58.95% | 57.61% | 55.95% | Lower | ▼ |
| SEI 4 | Number of new or redeveloped primary care facilities | LBTH Planning Applications Database and Primary Care Trust | 10 | GREEN | • A new walk-in centre was opened at Canary Wharf  
• Dental practice at St Peter’s Community Centre was reopened  
• New surgery was opened at Cable Street  
• Extension was completed to the St Stephen’s Health Centre  
• The new Barkantine Health and well-being Centre was opened on the Isle of Dogs  
• Pinchin St opened in 2007 as part of the Whitechapel Health Centre  
• Albion Health Centre was expanded  
• St Peters Centre in Wapping was also refurbished involving major improvements  
• A new dental practice (Williams Place) was opened at Roman Road together  
• New health centre at Mansell Street  
• Refurbishments and upgrade work were carried out to a number of GP practices and health centres including: Gill Street, Leopald Street, Ruston Street Clinic, Spitalfields and Wapping Health Centres and Wellington Way  
• Major refurbishment of the Bethnal Green Health centre completed in Dec 2009 has provided additional clinical and staff accommodation, a building that is fully DDA compliant and provides improved waiting and patient facilities  
• Phase 2 of the Mile End Hospital Therapy Unit has been fully refurbished to provide extended clinical accommodation for both adult and children’s physio services and the re-location of the therapy main entrance and reception within the hospital  
• The Docklands Medical Centre took forward their own major redevelopment, which has increased the size and quality of the clinical space, and will also provide accommodation for a new dental practice  
• A range of GP practices have also been upgraded to facilitate additional clinical training facilities and other improved patient environments  
• Major refurbishment of the Mile End Hospital Therapy Unit has been fully refurbished to provide extended clinical accommodation for both adult and children’s physio services and the re-location of the therapy main entrance and reception within the hospital  
• The Docklands Medical Centre took forward their own major redevelopment, which has increased the size and quality of the clinical space, and will also provide accommodation for a new dental practice  
• A range of GP practices have also been upgraded to facilitate additional clinical training facilities and other improved patient environments | Higher | ▲ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEI 5</th>
<th>Number of physical visits to public library premises/1000 population</th>
<th>TH Index Indicator</th>
<th>10,000</th>
<th>AMBER</th>
<th>9,182</th>
<th>9,711</th>
<th>9,285</th>
<th>9,396</th>
<th>Higher</th>
<th>▲</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEI 6</td>
<td>Number of visits to Leisure Centres</td>
<td>Sport &amp; Physical Activity service - GLL</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>1,451,307</td>
<td>1,704,587</td>
<td>1,722,240</td>
<td>1,855,324</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 7</td>
<td>Percentage of New homes built on previously developed land</td>
<td>Best Value Performance Indicator 106</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>◄►</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 8</td>
<td>Percentage of proposals approved that would result in the loss of Listed Buildings or buildings of value in Conservation Areas</td>
<td>LBTH Planning Applications Database</td>
<td>Less than 5% of relevant planning applications</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>0.67% (1out of 149)</td>
<td>2.63% (1out of 38)</td>
<td>0% (0 out of 35)</td>
<td>0% (0 out of 49)</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 9</td>
<td>Number of domestic burglaries per 1,000 households</td>
<td>Best Value Performance Indicator 126</td>
<td>No more than 18.5</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 10</td>
<td>The percentage of hate crime cases with identified perpetrators investigated by the Community Safety Service resulting in formal action.</td>
<td>Local Performance Indicator LPSAH1 Excelsis</td>
<td>80% in 2009/10</td>
<td>RED</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 11</td>
<td>LAA NI 52: Working age people on out of work benefits</td>
<td>NOMIS (JSA and benefit data)</td>
<td>Target changed 2009: Below 5.7%</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.4% point gap</td>
<td>4.9% point gap</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 12</td>
<td>Percentage of children living in households with relative low income</td>
<td>Department for Work and Pensions</td>
<td>Reduction in the number recorded the previous year</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 13</td>
<td>Percentage of residents whose workplace is within the Borough</td>
<td>Census 2001</td>
<td>Higher than the London Average</td>
<td>AMBER</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 14</td>
<td>Number of days when air pollution is moderate or high for PM10</td>
<td>London Air Quality Network</td>
<td>No more than 35 days per year</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>• Poplar: 10 days</td>
<td>• Bethnal Green: 9 days</td>
<td>• Poplar: 10 days</td>
<td>• Bethnal Green: 10 days</td>
<td>• Poplar: 3 Days</td>
<td>• Bethnal Green: 1 Day (Bethnal Green site closed on Nov 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 15</td>
<td>Number of Noise-related complaints to Environmental Health</td>
<td>LBTH Environmental Health</td>
<td>Reduction in the number of complaint received the previous year</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>3,917</td>
<td>7,074</td>
<td>8,015</td>
<td>7,609</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 16</td>
<td>Percentage Improvement in domestic energy efficiency</td>
<td>LBTH Energy Efficiency</td>
<td>30% reduction in domestic energy consumption by 2010 from 1996 levels</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>9.22% Overall improvement in energy efficiency from 1 April 1996 to 31 March 2007</td>
<td>Data to come</td>
<td>13% reduction per capita since 2005</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 17</td>
<td>% of household waste which has been sent by the authority for recycling, re-use and composting</td>
<td>NI Indicator 192</td>
<td>30% by 2016</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>11.72%</td>
<td>13.61%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26.52%</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 18</td>
<td>Number of SUDS installed</td>
<td>LBTH BC</td>
<td>Increase in the number of SUDS installed in the previous year</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 19</td>
<td>Population of identified species in Tower Hamlets Biodiversity Action Plan</td>
<td>LBTH Local Biodiversity Partnership</td>
<td>No net loss</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>No reported losses</td>
<td>No reported losses</td>
<td>No reported losses</td>
<td>No reported loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 20</td>
<td>Percentage of approved planning applications that do not meet the sequential test for managing flood risk</td>
<td>Development Control and Environment Agency</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>Not collected</td>
<td>Not collected</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI 21</td>
<td>Percentage of residents that feel they can influence decisions affecting their local area</td>
<td>LBTH Annual Residents Survey</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>AMBER</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: Housing Completions 2009/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA/00/01509</td>
<td>236-238 Commercial Road</td>
<td>19/10/2009</td>
<td>Erection of additional second and third floors to residential, to provide 3 x 2 bed and 3 x 1 bed self-contained flats (6 new flats in total).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/02/00371</td>
<td>179 Cannon Street Road</td>
<td>09/02/2010</td>
<td>Demolition of existing single storey building and its replacement with a four storey building to create a restaurant (A3), one studio flat and one 2-bedroom flat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/02/01818</td>
<td>2-3 Island Row</td>
<td>20/08/2009</td>
<td>Refurbishment and change of use conversion of light industrial building at 4 Mill Place plus the erection of a mansard addition spanning 2 &amp; 3 Island Row and 4 Mill Place to create a one bedroom live work accommodation plus six self-contained (four x two bedroom and two x one bedroom) flats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/03/00154</td>
<td>Site North Of Copenhagen House, Copenhagen Place</td>
<td>20/08/2009</td>
<td>Demolition of existing storage warehouses and construction of a new mixed use development comprising 9 commercial/office units and 110 residential units with associated car parking and landscaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/03/00371</td>
<td>88-90 Commercial Street</td>
<td>27/10/2009</td>
<td>Conversion of upper floors to form 6 x 1 bedroom flats and 2 x 1 bedroom maisonettes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/04/00465</td>
<td>Land At South West Jnc Of Turners Road</td>
<td>08/09/2009</td>
<td>Demolition of derelict garages and erection of a four storey building comprising 8 flats consisting of 4 x 1 bedroom and 4 x 2 bedrooms and provision of two additional car parking spaces and bin stores at rear of 29-39 Turners Road together with the erection of boundary walls and gates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/04/00551</td>
<td>Riverside Works, 419 Wick Lane</td>
<td>18/12/2009</td>
<td>In outline, redevelopment by a lower ground plus 7 storey building comprising 104 live/work units, 123 m² of Class B1 floorspace and 107 m² of Class A1 (Shop) or Class A3 (Food and Drink) floorspace together with 111 parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/04/00552</td>
<td>Tredegar Estate (Phase 4), 2-122 Mostyn Grove</td>
<td>30/09/2009</td>
<td>Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide 204 self-contained flats, a new external amenity and support area and ancillary basement parking for cars, motor-cycles and bicycles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/04/00553</td>
<td>John Lawder House, 12 Gill Street</td>
<td>24/07/2009</td>
<td>Demolition of existing building and construction of 83 mixed tenure flats (32 Elderly/Supported Accommodation, 21 Move-on Accommodation, 10 General Needs Units &amp; 8 Shared Ownership Units) in development up to six storeys, ancillary facilities and external works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/04/00554</td>
<td>Riverside Works, 31 - 39 Millharbour</td>
<td>09/04/2009</td>
<td>Erection of a 14-22 storey building comprising 512 apartments, 917 sq m retail/commercial floor space with four basement levels providing car parking spaces, bicycle spaces and motorcycle parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date Filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/04/00573</td>
<td>431 To 433 And Land At Rear Of 431 To 433 Bethnal Green Road</td>
<td>Erection of additional floor to form two separate residential units (2 x one bed apartments).</td>
<td>12/05/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/04/00984</td>
<td>Land Adjacent To Gladstone House, East India Dock Road</td>
<td>Demolition of existing building and erection of a new 3-storey building to create 14 residential units consisting of 8 one bedroom, 4 two bedroom and 2 three bedroom flats.</td>
<td>12/05/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/04/01584</td>
<td>431 To 433 Bethnal Green Road</td>
<td>Conversion of first, second and third floors to create 3 self-contained flats.</td>
<td>10/03/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/05/00012</td>
<td>431 To 433 Bethnal Green Road</td>
<td>Conversion of existing residential use to 1 three bedroom and 3 one bedroom flats (four flats), erection of a ground floor rear extension and roof extension, plus partial demolition of walls to create garden space on ground floor. (Revised application).</td>
<td>31/07/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/05/00594</td>
<td>232 Bethnal Green Road</td>
<td>Erection of a mansard roof extension at 3rd floor level to create 2 self-contained flats (1 x studio and 1 x two bedroom unit) and change of use of ground floor and basement to mixed use A1/A2/B1.</td>
<td>26/11/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/05/00720</td>
<td>34 Cannon Street Road</td>
<td>Conversion of existing residential use to 1 three bedroom and 3 one bedroom flats (four flats), erection of a ground floor rear extension and roof extension, plus partial demolition of walls to create garden space on ground floor. (Revised application).</td>
<td>31/07/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/05/00782</td>
<td>542-544 Roman Road</td>
<td>Demolition of existing building and construction of a four storey building comprising of a retail shop (A1) on the ground floor with two x two bedroom flats and two x three bedroom flats above.</td>
<td>04/09/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/05/01089</td>
<td>Duke Of York Public House, 65 Ellsworth Street</td>
<td>Demolition of Public House to create a five-storey residential building with basement level comprising 10 self-contained flats (2 studios, 6 one-bed units, 1 two-bed unit and 1 three-bed unit).</td>
<td>15/07/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/05/01337</td>
<td>303 - 305 Burdett Road</td>
<td>Demolition of existing building and erection of a 4 to 9 storey mixed use building with basement to create 90 residential units (30 x one-bedroom, 40 x two-bedroom, 20 three-bedroom) and 947 sq.m of offices (Use Class B1) at basement and ground floor level. Creation of a public walkway and associated landscaping.</td>
<td>13/10/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/05/01782</td>
<td>70 Marsh Wall</td>
<td>Proposal: Erection of two buildings of 48 storeys and 39 storeys to provide 820 residential units, retail (Class A1), food and drink (Class A3, A4), business (B1) and leisure (D2) uses with new vehicular access, parking, open space and landscaping. The application is supported by an Environmental Impact Assessment.</td>
<td>02/10/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/05/02094</td>
<td>Former Police Station And Land Bounded By East Arbour Street</td>
<td>1. Demolition of existing roof to former police station fronting East Arbour Street and Aylward Street and associated buildings along Aylward Street and West Arbour Street. 2. Erection of a single storey roof extension plus rear extension to police station and alteration to window openings. 3. Redevelopment of former Magistrate Court by the erection of a part three, part four and part five storey building to create 63 flats (27 x 1 bedroom, 29 x 2 bedroom, 4 x 3 bedroom, 2 x 4 bedroom and 1 x 5 bedroom) including 13 car parking spaces and amenity provision.</td>
<td>24/03/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/05/02100</td>
<td>Site Adjacent To Canal On Repton Street</td>
<td>Redevelopment to provide a 7 and 10 storey building providing 87 residential units and a commercial unit (149m2) on the lower ground floor that will be used for Class D1 (community) use.</td>
<td>08/12/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/06/00058</td>
<td>83 Whitechapel High Street</td>
<td>Conversion/change of use of upper floors to four flats (3 x 1 bedroom, 1 bedsit). Replacement of existing windows.</td>
<td>21/04/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/06/00266</td>
<td>120-132 Chrisp Street</td>
<td>Erection of a building comprising 15 storeys plus roof terrace to provide restaurant/cafe (Class A3) and office/commercial unit (Class A1, A2, A3, B1) on ground floor with 66 residential units above.</td>
<td>03/02/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/06/00724</td>
<td>48 - 50 Westferry Road</td>
<td>A) Demolition of existing 2-storey retail shop unit and residential building at no. 48. B) Redevelopment of vacant sites at numbers 48 and 50 by erection of a new 5-storey mixed-use building for 2 - retail shop units on the ground floor with 8 residential flats consisting of 6 x 1 bed and 2 x 2 bedrooms on the first to the fourth floors.</td>
<td>28/07/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/06/00814</td>
<td>Between 107 - 109 Finnis Street</td>
<td>Erection of a two bed dwelling house.</td>
<td>11/05/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/06/01385</td>
<td>18 Bigland Street</td>
<td>Erection of part first, second and third storey extension, including alterations to the existing elevations. Conversion of dwelling to 2x1 bedroom flats, 1x2 bedroom flat and 1x3 bedroom flat, including provision for cycle and refuse storage.</td>
<td>05/03/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/06/01625</td>
<td>Land At Rear Of 109 -121 New Road</td>
<td>The re-development of a vacant site by erection of a part four storey building (block No.3) (over entrance way adjacent to No.119 New Road), and a part two (block No.4) and four storey buildings (blocks Nos. 1 and 2) at the rear of the site to provide residential accommodation consisting of 25 flats (3 x 1 bed, 18 x 2 beds, 2 x 3 beds, 1 x 4 beds and 1 x 5 beds) together with bicycle, refuse storage area and amenity spaces. The above 25 flats development scheme would comprise 100% affordable housing.</td>
<td>03/08/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/06/02208</td>
<td>178 Commercial Road</td>
<td>Erection of a three storey (an infill) rear extension with lightwell from first floor to create a basement storage area, an increased retail space at ground floor level plus 2 x 2 bedroom flats on the upper two floors and the rebuilding of the mansard to create 1 x 1 bedroom flat with refuse and bicycle provision at the rear of building.</td>
<td>09/09/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/06/02295</td>
<td>75 Redchurch Street</td>
<td>Change of use of upper three storeys from commercial to residential to provide 3no. two-bedroom flats together with alterations to front elevation infill of lightwell to rear with three storey extension and formation of terraces to rear at first and third floor levels</td>
<td>10/06/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/07/00174</td>
<td>Car Park, Bounded By Thomas Burt &amp; Adrian Boul House, Blythe Street</td>
<td>Erection of four, four bedroom houses on existing car park and access road.</td>
<td>23/07/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/07/00175</td>
<td>Car Park Between Joseph Priestley &amp; Gwilym Maries Houses, Wear Street</td>
<td>Erection of two, four bedroom houses on existing car park and access road.</td>
<td>23/07/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/07/00407</td>
<td>30 Ferry Street</td>
<td>Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a 6 storey building to provide 8 residential units (6 x 2 bedroom and 2 x 3 bedroom) with 2 parking spaces and associated amenity space at ground floor.</td>
<td>17/11/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/07/00411</td>
<td>Porter’s Lodge, Regents Wharf, Wharf Place</td>
<td>Construction of 3 storey building to provide 3 x 1-bed flats, provision of bin store enclosure and upgrading of entrance.</td>
<td>15/07/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/07/01248</td>
<td>412 - 414 Commercial Road</td>
<td>Amendment to the scheme previously permitted under planning permission reference PA/05/1070 on 27th July 2006 (demolition of existing buildings and construction of: A) a four storey building fronting Commercial Road containing a commercial unit at ground floor, for use either as a shop (A1) or financial professional services (A2), with 6no. one-bedroom flats above and B) 2no. two-storey houses fronting Steels Lane), consisting of: the increase in height of the approved building to five storeys by way of the addition of a mansard-style fourth floor incorporating 1no. two-bedroom flat</td>
<td>08/05/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amendments</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/07/01422</td>
<td>Phase 1 (Western), Indescon Court, 20 Millharbour Reservation matters (external appearance, design and landscaping) pursuant to condition 2 of outline planning permission (Ref: PA/02/01330) for the erection of an 8 storey building, rising to 17 and 15 storeys in the north-west and south-east corners respectively, comprising 364 residential units (Class C3), retail units (Class A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5) with basement parking for 174 cars and 393 cycle parking spaces, access provided from Mastmaker Road (Cassilis Road), with public and private open space and pedestrian routes with associated landscape works. (Amended application)</td>
<td>30/11/2009</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/07/01696</td>
<td>Site At Rear Of 56 Cannon Street Road Re-development of existing amenity land adjoining number 56 Cannon Street Road along Cable Street elevation by erection of a new three-storey, three-bedroom dwelling house with garden area to the rear.</td>
<td>12/08/2009</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/07/01789</td>
<td>8 Tredegar Road Conversion of a single family house into 2 self contained flats consisting of 1 x 1 bed at basement level and 1 x 3 bed on the ground, first and second floors including external rear staircase linking ground floor flat to garden area.</td>
<td>03/11/2009</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/07/02023</td>
<td>52 Cyprus Street Conversion of disused Public House including the demolition of existing rear extension and erection of a single storey rear extension to provide x5 residential units (3 x 1-bed, 1 x 2-bed, 1 x 3-bed).</td>
<td>06/10/2009</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/07/02332</td>
<td>41a Stainsby Road Demolition of existing two-storey public house (PH) building and erection of a 5 storey building to provide 9 flats consisting of 1 x 1 bedroom flat, 7 x 2 bedroom flats and 1 x 3 bedroom flat. Proposal would also involve addition of 2 No. balconies on north-west elevation (second and third floor level).</td>
<td>24/04/2009</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/07/02763</td>
<td>Fidelis House, 10 Gun Street Demolition of existing hostel and construction of a part-six, part-seven storey building comprising 20 x 1-bed supported housing units (Sui Generis).</td>
<td>09/02/2010</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/07/03158</td>
<td>Former Dover Castle P.H., 118 Old Bethnal Green Road Demolition of existing building and construction of a four storey plus dormer roof building to provide four x 1-bedroom flats and four x 2-bedroom flats.</td>
<td>25/06/2009</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/07/03199</td>
<td>106 - 128 Aylward Street Demolition of existing three storey residential block. Erection of 4-storey residential building with accommodation in roofspace (comprising 12x3 bed, 2x2bed and 7x1 bed) and associated works for 100% affordable housing (Total= 21 residential units).</td>
<td>01/02/2010</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/07/03295</td>
<td>7 - 9 Blondin Street Demolition of existing storage buildings and erection of 3-4 storey buildings comprising 5 x 4 bedroom houses and 22 flats comprising 3 x 1 bedroom, 17 x 2 bedroom and 2 x 4 bedroom units.</td>
<td>04/09/2009</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/08/00041</td>
<td>1 Hawksmoor Mews Infill of ground floor ‘undercroft’ and installation four new windows to create a two bedroom unit at ground and first floors.</td>
<td>17/09/2009</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/08/00066</td>
<td>1 Sly Street</td>
<td>Redevelopment including change of use of existing building to provide mixed use proposal comprising 230m² of commercial floorspace over ground and basement levels plus roof extension at third floor to provide nine self-contained apartments (4 x 2 bedroom and 3 x 1 bedroom and 2 studio).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/08/00083</td>
<td>452 Hackney Road</td>
<td>Redevelopment including change of use of existing building to provide mixed use proposal comprising one retail unit at ground / basement floors with 4 x 1 bed, 8 x 2 bed, 5 x 3 bed and 1 x 4 bed residential units at second and third floor level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/08/00182</td>
<td>48 Myrdle Street</td>
<td>Internal alterations to existing two storey building involving: the enlargement of 3 existing flats (at ground floor level); internal alterations to existing building comprising one retail unit at ground / basement floors with 4 x 1 bed, 8 x 2 bed, 5 x 3 bed and 1 x 4 bed residential units at second and third floor level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/08/00183</td>
<td>30 Myrdle Street</td>
<td>Erection of additional storey over existing two storey building to provide three new residential units (1 x 1 bedroom and 2 x 2 bedroom) ; Erection of additional storey over existing two storey building comprising four x one bedroom flats and one x three bedroom self-contained units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/08/00521</td>
<td>3 Boulcott Street</td>
<td>Erection of a four storey building to provide three new residential units (2 x 2 bedroom and 1 x 2 bedroom) in part of existing building comprising one retail unit at ground / basement levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/08/00878</td>
<td>Land To The East Of 5 Duoro Street</td>
<td>Erection of a four storey building comprising four new residential units at basement level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/08/01080</td>
<td>Land Rear Of 106-128 Aylward Street</td>
<td>Erection of a four storey building comprising four new residential units at basement level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/08/01355</td>
<td>28 Wights Road</td>
<td>Erection of a Mansard roof to create an additional storey to facilitate an additional residential unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/08/01409</td>
<td>3 Fulbourne Street</td>
<td>Erection of a Mansard roof to create an additional storey to facilitate an additional residential unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **1 Sly Street:** Redevelopment including change of use of existing building to provide mixed use proposal comprising 230m² of commercial floorspace over ground and basement levels plus roof extension at third floor to provide nine self-contained apartments (4 x 2 bedroom and 3 x 1 bedroom and 2 studio).
- **452 Hackney Road:** Redevelopment including change of use of existing building to provide mixed use proposal comprising one retail unit at ground / basement floors with 4 x 1 bed, 8 x 2 bed, 5 x 3 bed and 1 x 4 bed residential units at second and third floor level.
- **48 Myrdle Street:** Internal alterations to existing two storey building involving: the enlargement of 3 existing flats (at ground floor level); internal alterations to existing building comprising one retail unit at ground / basement floors with 4 x 1 bed, 8 x 2 bed, 5 x 3 bed and 1 x 4 bed residential units at second and third floor level.
- **30 Myrdle Street:** Erection of additional storey over existing two storey building to provide three new residential units (1 x 1 bedroom and 2 x 2 bedroom) ; Erection of additional storey over existing two storey building comprising four x one bedroom flats and one x three bedroom self-contained units.
- **3 Boulcott Street:** Erection of a four storey building to provide three new residential units (2 x 2 bedroom and 1 x 2 bedroom) in part of existing building comprising one retail unit at ground / basement levels.
- **Land To The East Of 5 Duoro Street:** Erection of a four storey building comprising four new residential units at basement level.
- **Land Rear Of 106-128 Aylward Street:** Erection of a four storey building comprising four new residential units at basement level.
- **28 Wights Road:** Erection of a Mansard roof to create an additional storey to facilitate an additional residential unit.
- **3 Fulbourne Street:** Erection of a Mansard roof to create an additional storey to facilitate an additional residential unit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA/08/01553</td>
<td>Conversion of 7 Almshouses, each containing 3 bed sitter flats, into 7 three-bedroom dwelling houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/08/02393</td>
<td>Erection of two storey self-contained flat adjoining 65 Strattondale Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/08/02405</td>
<td>Internal re-modelling and refurbishment of 11 Buckfast Street, changing the use from three person shared accommodation to 2 No. 1 Bedroom supported self contained flats including internal re-modelling and refurbishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/08/02406</td>
<td>Conversion of existing property to provide 2 x 1 bedroom &quot;supported&quot; self contained flats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/08/02656</td>
<td>Demolition of existing property and erection of new 2 storey building to provide retail at basement and ground floor, 1x 1 bed flat at rear of ground floor, and 1 x 1 bed flat at first floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/09/00064</td>
<td>Application for Lawful Development Certificate in respect of existing use of lower ground floor as a self-contained flat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/09/01205</td>
<td>Retrospective consent for alterations to the original approval PA05/02100 for the change of use of a ground floor one bed flat to an electricity sub-station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/09/01618</td>
<td>Alterations to existing structure and addition of four more flats in a similar design to provide two business units on ground basement, three (two) flat and thirteen flats and studios above omitting car parking in previous scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/09/0173</td>
<td>22 Calvert Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Housing Trajectory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22</th>
<th>22/23</th>
<th>23/24</th>
<th>24/25</th>
<th>25/26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H2c Net Additional dwellings - future years</td>
<td>2,452</td>
<td>4,932</td>
<td>2,221</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>4,667</td>
<td>3,793</td>
<td>3,923</td>
<td>6,831</td>
<td>3,383</td>
<td>4,964</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>2,732</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>2,864</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hectares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>2,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2d Managed Delivery Target</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>2,771</td>
<td>2,891</td>
<td>2,743</td>
<td>2,648</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>2,039</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>1,429</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>