Appendix L
Socio-economics

Contents

L1 Socio-economics: Additional Methodology

L1.1 Introduction

L1.1.1 This appendix presents further detail on the methodology for assessing the likely significant effects on socio-economic receptors that would arise from the existence and operation of the Proposed Development. The assessment of construction effects has been scoped out. The methodology for assessing cumulative socio-economic effects is also described.

L1.2 Baseline methodology

L1.2.1 The assessment, where applicable draws on relevant baseline data at the following scales:

- Lower Layer Super Output Area;
- Safer Neighbourhood Area (Churchill) as defined by the Metropolitan Police;
- Churchill Ward;
- defined radii (ranging from 1 – 3 miles) from the centre point of the Proposed Development;
- borough (City of Westminster);
- pan-borough (City of Westminster, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and London Borough of Wandsworth) and
- regional (London).

L1.2.2 The geographies chosen for assessment of different baseline sub-topics are flexible and reflect the characteristics of each receptor.

L1.2.3 Key data sources for the assessment are:

- Office for National Statistics (ONS);
- Ministry of Housing and Local Government (MHCLG);
- Greater London Authority (GLA);
- Census (2011);
- Index of Multiple Deprivation (2015);
- Business Register and Employment Survey (BRES);
- Ofsted;
- NHS; and
- Local information collected from a range of different published documents, including (but not limited to) City of Westminster Profiles (2015 and 2018)[1],

---

[1] City of Westminster, 2015. *Westminster Profile, 2015.* Available at: http://transact.westminster.gov.uk/docstores/publications_store/wardprofiles/Westminster-Profile-2015.pdf; and *City of Westminster Profile, 2018.* Available at: https://www.westminster.gov.uk/sites/default/files/city_profile.pdf

adopted Westminster City Plan 2016[2] and the emerging draft Westminster City Plan 2019-2040[3].

Employment

L1.2.4   A site visit was undertaken on 11 September 2019 to verify the use and status of existing employment accommodation on site. This baseline quantum of employment is set out in Appendix L2 and is used in the existence assessment. The occupational and skills profile of existing residents are also established for use in the operational effects assessment.

Housing

L1.2.5   The baseline conditions are established through a quantitative and qualitative assessment of existing onsite housing provision and extant housing need (number of units, tenure and dwelling size mix) identified in adopted and emerging planning policy and associated evidence base documents relating to London Borough of Westminster and London (see Appendix L2). These baseline conditions are relevant for the operational assessment.

L1.3   Social infrastructure

Education

L1.3.1   Baseline conditions are established through searches for existing facilities within specified distances of the application site. Distances have been selected in line with best practice, in terms of how far receptors are considered likely to travel to use educational facilities. For each facility, the existing capacity and number of children on roll is recorded to establish the overall surplus or deficit in school places. The data has been primarily sourced from Ofsted records, although in the case of schools located in Westminster, the Council's School Organisation and Investment Strategy 2018 (with update 2019-2020)[4] has been reviewed.

Healthcare

L1.3.2   Baseline conditions are established though a search for existing GP surgeries within a one-mile radius of the application site. For each GP surgery, the number of GPs and registered patients is recorded to establish the overall ratio of GPs to registered patients.

L1.3.3   A meeting was held with contacts from North West London Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unit (HUDU)) on 13th January 2020 to discuss the scope of the socio-economic

---

[2] City of Westminster, 2016. *Westminster City Plan (Consolidated with all changes since November 2013 – Revision to Westminster's City Plan November 2016).* Available at: https://www.westminster.gov.uk/westminsters-city-plan-strategic-policies

[3] City of Westminster, 2019. *City Plan 2019-2040 – Regulation 19 Publication Draft (June 2019).* Available at: https://www.westminster.gov.uk/sites/default/files/core_001_regulation_19_publication_draft_city_plan_2019-2040_wcc_june_2019.pdf

[4] Westminster City Council, 2018. *School Organisation and Investment Strategy 2018*. Available at: https://www.westminster.gov.uk/school-organisation-place-planning; Westminster City Council School Organisation and Investment Strategy 2019-2020 Update (Appendix A). Available at: unknown.

assessment and obtain further local context. During this meeting it was discussed that there is a general shift towards integrated care systems. This re-organisation of services is resulting in groupings of healthcare facilities known as Primary Care Networks (PCNs) responsible for providing care in the area, where different GP surgeries focus on different needs and specialisms.

L1.3.4   Whilst new styles of operation are recognised, it is assumed that a benchmark GP/ patient ratio (as set out in the Westminster City Council Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan – November 2019[5]) still provides a useful measure of existing provision, particularly in the context of the strategic nature of this baseline assessment. In lieu of a more appropriate methodology, the approach to assessing the baseline conditions has been continued.

Community facilities

L1.3.5   Baseline conditions are established through a search for existing community facilities, specifically community centres and youth clubs within a two-mile radius of the application site. A range of sources have been used to compile the baseline including council websites, Westminster City Council's Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (November 2019)[6], Google maps and the Cultural Infrastructure Map[7].

Play space

L1.3.6   Baseline conditions are established from Westminster City Council's Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (November 2019)[8].

Open space

L1.3.7   Baseline conditions are established from the Westminster City Council's Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (November 2019)[9].

Community cohesion

L1.3.8   The baseline conditions for the assessment of community cohesion draw upon the employment and social infrastructure baselines. In particular the existing occupational and skills profile of the area and adequacy of existing social

---

[5] City of Westminster, 2019. *City Plan 2019-2040 – Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (November 2019 – Live document)*. Available at
https://www.westminster.gov.uk/sites/default/files/ev_gen_007_draft_infrastructure_delivery_plan_wcc_november_2019.pdf
[6] City of Westminster, 2019. *City Plan 2019-2040 – Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (November 2019 – Live document).* Available at
https://www.westminster.gov.uk/sites/default/files/ev_gen_007_draft_infrastructure_delivery_plan_wcc_november_2019.pdf
7 Mayor of London. *Cultural Infrastructure Map*. Available at: https://maps.london.gov.uk/cim/index.html#
[8] City of Westminster, 2019. *City Plan 2019-2040 – Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (November 2019 – Live document).* Available at
https://www.westminster.gov.uk/sites/default/files/ev_gen_007_draft_infrastructure_delivery_plan_wcc_november_2019.pdf
[9] City of Westminster, 2019. *City Plan 2019-2040 – Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (November 2019 – Live document).* Available at
https://www.westminster.gov.uk/sites/default/files/ev_gen_007_draft_infrastructure_delivery_plan_wcc_november_2019.pdf

infrastructure will form part of the assessment. The assessment also considers the crime statistics for the local area which are drawn from the Metropolitan Police Crime data dashboard[10].

L1.4 Assessment methodology

Existence effects

L1.4.1 The assessment methodology for existence effects is covered in full in the main socio-economic chapter (Section 15).

Operational effects

L1.4.2 This section provides supplementary detail regarding the assessment methodology for operational effects relating to employment, housing, social infrastructure and community cohesion.

Employment – current and future residents living in City of Westminster and London

L1.4.3 Taking into account baseline data regarding existing employment uses, an assessment of the net employment effect of the Proposed Development is undertaken using the estimated employment floorspace supported by the Proposed Development.

L1.4.4 The Proposed Development includes some flexibility around the potential split between the different employment uses (See socio-economic chapter, Section 15), which would each result in different net employment effects. For the purposes of this assessment, maximum (Scenario 1) and minimum (Scenario 2) employment scenarios have been decided, based on assumed employment densities for each use class[11], as set out in Table 1 and Table 2 below.

Table 1: Maximum employment scenario

Block	Uses GIA
B1, B2, B3, B4	1,600 sq m Class A1 - A4
B5	350 sq m Class B1 158 sq m Class D1
B9	780 sq m Class D1 130 sq m Class A3

---

10 Metropolitan Police. *Crime data dashboard*. Available at: https://www.met.police.uk/sd/stats-and-data/met/crime-data-dashboard/

[11] See Table 3: Employment density assumptions applied

Table 2: Minimum employment scenario

Block	Uses GIA
B1, B2, B3, B4	1,450 sq m Class A1 - A4 150 sq m Class D1
B5	350 sq m Class B1 158 sq m Class D1
B9	910 sq m Class D2

In line with best practice[12], benchmark employment density multipliers are applied to the operational (i.e. non-vacant) existing employment sites ('reference case') and the Proposed Development, using professional judgement (refer to Table 3 below).

Table 3: Employment density assumptions applied

Use Class	Floorspace (NIA sqm) per full time equivalent (FTE)
Class A1-A3 (retail)	19[13]
Class B1a (office)	12[14]
Class D1 (social infrastructure)	45[15]
Class D2 (fitness centre)	65[16]

Table 4 sets out the additionality factors used to calculate estimated baseline ('reference case') and operational employment supported by the Proposed Development.

Appendix L2 details the calculation of estimated baseline on-site employment and the calculation of operational employment in terms of direct, indirect and induced FTE jobs at the borough and London scale.

---

[12] Homes and Communities Agency, 2015. *Employment Density Guide (3rd Edition);* and CAG Consultants,2016. *London Employment Sites Database Final Report*

[13] Based on average employment density across Class A1, A2 and A3 uses of 19sq m per FTE.

[14] Based on average Class B1a office employment density of 12sq m per FTE.

[15] CAG Consultants, 2016. *London Employment Sites Database (Final Report) Table 3.3*

[16] Based on a 'mid market' fitness centre

Table 4: Additionality factors applied to the calculation of estimated baseline ('reference case') and operational employment

Additionality factor	Value	Justification
Leakage (percentage of jobs generated by the Proposed Development which are taken up by residents outside of City of Westminster, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and London Borough of Wandsworth	Scenarios 1, 2 and Reference Case Pan-borough (City of Westminster, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and London Borough of Wandsworth): 25% London: 10%	For the purposes of Scenarios 1 and 2, a medium leakage rate has been assumed at the pan-borough scale and a low leakage rate is assumed at the London scale, based on the ready reckoner set out in Table 4.3 of the HCA (2014) Additionality Guide17. This is based on the consideration of employment opportunities being accessible to existing and future residents.
Displacement (percentage of jobs generated by the Proposed Development which are offset by reductions in economic activity elsewhere).	Scenarios 1, 2 and Reference Case Pan-borough (City of Westminster, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and London Borough of Wandsworth): 25% London: 25%	It is anticipated that the Proposed Development may accommodate employment activities previously located elsewhere, therefore a low displacement rate of 25% is assumed, based on the ready reckoner set out in Table 4.8 of the HCA (2014) Additionality Guide has been used18.
Multiplier (further economic activities which result from either labour supply or direct labour demands).	Scenarios 1, 2 and Reference Case Pan-borough (City of Westminster, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and London Borough of Wandsworth):1.3 London: 1.5	It is anticipated that the employment sectors to be accommodated in the Proposed Development will have average supply chain linkages, therefore the multipliers set out for the pan-borough level (City of Westminster, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and London Borough of Wandsworth) and the regional level (London) in Table 4.14 of the HCA (2014) Additionality Guide19 have been used.
Substitution (where a firm substitutes one activity for a similar one)	Scenarios 1, 2 and Reference Case Pan-borough (City of Westminster, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and London Borough of Wandsworth): 0% London: 0%	It is anticipated that the Proposed Development will not lead to a substitution of activities, therefore a substitution factor is not applied.

---

[17] Homes and Communities Agency, 2014. *Additionality Guide*. Available at:
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/378177/additionality_guide_2014_full.pdf
[18] Homes and Communities Agency, 2014. *Additionality Guide*. Available at:
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/378177/additionality_guide_2014_full.pdf
19 Homes and Communities Agency, 2014. *Additionality Guide*. Available at:
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/378177/additionality_guide_2014_full.pdf

Additionality factor	Value	Justification
Deadweight (the amount of employment that could be accommodated if the Proposed Development did not go ahead)	Scenarios 1 and 2 Pan-borough (City of Westminster, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and London Borough of Wandsworth): 50% of gross direct baseline employment (FTE) set out in in Appendix L2 London: 10% of gross direct baseline employment (FTE).	As the Proposed Development is proposed on a site with existing employment uses, the Applicant has estimated the Reference Case (i.e. number of FTE jobs supported by on-site employment generating uses) using the method set out in Appendix L2. In order to calculate deadweight, 50% of the Reference Case is subtracted from the gross employment generated by the Proposed Development. Further detail is provided in Appendix L2. The current number of FTE jobs supported by on-site employment-generating uses is set out in in Appendix L2. The Reference Case is subtracted from the gross employment generated by the Proposed Development. Further detail is provided in Appendix L2.

Housing – returning residents of the existing estate, current and future residents living in City of Westminster and London

L1.4.5   The assessment of effects on housing is informed by the baseline conditions relating to identified housing need.

L1.4.6   Appendix L2 provides an overview of the annual housing target for the City of Westminster set out in the adopted and emerging Development Plan documents. The adopted Westminster City Plan 2016[20] sets an annual housing delivery target of 1,068 dwellings per annum. Based on the latest Housing Delivery Test[21], which assesses annual housing delivery between 2015/16 and 2017/18 against annual Development Plan targets, the City of Westminster has historically delivered 116% of its housing need. However, it should be noted that in 2016/17 the City of Westminster delivered 151% of its need, and more recently in 2017/18, the City of Westminster only met 90% of its annual need against the 1,068 target.

L1.4.7   In the context of the emerging Draft London Plan[22], the annualised housing target allocated to Westminster is 985 dwellings over ten years. However, as set out in Westminster's Draft City Plan 2019 – 2040[23], the National Planning Policy Framework requires local planning authorities to use a standard methodology to calculate the number of homes needed unless exceptional circumstances exist to justify using a different methodology. The standard methodology differs from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)'s capacity-based approach in that it starts off with a baseline housing

---

[20] City of Westminster, 2016. *Westminster City Plan (Consolidated with all changes since November 2013 – Revision to Westminster's City Plan November 2016).* Available at:
https://www.westminster.gov.uk/westminsters-city-plan-strategic-policies
[21] GOV.UK, 2019. *Housing Delivery Test: 2018 measurement.* Available at:
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/housing-delivery-test-2018-measurement
[22] Mayor of London, 2019. *The London Plan – Intend to Publish version (December 2019).* Available at:
https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/london-plan/new-london-plan/intend-publish-london-plan-2019
[23] City of Westminster, 2019 – City Plan 2019-2040 – Regulation 19 Publication Draft (June 2019), available at
https://www.westminster.gov.uk/sites/default/files/core_001_regulation_19_publication_draft_city_plan_2019-2040_wcc_june_2019.pdf

need based on population projections, then adjusts that figure based on an 'affordability factor'. The resultant figure is then capped at 40% above the existing housing target. Using this methodology results in an annual requirement of 1,495 homes per year for Westminster. Within the context of the borough's recent (2017/ 2018) performance in the Housing Delivery Test, it is clear that a step change in delivery will be required to meet these latest targets.

L1.4.8   Adopted and emerging planning policy documents also identify the dwelling size (bedrooms) and tenure-specific nature of housing need, at the borough and London-wide level. Appendix L2 identifies the housing needs set out in adopted and emerging planning policy documents, broken down by dwelling size (bedrooms) and tenure. The requirements set out in the emerging planning policy documents are outlined below:

L1.4.9   The Draft Westminster City Plan 2019-2040[24] Policy 9 states that:

- 35% of all new homes will be affordable across Westminster; and

- 60% of affordable units will be 'intermediate' affordable housing for rent or sale and 40% will be social rent or London Affordable Rent.

L1.4.10   With regards to size, the Draft Westminster City Plan 2019-2040[25] Policy 11 states that:

- 25% of all new homes are to be family sized (between 3 - 5 bedrooms).

L1.4.11   At the London scale, the Draft London Plan (Intend to Publish version – December 2019)[26] states that;

- the strategic target is for 50% of all new homes delivered across London to be genuinely affordable; and

- 30% of affordable units should comprise low cost rented homes (London Affordable Rent/ Social Rent); 30% intermediate products (London Living Rent/London Shared Ownerships) and remaining 40% to be determined by borough as low cost rented homes or intermediate products based on identified need.

L1.4.12   With regards to size, London Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2017[27] identifies overall London-wide needs across all tenues as set out below:

- 55% 1 bed units

- 16% 2 bed units

---

[24] City of Westminster, 2019 – City Plan 2019-2040 – Regulation 19 Publication Draft (June 2019), available at https://www.westminster.gov.uk/sites/default/files/core_001_regulation_19_publication_draft_city_plan_2019-2040_wcc_june_2019.pdf

[25] City of Westminster, 2019 – City Plan 2019-2040 – Regulation 19 Publication Draft (June 2019), available at https://www.westminster.gov.uk/sites/default/files/core_001_regulation_19_publication_draft_city_plan_2019-2040_wcc_june_2019.pdf

[26] Mayor of London, 2019. *The London Plan – Intend to Publish version (December 2019).* Available at: https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/london-plan/new-london-plan/intend-publish-london-plan-2019

27 Mayor of London, 2017. The 2017 London Strategic Housing Market Assessment (November 2017). Available at: https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/london_shma_2017.pdf

- 14% 3 bed units

- 15% 4+ bed units

Social infrastructure – returning residents of the existing estate, existing neighbourhood residents, and future residents of the Proposed Development

L1.4.13   The application site has an existing residential population and therefore the assessment must consider whether the Proposed Development would result in a net increase in population versus the baseline position. It is not clear what level of population increase would have occurred without the development proceeding (i.e. growth forecast local rates). The assessment uses the estimated upper limit of the population increase, as informed by the GLA Population Yield Calculator[28] , to provide a reasonable estimate of the effect of population demand on community services.

Education

L1.4.14   The assessment of primary, secondary and early years places for the community is informed by baseline conditions and anticipated demand. Pupil yields for the Proposed Development are derived from the GLA Population Yield Calculator[29], and are considered within the context of the available existing school places.

Healthcare

L1.4.15   The requirements of the community in terms of healthcare facilities is informed by the required provision set out in Westminster City Council's Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (November 2019)[30] which states that capacity of primary care is usually calculated using a benchmark figure of 1 GP to a maximum of 1,800 patients. The effect of the new population demand is considered within the context of existing healthcare provision.

Community facilities

L1.4.16   The need for community facility provision is informed by recognised best practice of one community centre for every 7-11,000 people[31]. Recognising the wide range of community facilities that may already be provided within the vicinity of the application site, the effect of the new population demand is considered through a qualitative assessment.

28 GLA (updated 2019) *Population Yield Calculator*. Available at:
https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/population-yield-calculator
29 GLA (updated 2019) *Population Yield Calculator*. Available at:
https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/population-yield-calculator
30 City of Westminster, 2019.*City Plan 2019-2040 – Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (November 2019 – Live document)*. Available at
https://www.westminster.gov.uk/sites/default/files/ev_gen_007_draft_infrastructure_delivery_plan_wcc_november_2019.pdf
31 Barton, H., Grant, M. and Guise, R. (2010) *Shaping neighbourhoods for local health and global sustainability (2nd ed.). Routledge*

Play space

L1.4.17   The play space requirement for the Proposed Development is informed by Policy 35 of the Westminster City Plan[32] which states that 'major residential development should provide the quantum of play space in accordance with the Mayor of London's Shaping Neighbourhoods Plan and Informal Recreation SPG (2012) or any subsequent replacement document'[33].

L1.4.18   The Draft London Plan (Intend to publish version) (2019) Policy S4 Play and informal recreation states that 'development proposals for schemes that are likely to be used by children and young people should for residential developments, incorporate good-quality, accessible play provision for all ages. At least 10 square metres of playspace should be provided per child that:

- provides a stimulating environment

- can be accessed safely from the street by children and young people independently

- forms an integral part of the surrounding neighbourhood

- incorporates trees and/or other forms of greenery

- is overlooked to enable passive surveillance

- is not segregated by tenure'[34]

Open space

L1.4.19   The requirement for open space provision in the Proposed Development is informed by Policy 35 of the Westminster City Plan[35] which states that all major developments are required to provide new or improved public open space.

Community cohesion – returning residents of the existing estate, existing neighbourhood residents, and future residents of the Proposed Development

L1.4.20   A qualitative assessment on community cohesion considers potential impacts on the ability of the community to bind and associate together, and the ways in which local people interact with their surroundings. With regards to the

---

32 City of Westminster, 2019. *City Plan 2019-2040 – Regulation 19 Publication Draft (June 2019)*. Available at https://www.westminster.gov.uk/sites/default/files/core_001_regulation_19_publication_draft_city_plan_2019-2040_wcc_june_2019.pdf

33 City of Westminster, 2019. *City Plan 2019-2040 – Regulation 19 Publication Draft (June 2019)*. Available at https://www.westminster.gov.uk/sites/default/files/core_001_regulation_19_publication_draft_city_plan_2019-2040_wcc_june_2019.pdf

34 Mayor of London, 2019. *The London Plan – Intend to Publish version (December 2019).* Available at: https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/london-plan/new-london-plan/intend-publish-london-plan-2019

35 City of Westminster, 2019. *City Plan 2019-2040 – Regulation 19 Publication Draft (June 2019)*. Available at https://www.westminster.gov.uk/sites/default/files/core_001_regulation_19_publication_draft_city_plan_2019-2040_wcc_june_2019.pdf

returning residents of the existing estate and the existing neighbourhood residents, the assessment focusses on:

- the nature of new employment opportunities and alignment with the existing employment profile;

- whether the provision of new social infrastructure is adequate to ensure existing residents' access to services is not worsened; and

- how changes to the quality of the environment in terms of open space provision and connectivity through the site may affect the ability of existing neighbourhood and returning residents of the existing estate to interact with their environment and future residents of the Proposed Development.

L1.4.21   For future residents, the assessment focusses on:

- how the occupancy of the completed development (including mix of residential types and tenure and mix of uses within the site) may contribute to social diversity;

- whether the existing provision and provision of new social infrastructure is adequate to serve the future residents; and

- how the provision of open space and connectivity through the site may affect the ability of future residents to interact with their environment and existing neighbourhood and returning residents of the existing estate.

L1.4.22   An assessed will also be made regarding the ways in which the Proposed Development includes improvements to safety, to demonstrate how crime and fear of crime can be lessened for users of the Site.

L1.5   Assessment criteria

L1.5.1   The approach to the assessment of significance of socio-economic effects is consistent across the existence and operational effects. There is no definitive set of regulations for assessing the significance of socio-economic effects, although there are conventions and good practice guidance. The assessment is therefore based on convention, professional judgement and experience, and considers the value and sensitivity of receptors from the baseline socio-economic characteristics, based on their importance, size and potential for substitution, as well as the magnitude of the net additional impact based on qualitative and quantitative evidence (where applicable).

L1.5.2   The adjudged significance (Table 6) is a product of the magnitude of effects (Table 6) and the sensitivity of the receptor (Table 5). Significance equates to both adverse and beneficial effects through the consideration of the costs and benefits and the overarching objective. In EIA terms, an effect of moderate or substantial significance, as judged in Table 6, is deemed to be significant.

Table 5: Methodology for determining receptor sensitivity

Sensitivity	Examples of receptor/resource
Very High	Very high importance and rarity, very limited potential for substitution
High	High importance and rarity, limited potential for substitution
Medium	Medium importance and rarity, limited potential for substitution
Low	Low importance and rarity, potential for substitution
Negligible	Very low importance and rarity, potential for substitution

Table 6: Effect significance matrix

Magnitude of effect	Sensitivity of receptor				
	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Very large	Substantial significance	Substantial significance	Moderate significance	Moderate significance	[1]
Large	Substantial significance	Moderate significance	Moderate significance	Minor significance	[2]
Medium	Moderate significance	Moderate significance	Minor significance	[2]	Neutral significance
Small	Moderate significance	Minor significance	[2]	Neutral significance	Neutral significance
Negligible	[1]	[2]	Neutral significance	Neutral significance	Neutral significance
[1] The choice between 'Moderate significance', 'Minor significance' and 'Neutral significance' depends on the specifics of the impact and has been informed by professional judgement and reasoning.					
[2] The choice between 'Minor significance' and 'Neutral significance' depends on the specifics of the impact and has been informed by professional judgement and reasoning.					

L1.6 Assumptions and limitations

L1.6.1 In producing the methodology, evidence- and judgement-based assumptions have been made on:

- employment multipliers for indirect and induced effects;
- leakage, deadweight and displacement of employment effects;
- employment densities;
- estimated population yield, in particular child yield, and the number of school pupils;
- social infrastructure best practice thresholds; and
- scale of impact for the assessments, as defined by receptor.

L1.6.2 All of the above assumptions are embedded directly into the methodology but are referenced here for completeness.

L2 Socio-economics: supporting tables

L2.1 Demographics for baseline assessment

Population size

Table 7 Estimated population of City of Westminster and London between 2017-2042[36]

Borough	Estimated population 2017	Estimated population 2042	Projected population change 2017-2042	Projected population change 2017-42 (%)
City of Westminster	244,813	277,444	32,631	13.3%
London	8,838,025	10,522,121	1,684,096	19.1%

Sectoral employment

Table 8 Percentage of employees by broad industry type in Churchill Ward, City of Westminster and London[37]

Industry	Churchill Ward (%)	City of Westminster (%)	London (%)
A, B, D, E Agriculture, mining and quarrying, energy, water supply and waste management activities	3.8	0.6	0.7
C Manufacturing	1	1	2.2
F Construction	1.4	2.1	3.6
G Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motor cycles	11.5	10.6	12.1
H Transport and storage	17.1	1.5	4.1
I Accommodation and food service activities	12.9	13	8.4
J Information and communication	1	9.5	7.9
K Financial and insurance activities	0.1	6.6	7
L Property and real estate activities	2.1	4.9	2.7
M Professional, scientific and technical activities	11.4	16.9	13.7
N Administrative and support service activities	5.7	8.1	10.9
O Public administration and defence	14.3	9.4	4.3
P Education	7.1	4.5	7.4

---

[36] ONS, 2017. *Mid-year population estimates.* Available at: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates; GLA, 2017. *Trend-based population estimates: Long-term.* Available at: https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/trend-based-population-projections

[37] ONS, 2019. *2018 Business Register and Employment Survey (BRES).* Available at: https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/employmentandemployeetypes/bulletins/businessregisterandemploymentsurveybresprovisionalresults/2018#business-register-and-employment-survey-data

Industry	Churchill Ward (%)	City of Westminster (%)	London (%)
Q Health	11.4	4.6	10.3
R, S, T, U Arts, entertainment, recreation and other services	2.1	6.6	4.8

Table 9 Percentage of employees by occupation in City of London and Westminster[38]

Occupation	City of Westminster (%)	London (%)
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	23.5	13.3
Professional Occupations	32.3	26.4
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	18.6	18.7
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	6.7	8.9
Skilled Trade Occupations	#39	6.8
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	6.7	7.1
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	4.1	5.7
Process, Plan and Machine Operatives	#40	4.5
Elementary	3.4	8.1

L2.2 Adopted and emerging policy targets relating to housing size and tenure mix

Table 10 Annual housing delivery targets set out in adopted and emerging planning policy documents

Policy Document	Policy	Quantum
Westminster City Plan 2016	Policy S14 Optimising Housing Delivery	1,068 dwellings per annum
Draft Westminster City Plan 2019-2040	Policy 8 Stepping up housing delivery	1,495 dwellings per annum
London Plan 2016	Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply, Table 3.1 Annual average housing supply monitoring targets 2015-2025	1,068 dwellings per annum
Draft London Plan (Intend to Publish version - December 2019)	Table 4.1 10 year targets for net housing completions (2019/20 - 2028/29)	985 dwellings per annum (annualised average)

---

[38] ONS, 2018. *Nomis Labour Market Profile – Westminster – Employment by occupation (Oct 2018 – Sep 2019).* Available at: https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157259/report.aspx#tabempocc

[39] # - Sample size too small for reliable estimate

[40] # - Sample size too small for reliable estimate

Table 11 Target dwelling size and tenure mix identified in adopted and emerging planning policy and evidence base documents in order to meet borough and London-wide housing needs

Policy Document	Policy	Housing size (bedrooms) and tenure mix
Westminster City Plan 2016	Policy S16 Affordable Housing	The council will aim to exceed 30% of new homes to be affordable homes.
Draft Westminster City Plan 2019-2040	Policy 9 Affordable Housing	35% of all new homes will be affordable across Westminster. 60% of affordable units will be 'intermediate' affordable housing for rent or sale and 40% will be social rent or London Affordable Rent.
	Policy 11 Housing for Specific Groups	Policy aspiration for 25% of all new homes to be family sized (between 3 - 5 bedrooms)
London Plan 2016	Policy 3.11 Affordable Housing Targets	Affordable housing mix should comprise 60% social or affordable rent and 40% for intermediate rent or sale.
Draft London Plan (Intend to Publish version - December 2019)	Policy H6 Affordable Housing Tenure	Policy aspiration for 50% affordable housing. Affordable housing mix should comprise a minimum of 30% low cost rented homes (London Affordable Rent/Social Rent); 30% intermediate products (London Living Rent/London Shared Ownerships) and remaining 40% to be determined by borough as low cost rented homes or intermediate products based on identified need.
London Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2017	Table 1	Identified need for affordable housing as per Policy H6. Identified overall London-wide needs across all tenures: 55% 1 bed units; 16% 2 bed units; 14% 3 bed units; 15% 4+ bed units.

L2.3 Baseline of existing on-site employment

Table 12 Estimate of gross full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs supported by existing on-site employment generating uses

Block	Address (Ebury Bridge Road)	Business name (as of September 2019)	Estimate floorspace (GIA) (sqm)	Estimate floorspace (NIA) (sqm)[41]	Planning Use Class (as judged on site visit September 2019)	Assumed Employment Density[42]	Justification	FTE Supported
Rye House	3	Vival Property Services	47	37.6	A2	16	It is judged that the unit is in A2 use (Finance & Professional Services), and can be considered to align with the corresponding density set out in the HCA (2015) Employment Density Guide	2
Rye House	5	Vacant	47	37.6	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Rye House	7	Hair Prive	47	37.6	A1	19	It is considered that the unit is in A1 use (Retail) and can be considered to align with the 'High Street' sub-sector employment density set out in the HCA (2015) Employment Density Guide	2
Rye House	9	Vacant	47	37.6	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Rye House	11-13	Ideal Café	94	75.2	A3	19	It is considered that the unit is in A3 use (Restaurants and Cafés) and can be considered to align with the	4

---

[41] According to the HCA (2015) Employment Densities Guide, as a general benchmark, 15-20% acts as a suitable assumption for converting gross to net areas in non-industrial properties. A reduction of 20% has thus been applied.
[42] Based on benchmark employment densities set out in Table 4 Employment Density Matrix in HCA (2015) Employment Densities Guide

Block	Address (Ebury Bridge Road)	Business name (as of September 2019)	Estimate floorspace (GIA) (sqm)	Estimate floorspace (NIA) (sqm)[41]	Planning Use Class (as judged on site visit September 2019)	Assumed Employment Density[42]	Justification	FTE Supported
							corresponding density set out in the HCA (2015) Employment Density Guide	
Rye House	15-19	Ebury Bridge Regeneration Base	141	112.8	A2	16	It is considered that the unit would support an employment density comparable to a unit in A2 use (Finance & Professional Services), and the corresponding density set out in the HCA (2015) Employment Density Guide is therefore applied.	7
Bucknill House	21	Crown Dry Cleaners	47	37.6	A1	19	It is considered that the unit is in A1 retail use and can be considered to align with the 'High Street' sub-sector employment density set out in the HCA (2015) Employment Density Guide	2
Bucknill House	23	Ebury News	47	37.6	A1	19	It is considered that the unit is in A1 retail use and can be considered to align with the 'High Street' sub-sector employment density set out in the HCA (2015) Employment Density Guide	2
Bucknill House	25	Leonora Couture	47	37.6	A1	19	It is considered that the unit is in A1 retail use and can be considered to align with the 'High Street' sub-sector	2

Block	Address (Ebury Bridge Road)	Business name (as of September 2019)	Estimate floorspace (GIA) (sqm)	Estimate floorspace (NIA) (sqm)[41]	Planning Use Class (as judged on site visit September 2019)	Assumed Employment Density[42]	Justification	FTE Supported
							employment density set out in the HCA (2015) Employment Density Guide	
Bucknill House	27	Occasions Pimlico	47	37.6	A1	19	It is considered that the unit is in A1 retail use and can be considered to align with the 'High Street' sub-sector employment density set out in the HCA (2015) Employment Density Guide	2
Bucknill House	29-31	Greens Pharmacy	94	75.2	A1	19	It is considered that the unit is in A1 retail use and can be considered to align with the 'High Street' sub-sector employment density set out in the HCA (2015) Employment Density Guide	4
Bucknill House	33	Mauro Sergio	47	37.6	A1	19	It is considered that the unit is in A1 retail use and can be considered to align with the 'High Street' sub-sector employment density set out in the HCA (2015) Employment Density Guide	2
Bucknill House	35	Vacant	47	37.6	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Bucknill House	37	Ian Bennett Millinery	47	37.6	A1	19	It is considered that the unit is in A1 retail use and can be considered to align with the 'High Street' sub-sector employment density set out in	2

Block	Address (Ebury Bridge Road)	Business name (as of September 2019)	Estimate floorspace (GIA) (sqm)	Estimate floorspace (NIA) (sqm)[41]	Planning Use Class (as judged on site visit September 2019)	Assumed Employment Density[42]	Justification	FTE Supported
							the HCA (2015) Employment Density Guide	
		Total floorspace	846	676.8			Total estimated gross FTE jobs supported by existing on-site employment-generating uses	31

L2.4   Estimated operational employment calculations

Table 13 Estimation of gross direct FTE jobs supported by Proposed Development in maximum and minimum operational employment scenarios

Ref	Description of calculation	Pan-Borough (max scenario)	Pan-Borough (min scenario)	London (max scenario)	London (min scenario)
A	Gross Direct Employment	107	101	107	101
B	Leakage assumption	0.25	0.25	0.1	0.1
C = A x (1-B)	…leaves employment of	81	76	97	91
D	Displacement assumption	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
E = C x (1-D)	…leaves employment of	60	57	72	68
F	Substitution assumption	0	0	0	0
G = E x (1-F)	…leaves employment of	60	57	72	68
H	Deadweight (reference case)	50% of existing on-site direct employment	50% of existing on-site direct employment	10% of existing on-site direct employment	10% of existing on-site direct employment
I = G x (1-H)	…leaves employment of	41	37	69	64
J	Composite multiplier	1.3	1.3	1.5	1.5
K = I	Net additional direct employment	41	37	69	64
L = I x (J-1)	Net additional indirect and induced employment	12	11	34	32
M = K + L	**Net additional total employment**	**53**	**49**	**103**	**96**

L2.5   Existing social infrastructure schedules

GP surgery provision

Table 14 GP surgeries within a one-mile radius[43] of the Proposed Development[44]

Surgery Name	Address	Distance (Miles)	Borough	No. of Patients Registered	No. of GPs Employed
Dr Victoria Muir's Practice	Belgrave Medical Centre, 13 Pimlico Rd, SW1W 8NA	0.1	Westminster	8,788	4
Dr Shakarchi's Practice	Belgrave Medical Centre, 13 - 13A Pimlico Rd, SW1W 8NA	0.1	Westminster	4,098	2
The Belgravia Surgery	26 Eccleston Street , London, Greater London, SW1W 9PY	0.4	Westminster	7,513	3
Pimlico Health At The Marven	46-50 Lupus Street , London, Greater London, SW1V 3EB	0.5	Westminster	14,262	9
Victoria Medical Centre	29 Upper Tachbrook Street, SW1V 1SN	0.5	Westminster	16,368	11
Knightsbridge Medical Centre	71-75 Pavillion Road, SW1X 0ET	0.8	Kensington and Chelsea	16,010	11
The Chelsea Practice	30 Flood Walk, SW3 5RR	0.8	Kensington and Chelsea	5,215	3
Battersea Fields Practice	115 Thessaly Road, SW8 4EJ	0.9	Wandsworth	11,570	4
Millbank Medical Centre	20 Page Street, SW1P 4EN	0.9	Westminster	7,243	3
			Total	91,067	50

---

[43] This distance represents the direct path and does not account for walking/bus/driving routes.
[44] NHS, Find a GP. Available at: https://www.nhs.uk/service-search/find-a-gp

Education facilities

Table 15 Early years facilities within a two-mile radius of the Proposed Development

	Early years facility	Distance (miles)[45]	Borough	Ofsted report date	Total no. of places (capacity)[46]	No. of children on roll[47]	Surplus/ deficit
1	Abbots Manor Community Nursery	0.12	Westminster	2018	25	25	0
2	Bright Horizons Chelsea Day Nursery and Preschool	0.15	Westminster				0[48]
3	The Angel Nursery Community Nursery	0.39	Westminster	2016	30	52	-22
4	Churchill Gardens Primary Academy	0.48	Westminster	2016			0[49]
5	St Peter's Eaton Square CofE Primary School	0.49	Westminster	2010			0[50]
6	Pimlico Creche	0.55	Westminster	2018	15	33	-18
7	St Joseph's Catholic Primary School	0.58	Kensington and Chelsea	2013			0[51]
8	Christ Church Street French Nursery	0.61	Kensington and Chelsea	2016	18	18	0
9	The Knightsbridge Kindergarten	0.62	Westminster	2018	76	62	14
10	Miss Daisy's Nursery School	0.66	Kensington and Chelsea	2018	65	63	2
11	Bessborough Community Nursery	0.72	Westminster	2019	60	61	-1
12	The Little House Nursery	0.74	Westminster	2017	64	83	-19
13	Spring - Violet Melchett	0.75	Kensington and Chelsea	2018	42	53	-11
14	Tachbrook Nursery School	0.77	Westminster	2015			0[52]
15	Miss Daisy's Nursery School	0.83	Kensington and Chelsea	2017	41	41	0
16	Busy Bees Day Nursery at Westminster	0.93	Westminster	2018	72	73	-1
17	Marsham Street Community Nursery	0.94	Westminster	2013	55	63	-8
18	Hatching Dragons Westminster	0.96	Westminster	2019	27	23	4
19	Storm Family Centre Limited	1	Wandsworth	2018	20	19	1
20	Cheeky Cherubs Day Nursery	1.04	Wandsworth	2018	26	16	10
21	Ethelburga Early Years	1.05	Wandsworth	2018	29	32	-3

---

[45] This distance represents the direct path and does not account for walking/bus/car routes.

[46] Ofsted – Find an inspection report. Available at: https://reports.ofsted.gov.uk/ (as of December 2019)

[47] Ofsted – Find an inspection report. Available at: https://reports.ofsted.gov.uk/ (as of February 2019)

[48] Given the lack of information, the surplus/deficit has been assumed neutral.

[49] As footnote 11

[50] As footnote 11

[51] As footnote 11

[52] Given the lack of information, the surplus/deficit has been assumed neutral.

	Early years facility	Distance (miles)[45]	Borough	Ofsted report date	Total no. of places (capacity)[46]	No. of children on roll[47]	Surplus/ deficit
22	Learning Ladders Early Years	1.11	Wandsworth	2018	42	24	18
23	The Park SW11 Kindergarten	1.13	Wandsworth	2013	30	29	1
24	Strawberry Academy	1.19	Lambeth	2017	39	39	0
25	Mace Montessori Nursery	1.19	Lambeth	2015	60	70	-10
26	Quensberry Nursery	1.24	Kensington and Chelsea	2018	64	64	0
27	Bridge Lane Nursery Ltd	1.28	Wandsworth	2015	66	96	-30
28	The Oval Montessori Nursery	1.33	Lambeth	2015	20	24	-4
29	James Kane Day Nursery	1.34	Lambeth	2015	49	19	30
30	World's End Under Fives Centre	1.34	Kensington and Chelsea	2018	24	23	1
31	Bright Horizons Battersea Day Nursery and Preschool	1.39	Wandsworth	2016	79	65	14
32	Working Mums Daycare & Pre-School	1.4	Wandsworth	2018	66	38	28
33	Thomas's Kindergarten	1.4	Wandsworth	2016	38	45	-7
34	Union Grove Community Nursery	1.43	Lambeth	2018	48	36	12
35	Somerset Nursery School and Children's Centre	1.43	Wandsworth	2014	78	80	-2
36	The Clapham Day Nursery & Pre-school	1.44	Lambeth	2017	72	96	-24
37	Stepping Stones Community Nursery	1.44	Lambeth	2017	14	8	6
38	The Willcocks Nursery School Ltd	1.45	Westminster	2012	32	36	-4
39	Union Grove Community Nursery	1.46	Lambeth	2019	48	41	7
40	Magic Roundabout Nurseries Ltd	1.46	Lambeth	2018	185	119	66
41	St Thomas' Hospital Day Nursery	1.47	Lambeth	2016	102	75	27
42	Monkey Puzzle Day Nursery Battersea	1.51	Wandsworth	2019	71	53	18
43	Purple Jay Nursery Lambeth	1.52	Lambeth	2018	80	62	18
44	Fledgings Kindergarten	1.54	Wandsworth	2018	24	6	18
45	Clapham Montessori	1.55	Lambeth	2017	26	20	6
46	Spring - Cheyne	1.58	Kensington and Chelsea	2018	63	36	27
47	Green Shoots Day Nursery	1.6	Lambeth	2018	25	20	5
48	The Italian Day Nursery	1.61	Lambeth	2015	26	32	-6
49	Bumble Bee Nursery School	1.63	Wandsworth	2016	34	38	-4
50	The Pelican Nursery	1.63	Lambeth	2018	40	55	-15

	Early years facility	Distance (miles)[45]	Borough	Ofsted report date	Total no. of places (capacity)[46]	No. of children on roll[47]	Surplus/ deficit
51	Pooh Corner SW7 Kindergarten	1.64	Kensington and Chelsea	2018	40	39	1
52	Destiny Kids Nursery	1.65	Wandsworth	2018	28	14	14
53	Henry Fawcett Community Nursery	1.67	Lambeth	2016	47	54	-7
54	Ecole Du Parc	1.67	Wandsworth	2017	68	60	8
55	The Pelican Nursery	1.7	Lambeth	2018	24	26	-2
56	Ecole Du Parc	1.73	Wandsworth	2018	45	28	17
57	Tia Anna's Nursery Ltd	1.76	Lambeth	2018	37	34	3
58	Lavender Hill Day Nursery	1.76	Wandsworth	2018	72	78	-6
59	Toad Hall Nursery School	1.76	Lambeth	2016	20	30	-10
60	Linden Tree Nursery Schoool	1.77	Lambeth	2017	37	22	15
61	Stockwell Gardens Nursery	1.82	Lambeth	2019	63	39	24
62	The Co-operative Childcare Waterloo	1.86	Lambeth	2017	64	64	0
63	York Gardens Nursery	1.86	Wandsworth	2017	24	46	-22
64	Anglo Spanish Day Nursery	1.86	Lambeth	2019	86	94	-8
65	La Petite Fleur Pre-School and Nursery	1.88	Wandsworth	2018	30	23	7
66	Pippa Pop-ins	1.9	Hammersmith and Fulham	2013	60	113	-53
67	Bunnies on the Green Nursery	1.91	Lambeth	2019	26	31	-5
68	Active Learning Fulham Nursery	1.92	Hammersmith and Fulham	2018	100	78	22
69	Cubs Club Nursery	1.95	Lambeth	2017	28	23	5
70	Hope Montessori Nursery School (Marylebone)	1.95	Westminster	2019	70	80	-10
71	Banana Moon Day Nursery Battersea	1.97	Wandsworth	2016	58	32	26
72	The Marmalade Cat	1.97	Wandsworth	2016	40	84	-44
73	SRC Community Nursery	1.98	Southwark	2019	69	63	6
74	St Patrick's Montessori Nursery School	1.99	Lambeth	2017	66	100	-34
75	We Care Child Care	1.99	Lambeth	2017	35	48	-13
76	Bright Horizons Hyde Park Day Nursery and Preschool	1.99	Westminster	2018	46	50	-4
						Total	74

Table 16 Primary schools within a two-mile radius of the Proposed Development

	Primary school facility	Distance (miles)[53]	Phases[54]		Borough	Ofsted report date (full report)	Ofsted summary[55]		Westminster School Organisation and Investment Strategy 2018[56]			Surplus/ deficit
1	St Barnabas' CofE Primary School	0.12			Westminster	2013		139	161	122		39
2	St Gabriel's CofE Primary School	0.39			Westminster	2014		182	210	188		22
3	Holy Trinity CofE Primary School	0.41			Kensington and Chelsea	2012	210	219				-9
4	Churchill Gardens Primary Academy	0.48			Westminster	2016		219	210	202		8
5	St Peter's Eaton Square CofE Primary School	0.49			Westminster	2006		294	340	296		44
6	Pimlico Primary	0.55			Westminster	2015		229	240	192		108
7	St Joseph's Catholic Primary School	0.58			Kensington and Chelsea	2013	238	226				12
8	St Vincent de Paul RC Primary School	0.62			Westminster	2016		218	210	195		15
9	Christ Church CofE Primary School	0.67			Kensington and Chelsea	2013	210	207				3
10	Marlborough Primary School	0.73			Kensington and Chelsea	2014	420	374				46
11	Burdett-Coutts and	0.76			Westminster	2014		195	378	218		160

[53] This distance represents the direct path and does not account for walking/bus/driving routes.

[54] These columns identify which phases the schools provide for.

[55] Data sourced from school homepage from Gov.uk – Find and Compare Schools in England. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/school-performance-tables (as of March 2020)

[56] Westminster City Council, 2018. *School Organisation and Investment Strategy 2018*. Available at: https://www.westminster.gov.uk/school-organisation-place-planning. The data from this source has been used in the case of schools located in Westminster.

	Primary school facility	Distance (miles)[53]	Phases[54]		Borough	Ofsted report date (full report)	Ofsted summary[55]		Westminster School Organisation and Investment Strategy 2018[56]		Surplus/ deficit
	Townshend Foundation CofE Primary School										
12	Westminster Cathedral RC Primary School	0.78			Westminster	2013		182	210	196	14
13	Millbank Academy	0.85			Westminster	2013		356	420	358	62
14	St Mary's RC Voluntary Aided Primary School	0.87			Wandsworth	2012	222	224			-2
15	Oratory Roman Catholic Primary School	0.88			Kensington and Chelsea	2010	210	212			-2
16	St George's CofE Primary School	0.95			Wandsworth	2019	240	239			1
17	St Matthew's School, Westminster	0.98			Westminster	2013		209	210	191	19
18	Chesterton Primary School	1.1			Wandsworth		409	463			-54
19	Griffin Primary School	1.16			Wandsworth		420	298			122
20	Park Walk Primary School	1.26			Kensington and Chelsea	2012	236	198			38
21	Westbridge Primary School	1.26			Wandsworth	2017	345	183			162
22	Herbert Morrison Primary School	1.27			Lambeth	2016	236	225			11
23	Our Lady of Victories RC Primary School	1.29			Kensington and Chelsea	2011	240	235			5
24	Ashburnham Community School	1.31			Kensington and Chelsea	2015	229	223			6

	Primary school facility	Distance (miles)[53]	Phases[54]		Borough	Ofsted report date (full report)	Ofsted summary[55]		Westminster School Organisation and Investment Strategy 2018[56]		Surplus/ deficit
25	St Stephen's Church of England Primary School	1.34			Lambeth	2019	236	222			14
26	St George's Hanover Square CofE Primary School	1.36			Westminster	2011		165	210	189	21
27	John Burns Primary School	1.37			Wandsworth	2008	219	220			-1
28	St Anne's Catholic Primary School	1.37			Lambeth	2013	396	402			-6
29	Heathbrook Primary School	1.39			Lambeth	2019	420	356			64
30	Vauxhall Primary School	1.4			Lambeth	2012	210	237			-27
31	St Mark's Church of England Primary School	1.44			Lambeth	2016	237	213			24
32	Shaftesbury Park Primary School	1.44			Wandsworth	2013	450	372			78
33	Servite RC Primary School	1.45			Kensington and Chelsea	2007	210	234			-24
34	Allen Edwards Primary School	1.51			Lambeth	2014	350	369			-19
35	Lark Hall Primary School (Including Lark Hall Centre for Pupils with Autism)	1.55			Lambeth	2014	478	354			124
36	Sacred Heart Catholic Primary School, Battersea	1.55			Wandsworth	2014	504	412			92

	Primary school facility	Distance (miles)[53]	Phases[54]		Borough	Ofsted report date (full report)	Ofsted summary[55]		Westminster School Organisation and Investment Strategy 2018[56]		Surplus/ deficit
37	Bousfield Primary School	1.56			Kensington and Chelsea	2008	450	437			13
38	Ashmole Primary School	1.59			Lambeth	2006	210	218			-8
39	Walnut Tree Walk Primary School	1.61			Lambeth	2014	315	246			69
40	Belleville Wix Academy	1.61			Wandsworth		334	311			23
41	Henry Fawcett Primary School	1.67			Lambeth	2017	420	371			49
42	Soho Parish CofE Primary School	1.69			Westminster	2019		169	164	178	-14
43	Christ Church CofE Primary School	1.69			Wandsworth	2012	220	172			48
44	Reay Primary School	1.7			Lambeth	2017	250	243			7
45	Archbishop Sumner Church of England Primary School	1.73			Lambeth	2014	446	406			40
46	Van Gogh Primary	1.77			Lambeth			660			0[57]
47	Clapham Manor Primary School	1.78			Lambeth	2007	420	454			-34
48	Falconbrook Primary School	1.78			Wandsworth	2011	399	276			123
49	Macaulay Church of England Primary School	1.8			Lambeth	2009	210	213			-3

---

[57] Given the lack of information on capacity, the surplus/deficit has been assumed neutral.

	Primary school facility	Distance (miles)[53]	Phases[54]		Borough	Ofsted report date (full report)	Ofsted summary[55]		Westminster School Organisation and Investment Strategy 2018[56]			Surplus/ deficit
50	Oasis Academy Johanna	1.84			Lambeth	2015	246	209				37
51	St Andrew's Church of England Primary School	1.87			Lambeth	2019	210	191				19
52	St Cuthbert with St Matthias CofE Primary School	1.88			Kensington and Chelsea	2016	236	183				53
53	Charlotte Sharman Primary School	1.93			Southwark	2018	236	308				-72
54	Keyworth Primary School	1.94			Southwark	2018	500	394				106
55	St Georges Cathedral Catholic Primary School	1.95			Southwark	2018	420	233				187
56	Christ Church Primary SW9	1.98			Lambeth	2019	209	190				19
57	St Jude's Church of England Primary School	1.99			Southwark	2014	210	99				111
58	Hampden Gurney CofE Primary School	2			Westminster	2009		226	210	204		6
											Total	**1,949**

Table 17 Secondary schools within a three-mile radius of the Proposed Development

	Secondary school facility	Distance (miles)[58]	Phases[59]			Borough	Ofsted report date	Ofsted summary[60]		Westminster School Organisation and Investment Strategy 2018[61]		Surplus/ deficit
			Primary	Secondary	Sixth Form			Total no. of places (capacity)	No. of children on roll	Total no. of places (capacity)	No. of children on roll	
1	Sir Simon Milton Westminster University Technical College	0.14				Westminster						0[62]
2	Pimlico Academy	0.55				Westminster	2010		1165	1050	1020	30
3	Saint Thomas More Language College	0.58				Kensington and Chelsea	2013	592	617			-25
4	Westminster City School	0.76				Westminster	2013		797	710	641	69
5	The Grey Coat Hospital	0.81				Westminster	2009		1058	755	797	-42

---

[58] This distance represents the direct path and does not account for walking/bus/driving routes.

[59] These columns identify which phases the schools provide for.

[60] Data sourced from school homepage from Gov.uk – Find and Compare Schools in England. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/school-performance-tables (as of March 2020)

[61] Westminster City Council, 2018. *School Organisation and Investment Strategy 2018*. Available at: https://www.westminster.gov.uk/school-organisation-place-planning. The data from this source has been used in the case of schools located in Westminster.

[62] Data not available

| | Secondary school facility | Distance (miles)[58] | Phases[59] | | | Borough | Ofsted report date | Ofsted summary[60] | | Westminster School Organisation and Investment Strategy 2018[61] | | Surplus/ deficit |
			Primary	Secondary	Sixth Form			Total no. of places (capacity)	No. of children on roll	Total no. of places (capacity)	No. of children on roll	
6	Harris Academy Battersea	1.18				Wandsworth	2018	1150	1006			0[63]
7	Lilian Baylis Technology School	1.33				Lambeth	2013	800	802			0[64]
8	Saint John Bosco College	1.38				Wandsworth	2013	1200	569			0[65]
9	Archbishop Tenison's School	1.54				Lambeth		700	360			340
10	Chelsea Academy	1.61				Kensington and Chelsea	2012	1050	1129			0[66]
11	Platanos College	1.67				Lambeth	2014	1000	1004			-4
12	Oasis Academy South Bank	1.76				Lambeth	2015	720	667			53

[63] The data for capacity and number of children on roll is not disaggregated for this combined secondary and sixth form facility, making it challenging to identify any detail on within which key stages or year groups a surplus or deficit might fall. The surplus/deficit has thus been assumed neutral.
[64] As above
[65] As above
[66] As above

	Secondary school facility	Distance (miles)[58]	Phases[59]			Borough	Ofsted report date	Ofsted summary[60]		Westminster School Organisation and Investment Strategy 2018[61]		Surplus/ deficit
			Primary	Secondary	Sixth Form			Total no. of places (capacity)	No. of children on roll	Total no. of places (capacity)	No. of children on roll	
13	Notre Dame Roman Catholic Girls' School	1.96				Southwark	2012	620	615			5
14	The London Oratory School	1.99				Hammersmith and Fulham	2009	1101	1351			0[67]
											Total	**426**

L2.6 Community facilities

Table 18 Community facilities within a two-mile radius[68] of the Proposed Development[69]

Community facility	Address	Type of facility	Further detail
Dryburgh Community Hall	Abbots Manor Estate, SW1V 4ET	Community centre	Community hall
Grosvenor Hall	Vincent Street, SW1P 4HB	Community centre	Community hall
Lillington Gardens Community Centre	Morgan House, 57 Vauxhall Bridge Road, SW1V 2LF	Community centre	Community hall
St Saviours Hall	St Saviours Church, St George's Square, SW1V 3QW	Community centre	Associated with a place of worship
Abbey Community Centre	34 Great Smith Street, SW1P 3BU	Community centre	Community hall and conference centre
Stockwell Centre	1 Studley Road, SW4 6RA	Community centre	Associated with a place of study
Wheatsheaf Hall	Wheatsheaf Lane, SW8 2UP	Community centre	Community hall
Heath Road Community Hall	117 Heath Road, SW8 3BB	Community centre	Community hall
Chandler Hall	15 Lambeth Walk, SE11 6DU	Community centre	Community hall

---

[67] As above

[68] This distance represents the direct path and does not account for walking/bus/driving routes.

[69] The data has been compiled from a range of sources:
Google maps; City of Westminster, 2019. *City Plan 2019-2040 – Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (November 2019 – Live document)*. Available at
https://www.westminster.gov.uk/sites/default/files/ev_gen_007_draft_infrastructure_delivery_plan_wcc_november_2019.pdf; City of Westminster, *Hall hire.* Available at
https://www.westminster.gov.uk/yourhousing/spacesforhire; Mayor of London. *Cultural Infrastructure Map*.
Available at: https://maps.london.gov.uk/cim/index.html#

Community facility	Address	Type of facility	Further detail
Holland Town Community Hall	11 Vassall Road, SW9 6FW	Community centre	Community hall
R.O.S.E Clubroom	Ascalon Street, SW8 4DL	Community centre	Community hall
The Venue Community Centre	191 Battersea Park Road, SW11 4LD	Community centre	n/a
Kambala Community Clubroom	126 Fawcett Close, SW11 2LU	Community centre	Residential-led community initiative
Wilditch Centre	48 Culvert Road, SW11 5BB	Community centre	Community hall
Ashmole Estate Tenants' Hall	2 Meadow Road, SW8 1PL	Community centre	Community hall
Stockwell Park Community Centre	21 Aytoun Place, SW9 0TE	Community centre	n/a
Sir Thomas More Community Centre	Sir Thomas More Estate, SW3 5BH	Community centre	n/a
John Keys Resource Centre	Pond House, SW3 6QU	Community centre	Community hall
London Chinese Community Centre	2 Leicester Court, WC2H 7DW	Community centre	Cultural centre
Churchill Gardens Residents Association	Lupus Street, SW1V 3AL	Community centre	Community hall
Kennington Park Centre	40 St Agnes Place, SE11 4BE	Community centre	Community hall
Alberta TRA Hall	Alberta Street, SE17 3SG	Community centre	Community hall
Ethelburga Community Centre	60 Worfield Street, SW11 4RA	Community centre	n/a
York Gardens Library and Community Centre	34 Lavender Road, SW11 2UG	Community centre	n/a
The Old Laundry	6 Stockwell Gardens, SW9 9HQ	Community centre	Children's centre
Ixworth Place Community Centre	2 Kimbolton Row, London SW3 6RQ	Community centre	Community hall
Lansdowne Green Community Centre	283-291 Wandsworth Road, SW8 2ND	Community centre	Community hall
Chelsea Old Church	64 Cheyne Walk, SW3 5LT	Community centre	Associated with place of worship
Bolney Meadow Community Centre	31 Bolney Street, SW8 1EZ	Community centre	n/a
Vauxhall Gardens Community Centre	5 Glasshouse Walk, SE11 5ES	Community centre	n/a
Hammerton Memorial Hall	102 Lingham Street, SW9 0UP	Community centre	Associated with place of worship
Pedlars Acre Community Hall	1 Opal Street, SE11	Community centre	Community hall
Pennethorne House Meeting Room	4 Wye Street, SW11 2SJ	Community centre	Community hall
Patmore Clubroom	Thessaly Road, SW8 4HR	Community centre	n/a
Covent Garden Community Centre	Seven Dials Club, WC2H 9LA	Community centre	n/a
Jubilee Hall	Jubilee Hall Recreation Centre & Gym, WC2E 8BE	Community centre	Charity sports centre
Cardinal Hume Centre	The Surgery, SW1P 2BG	Community centre	Family centre
Amigo House Hall	Amigo House, SE1 7QE	Community centre	Community hall
Lansdowne Green Family Centre	Lambeth Family Housing Centre, SW8 2BJ	Community centre	Family centre
Pimlico Thamesbank Centre	Thames Bank Centre, Turpentine Lane, SW1V 4BD	Community centre	n/a
Kennington Park Community Centre	8 Harleyford Street, SE11 5SY	Community centre	n/a
Battersea Arts Centre	Lavender Hill, SW11 5TN	Community centre	Arts centre

Community facility	Address	Type of facility	Further detail
Soho Family Centre	St. James' Residences, W1F 0RN	Community centre	Family centre
Central Hall Westminster	Storey's Gate, SW1H 9NH	Community centre	n/a
Dimson Lodge Clubroom	141 Battersea Church Road, SW11 3NR	Community centre	Clubroom
Kennington-Bowl skate park	Beregaria Court, SE11 4BT	Community centre / Youth club	Sports facilities
Clapham-Common skate park	10 Rookery Rd, SW4 9DD	Community centre / Youth club	Sports facilities
Southbank Centre	Belvedere Road, SE1 8XX	Multipurpose community centre	Community and arts centre
Archbishop Davidson Institute	218 Lambeth Road, SE1 7JY	Youth centre	n/a
St Andrew's Club	Alec Wizard House, SW1P 2DG	Youth club	Associated with place of worship
Catholic Youth Service	39 Eccleston Square, SW1V 1BX	Youth club	Associated with place of worship
Alford House Club	Aveline St SE11 5DQ	Youth club	n/a
Chelsea Youth Club	Vlantyre St, SW10 0EQ	Youth club	n/a
Ethelred Estate Community Youth Club	7 Lollard St, SE11 6QH	Youth club	n/a
MYX	70 S Lambeth Rd, SW8 1RL	Youth club	n/a
Providence House Youth Club	138 Falcon Rd, SW11 2LW	Youth club	Associated with place of worship