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Introduction

Background

1.1 Atkins was commissioned by the London borough of Southwark in March 2011 to undertake an assessment of open space facilities within the borough including the preparation of a strategy and action plan. The purpose of the strategy is to produce a qualitative and quantitative audit and analysis of the supply of, and demand for, open space provision in the borough. This strategy will update and supersede previous open space work undertaken for the Council in 2003 and 2010.

Scope of this Study

1.2 The aim of the Southwark open space strategy is to assess and analyse the quantity and quality of existing open spaces, outdoor sports and recreational facilities, the varied functions of open spaces and the needs of local people.

1.3 The results of this analysis will:
   • inform the development of planning policies.
   • provide the Council with adequate planning guidance and open space standards.
   • assist the Council in identifying needs for new open spaces and outdoor and indoor sports facilities.
   • inform the future management of open spaces and sports facilities including the identification of opportunities to enhance and reconfigure open space provision.
   • enable the Council to identify priorities for future investment and provide a rationale to secure external funding for the improvement and additional provision of facilities particularly via developer contributions.

1.4 This strategy includes an assessment of the quantity, quality and value of parks and open spaces in Southwark and identifies whether existing provision is currently meeting local needs. The study also identifies whether the existing provision in the borough will be sufficient to meet the projected needs of the borough up to 2026 before developing local standards and measures to address current and projected deficiencies in open space provision. The strategy will be used by the Council to inform the preparation of the borough’s emerging planning policies.

1.5 This study has been undertaken in four phases:
   • Phase 1: The National, Regional and Local Framework. A desk top study looking at National, Regional and Local initiatives as well as an analysis of the local context.
   • Phase 2: Assessment of Supply. Looking at the quantity and quality of the open spaces in the borough and identifying opportunities for improvement and enhancement.
   • Phase 3: Assessment of demand. Identifying strategic, borough-wide concerns and assessing the demand for Open Space.
   • Phase 4: Recommendations to Inform the Strategy. Analysis of strategic demand and supply, leading to recommendations for the protection and enhancement of existing spaces to inform the Open Space Strategy and guide future policy development.
Approach to Consultation

An integral component of the Southwark Open Space Strategy is to engage with residents of the borough to determine their use of and attitudes towards the Southwark's open spaces and outdoor sports facilities. This study has included a telephone survey of 750 borough residents as well as a consultation workshop with parks groups and local residents. A summary of the findings of the telephone survey and stakeholder consultation is set out in Chapter 3.

Structure of this Report

This report broadly follows the structure of the recommended approach to undertaking an open space study:

- Chapter 2 provides a review of the current national, regional and local strategies, guidance and initiatives.
- Chapter 3 sets out an assessment of local open spaces needs and priorities, including analysis of the consultation findings.
- Chapter 4 outlines the approach to planning open space provision.
- Chapter 5 provides an assessment of the supply of different types of open space in the borough.
- Chapter 6 provides an assessment of the quality of open space.
- Chapter 7 provides initial recommendations on standards that should be adopted within the sub-area.
- Chapter 8 provides recommendations on meeting open space needs at the borough level.
- Chapter 9 provides recommendations on meeting open spaces needs at the sub-area level.
Introduction

2.1 National, Regional and Local Strategies and Initiatives provide a framework to influence the assessment of open space. Areas of open space within Southwark have many different functions which contribute to quality of life for local residents. Consequently a number of competencies are involved ensuring a comprehensive study of Open Space related policy, including planning; leisure and recreation; health; education and crime and culture. These are considered in the following policy review which spans the national, regional and local levels.

2.2 The analysis set out here provides a brief summary of the key messages extracted from the relevant contextual documents, with further details of each policy initiative included as part of Appendix A.

Importance of Open Space

2.3 A wide variety of policy documents and research reports have identified clear benefits arising from the provision of high quality open space. A report by CABE Space\(^1\) summarised these benefits as:

- The positive economic value of open space, including positive impacts on business, rental values, property prices and the ability to create tax revenue.
- The impact on physical and mental health, with well designed open spaces linked to an increase in physical activity and exercise, an improvement in people's mental well-being and longer life expectancy. These positive health benefits are also identified in a range of Government documents including 'Building Health: Creating and Enhancing for Healthy Active Lives', as well as at the local level in Southwark's Sport and Physical Activity Strategy.
- The benefits for children and young people. Play is crucial for many aspects of children's development, with open space and children's play provision clearly key to facilitating opportunities for play. This is also recognised in the Governments Play Strategy, the Mayor of London's Supplementary Planning Guidance on 'Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation' and within the Southwark Play Strategy.
- Reducing crime and the fear of crime. Fear of crime and, to a much lesser extent, crime itself can deter people from using even good quality public spaces. Physical changes to, and the better management of, open space can help to allay these fears. Improving the security of open spaces is also recognised as a priority within Southwark's Crime and Disorder Strategy.
- The social dimension of open space is also important. Open spaces are open to all, regardless of ethnic origin, age or gender, and as such they represent a democratic forum for citizens and society. When properly designed and cared for, they bring communities together, provide meeting places and foster social ties. These spaces shape the cultural identity of an area, are part of its unique character and provide a sense of place for local communities.
- Value from biodiversity and nature. Vegetation brings many important environmental benefits to urban areas, including the cooling of air and the absorption of atmospheric pollutants. Vegetation also provides an opportunity for people to be close to nature with the associated positive impact that this can bring in terms of mental health. These benefits are well recognised at the national level, as part of PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, at the London-wide level, as part of the Mayor's Biodiversity Strategy, and at the local level, as part of Southwark's Biodiversity Action Plan.

\(^1\) The Value of Public Space – How high quality parks and public spaces create economic, social and environmental value. CABE Space
The Need for Open Space Assessments

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

2.4 The need for an open space strategy is set out in national and regional government guidance, including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and the London Plan. The open space strategy and evidence base report has been developed in accordance with the relevant guidance.

2.5 The strategy uses the definition of open space that is set out in the NPPF. The NPPF defines open space as all open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water (such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs) which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as a visual amenity.

2.6 The types of open space that may be of public value and are included as part of this work, include:
- Parks and gardens
- Natural and semi natural urban green spaces
- Green corridors
- Outdoor sports and play facilities
- Amenity spaces
- Provision for children and teenagers
- Allotments, community gardens and urban farms
- Cemeteries and churchyards
- Civic spaces.

2.7 We will implement the Open Space Strategy while conducting our spatial planning, cultural, parks and leisure management duties. Quality open spaces are essential to ensuring Southwark is a healthy, safe and pleasant place to live, work and visit and therefore the strategy will provide guidance across all Council functions.

2.8 The strategy sets out standards for different types of open space and recreation facilities, and provides an action plan to deliver the objectives set out in this strategy.

PPG17: Planning for open space, sport and recreation

2.9 According to Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (2002), open spaces, sport and recreation underpin people’s quality of life and are fundamental in delivering broader government objectives, including:
- supporting an urban renaissance;
- promotion of social inclusion and community cohesion;
- health and well being; and
- promoting more sustainable development.

2.10 In establishing the value of existing recreational facilities to the community and the need for new facilities, PPG17 recommends that Local Planning Authorities should undertake robust assessments of the existing and future needs of their communities for open space, sports and recreational facilities. Guidelines describing how such assessments should be completed are set out in Assessing
Needs and Opportunities: A companion guide to PPG17 (ODPM, 2002). This study addresses almost all of the issues pertaining to playing pitches and allotments which are identified in the guide.

2.11 The guidelines recommend that audits of local space needs should:

- Cover the differing and distinctive needs of the population for open space and built sports and recreational facilities including those working in and visiting areas.
- Include audits of existing open space, sports and recreational facilities including usage, accessibility, costs and opportunities for new open space and facilities. Audits should establish the quantity of spaces.
- Identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses.

2.12 PPG 17 advises Local Authorities to use the information gained from their assessment of needs and opportunities to set locally derived standards for the provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities in their areas. Such standards form the basis of redressing quantitative and qualitative deficiencies through the planning process. The companion Guide to PPG 17 provides guidance as to how local authorities should identify and apply provision standards based upon assessments of local need.

Mayor of London

2.13 The Mayor of London strongly supports the protection, promotion and enhancement of London’s open spaces and natural environments. The London Plan 2011 sets out the spatial planning framework for London. Its policies aim to ensure that London authorities:

- Realise the value of open space and green infrastructure.
- Protect London’s green belt, metropolitan open land and local open spaces, and support regional and metropolitan park opportunities.
- Support the creation of networks of strategic open space such as green chains and green corridors.
- Create new open space in areas of deficiency and promote improvement to existing provision.
- Require boroughs to prepare open space strategies to protect, create and enhance all types of open space in their area.
- Ensure that children have safe access to good-quality, well-designed, secure and stimulating play and informal recreation provision.
- Protect and improve biodiversity, tackling deficiencies in access to nature.
- Protect and promote trees, woodland, and geodiversity.
- Improve access to the countryside and the quality of the landscape in the urban fringe.

2.14 Policy 2.18 of the London Plan: Green Infrastructure: the network of open and natural spaces, supports national policy guidance requiring the production of an open space study. The policy states that all London boroughs should:

- Follow the guidance in PPG 17 and undertake audits of all forms of open space and assessments of need. These should be both qualitative and quantitative, and have regard to the cross-borough nature and use of many open spaces.
- Produce Open Space Strategies that cover all forms of open space. These should identify
priorities for addressing deficiencies and should set out positive measures for the management of open space. These strategies and their action plans need to be kept under review.

- Produce DPD policies to ensure that green infrastructure needs are planned and managed to realise the current and potential value of open space to communities and to support delivery of the widest range of linked environmental and social benefits.

2.15 The Mayor has also produced guidance on the production of open space studies specific to the London context. The guidance expands upon the companion note to PPG17 and develops the open space hierarchy further to take account of the different roles that parks play in London. Further details of the approach to open space planning in London are provided in Chapter 4.

Approach to Open Space Planning in Southwark

Southwark Plan (2007)

2.16 The Southwark Plan is part of the Development Plan along with the Core Strategy and London Plan. Some of the detailed Southwark plan policies were ‘saved’ in July 2010 with permission from the Secretary of State.

2.17 There are three detailed policies which relate to the protection of open space in the borough identified in the Plan. All policies have been saved and, as such, form part of the Development Plan:

- Policy 3.25, which states that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development on Metropolitan Open Land (in line with the London Plan).
- Policy 3.26, which states that permission will not be granted for development on borough Open Land unless it meets five criteria to ensure that the function and role of the open space is not compromised.
- Policy 3.27, which states that permission will not be granted for development on Other Open Space unless it meets five criteria to ensure that the function and role of the open space is not compromised, or that the open space is re-provided to a similar level of quality within 400m of the original space.

2.18 The UDP also identifies a schedule of MOL, BOL and OOS, along with a detailed typology for each space identified from the work undertaken as part of the 2003 Open Space Study.

Southwark Core Strategy (2011)

2.19 The Southwark Core Strategy was adopted in April 2011 and also forms part of the Development Plan for the borough.

2.20 The key policy with regard to open space is Strategic Policy 11 – Open Spaces and Wildlife, which seeks to ‘improve, protect and maintain a network of open spaces and green corridors that will make places attractive and provide sport, leisure and food growing opportunities for a growing population’ by:

- Continuing to protect important open spaces from inappropriate development. These will include parks, allotments, sports grounds, green chains, sites of importance for nature conservation (SINCs) and cemeteries. Large spaces of importance to all of London will be
protected (Metropolitan Open Land) as well as smaller spaces of more borough-wide and local importance (Borough Open Land and Other Open Spaces).

- Protecting woodland and trees and improving the overall greenness of places, including through promoting gardens and local food growing.
- Promoting and improving access to and links between open spaces.
- Identifying and protecting open spaces that provide quiet areas and relative tranquillity.
- Requiring new development to help meet the needs of a growing population by providing space for children’s play, gardens and other green areas and helping to improve the quality of and access to open spaces and trees, particularly in areas deficient in open space.
- Requiring new development to avoid harming protected and priority plants and animals and help improve and create habitat.

2.21 The policy recognises that the largest open spaces in the borough are protected by the Mayor as part of the Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) designation. These have the highest level of protection and must be kept open in nature with development only in exceptional cases. This essentially reinforces Policy 3.25 of the UDP.

2.22 The policy also reinforces policies 3.26 and 3.27 of the UDP which seek to protect Borough Open Land and Other Open Space.

2.23 No open space standards are identified within the Core Strategy and there is no specific analysis of the different typologies of open space outside the SINCs. However, the borough’s S106 SPD does provide some further details on open space standards.

Section 106 Planning Obligations SPD (2007)

2.24 The borough’s Section 106 Planning Obligations SPD provides guidance that expands on the policies concerning planning obligations in the Southwark Plan (UDP, 2007), particularly Policy 2.5 Planning Obligations and appendix 6.

2.25 The SPD states that applications for 10 residential units and above will be required to contribute to public open space, children’s play equipment and sports development.

2.26 The SPD identifies that, to maintain the current borough-wide level of provision of 2 ha per 1,000 population with the expected increase of 60,000 people in 29,000 dwellings by 2016, will require an additional 180 ha of open space. Planning contributions will be used to create additional open space, or up-grade the quality of existing resources. The 2ha per 1,000 standard was identified using the borough’s 2003 Open Space Study.

2.27 The SPD also requires that, in areas of district park deficiency, the council will seek to secure additional contributions towards open space provision.
Position of Open Space Strategy

2.28 Figure 2.1 illustrates how this study relates to other Council strategies on sport, open space and recreation.

Figure 2.1 – Position of Open Space Study Relative to Other Council Strategies
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**Development strategy within the borough**

2.29 It is important to understand the scale and location of new development within the borough when planning for open space. New development can create increased demand for open space, but can also present opportunities for the creation of new spaces.

2.30 The Core Strategy identifies major growth areas that are identified for development of new housing and employment opportunities. The focus of new development is on Aylesbury; Bankside, Borough & London Bridge; Canada Water, Elephant and Castle and Peckham. These key growth areas have been set targets for housing and employment, as shown in Table 2.1.

**Table 2.1 - Core strategy targets for housing and employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Housing (net)</th>
<th>Affordable housing (net)</th>
<th>Employment (jobs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borough-wide</td>
<td>24,450</td>
<td>8,558</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury action area</td>
<td>4,200 (gross)</td>
<td>2,100 (gross)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankside &amp; Borough action area</td>
<td>1,900 (with London Bridge)</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Water action area</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant &amp; Castle opportunity area</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.31 The Aylesbury Action Area has high targets for housing and affordable housing. The regeneration of the Aylesbury estate is the main focus for this area, which will deliver quality private, intermediate and affordable rental housing, comprising excellent parks, streets and squares that are accessible to all.

2.32 The Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area is set to receive 4,000 new homes and a minimum of 1,400 affordable housing units along with 5,000 new jobs. There will be a focus on encouraging more offices, hotels and smaller businesses to relocate into this area.

2.33 The Borough, Bankside and London Bridge opportunity area has been set the highest target for employment with an additional 25,000 jobs required over the period 2008 – 2026. This area is to develop as a thriving centre for commercial and business activity providing the location for a range of small local businesses, creative/media businesses and global companies, along with supporting tourism and cultural facilities.

2.34 The Canada Water Action Area is set to receive high quality mixed use development that will support a range of residential, retail and office uses. There will be a focus on strengthening Canada Water’s retail core and encouraging more civic and leisure uses and new businesses to move into this area.

2.35 The Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan will set targets for the scale and type of development proposed within the sub-area.

2.36 Further details of the development strategy within each sub-area are included within Appendix B.
Borough Sub-Areas

2.37 The Core Strategy aims to improve places in Southwark based upon each area’s strengths and unique identities. The strategy is to focus on place making within eight distinct sub-areas, which together cover the entire borough. The eight sub-areas (illustrated in Figure 2.2) are:

• Bankside, Borough and London Bridge
• Bermondsey and Old Kent Road
• Elephant and Castle
• Canada Water and Rotherhithe
• Aylesbury and Walworth
• Peckham and Nunhead
• Camberwell
• Dulwich.

2.38 The Council is currently preparing area based planning documents to provide more detailed policies and guidance on each growth area to meet the needs of each local community.

2.39 As well as considering borough-wide issues, this study undertakes analysis of the supply and demand for open space at the sub-area level.

Key issues

2.40 The key issues for open space provision in Southwark, which have been identified through the review of the strategic and policy context are:

• Southwark’s Core Strategy (2011) and Adopted UDP (2007) do not include any open standards at present. Although there is a target to maintain the current standard of 2ha of open space per 1,000 population set out within the S106 Planning Obligations SPD, this standard is not broken down into types of open space. Without quantity standards there is no benchmark against which existing levels provision of public parks can be measured, and it is not possible to establish the level of provision that should be provided in new developments that are in areas of deficiency. It is therefore necessary to set locally based standards of provision for a range of categories of open space where it is important that local needs are provided for locally on a consistent basis. This is a key objective for this study.

• Southwark is an inner London borough with a diverse range of open space types, a complex urban fabric, and a variety of competing demands on open space. Given the different demographic structure, population density and deprivation context, demand for open space is likely to be different in Canada Water compared to Bankside or Elephant and Castle for example. There is a need to consider how open space needs differ throughout the borough.

• Southwark is expected to see an increase in population of up to 19% between 2011 and 2026, which will put pressure on the existing network of open space. There is a need for a strategy which can maximise the quality and value of the existing spaces in these areas, as well as identifying opportunities for new spaces, which can meet the growing demands on them.

• There are opportunities to create new open spaces within the borough which accompany development proposals. There is a need to identify the most appropriate type of open space
required to support the needs of local communities, to ensure that the opportunities presented by these new spaces is maximised.

• Land is under a variety of competing pressures in Southwark, with strong development pressure on open space. There is a need to provide a number of layers of justification to ensure that policies which protect open space against pressure for development are robust. This means gathering detailed information on the wide variety of functions (cultural, recreational, ecological etc) and their value.

• The correct provision and promotion of high quality, accessible leisure facilities is a vital component of improving quality of life and creating vibrant, healthy, active communities.

• The importance of green space in the urban environment is recognised across a comprehensive range of policies, strategies and research documents, with many strategies highlighting the impact that an effective open space network can have on health, recreation, landscape and the environment.
3. Open space needs assessment

3.1 There are a number of objective indicators which influence the open space needs of individual parts of the borough. This chapter assesses the objective indicators of need and the needs of the borough’s residents identified in the residents survey which focused on usage patterns and perceptions. Key findings of the consultation with local stakeholders also form part of the analysis of need and are set out at the end of this Chapter.

3.2 The analysis explores the needs at the overall borough level and by the eight open space sub-areas (see Chapter 2)

Demographic profile

3.3 The demographic profile of an area has a direct influence on levels of participation in both formal and informal sporting activities and the general use of open space due to the fact that people’s involvement in these activities generally varies according to age. Figure 3.1 illustrates the demographic profile of the borough split by the eight sub-areas. The table shows that the sub-areas of Bankside and Canada Water have a significantly higher proportion of the population aged 15-29 than the rest of the borough, which may indicate a greater demand for certain types of outdoor sporting facilities such as full-size adult football, cricket and rugby pitches.

3.4 The table also shows that the proportion of the population under aged fifteen is highest in the sub-area of Aylesbury and Walworth, which suggests that the demand for children’s play per unit of population is likely to be higher in comparison to the other sub-areas.

3.5 Research undertaken by the market research company RSGB (2003) and Hayslip and Panek (1989) has investigated the use of public parks in England with regards to social inclusion. The findings from the study found that open space use varied according to age: younger age groups being more likely to use parks than older ones: “The extent and nature of participation in leisure and recreation change with a person’s age. Generally speaking, participation in leisure activities declines with age, although there are variations according to ones income level, personality, interest, health condition, ability level, transportation, education level and a number of social characteristics.”

3.6 RSGB found that those between the age of 25 and 44 were found most likely to make use of a given open space, with 70% of respondents claiming to have used a park during the course of the last year. This was also reinforced by the Residents’ Survey which identified that residents over 65 were much less likely to use open spaces than younger age groups. The borough as a whole has a higher proportion of people aged below 60 than London as a whole, which suggests that demand for open space per population may be greater than that across London.

3.7 Figure 3.1 shows that the sub-areas of Bankside and Canada Water have the highest proportion of people aged under 60 residing in the area. It is therefore possible that demand for open space per population may be higher within these areas than in other parts of the borough.
Figure 3.1 – Demographic Structure by Sub-Area

Table 3.1 shows the estimated population increase in each sub-area between 2011 and 2026, based upon the 2010 GLA population projections. The projections take into account the number and type of housing units planned for each sub-area, as well as wider demographic trends experienced by the borough.

The table shows that the population of half of the sub-areas are expected to increase by some 25% during the next fifteen years, compared to 18.7% within the borough as a whole. This will clearly increase the demand for open space with the sub-areas of Bankside, Elephant and Castle, Bermondsey and Canada Water. When the increase in population is broken down by age, the table reveals that the age group with the largest increase is the 60-74 year group, which is in line with broad trends of the UK’s ageing population. This is followed by the under 15 age group, which experiences an increase of 22.9%, which suggests that demand for children’s play facilities will increase.

Growth in the 15-29 year age group up to 2026 shows one of the lowest levels of growth out of any of the age cohorts, suggesting that in the future, participation levels in some types of leisure and recreation in the sub-area may be relatively stable.
Table 3.1 – Population Projections by Sub-Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Area</th>
<th>2011 population</th>
<th>2026 population</th>
<th>% increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>24,030</td>
<td>30,233</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>15,585</td>
<td>19,602</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey and Old Kent Road</td>
<td>63,020</td>
<td>79,248</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Water</td>
<td>28,917</td>
<td>36,151</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury and Walworth</td>
<td>22,695</td>
<td>25,234</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>40,499</td>
<td>46,190</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham and Nunhead</td>
<td>59,044</td>
<td>67,754</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>35,029</td>
<td>38,528</td>
<td>101.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>288,819</td>
<td>342,939</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 - Population projections by age - Southwark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age cohort</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>% increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>54,313</td>
<td>66,748</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>77,384</td>
<td>81,932</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>79,846</td>
<td>98,071</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>43,437</td>
<td>52,449</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-74</td>
<td>21,493</td>
<td>28,893</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>12,346</td>
<td>14,846</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GLA Population Projections 2010

Household Composition

3.11 In addition to age, gender and ethnicity, a range of other factors influence participation in open space activities. Research undertaken by Mintel (2000) in their report ‘Sports Participation’ identified the life stage of individuals as being a significant factor in sport participation rates. Mintel (2000) identified participation levels as being highest among those who are employed but not married, and that participation is influenced by family status and occupational group as individuals grow older.

3.12 Whilst the demographic trend of an ageing population has served to increase the level of non-participation amongst the population as a whole, the current trend towards marrying later and starting a family later have increased the length of time that individuals participate most actively in sport.

3.13 Table 3.3 shows Canada Water as having a higher proportion of households that are pre-family, defined as married or cohabiting couples with no children, (18.4%) when compared to the borough as a whole (12.4%). Canada Water also has a higher proportion of single person households (40.4% compared to 36.5% in the borough) and lower proportions of households with dependent children (23.1% against 28.1% in the borough). In addition, Bankside also has the highest proportion of single person households with 42.8%
3.14 Considering these figures against the findings of the Mintel report (2000) there is likely to be greater demand for certain types of leisure activities in open spaces in certain sub-areas, such as Canada Water and Bankside when the higher proportion of young families is taken into consideration. In particular there may be greater demand for active sports participation than London as a whole, and less demand for family orientated leisure, such as play areas and informal open space that can be used for family picnics/gatherings. However this must be understood in context alongside the other demographic findings, such as the age structure of the sub-areas.

Table 3.3 – Household Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre family</th>
<th>Single person and other households</th>
<th>Households with dependent children</th>
<th>Households without dependent children</th>
<th>Pensioner households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey and Old Kent Road</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Water</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury and Walworth</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham and Nunhead</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2001

Open Space Need Indicators

3.15 Several indicators have been assessed to show variations in open space need within the borough. These are described below and illustrated in Figures 3.2 – 3.8.

Population Density

3.16 Population density is an indicator of open space need, since open spaces within areas of high population density are within reach of a greater number of people, and potentially used more often. Often areas of high population density will be housing estates and other tall buildings with a residential component which may have a lack of private amenity space in the form of gardens or yards.

3.17 Figure 3.2 illustrates population density by census output area, as derived from the ONS population estimates for Lower Level Super Output Areas (LSOAs). The measure of density used is people per hectare which has been calculated from the total population divided by the area of LSOA. The density indicator shown in Figure 3.2 relate to gross densities including all open space, infrastructure etc. The figure provides an analysis of population density across the whole of Southwark for each of the sub-areas can be seen in context with the rest of the borough. This is accompanied by Table 3.4 which aggregates the population density analysis to sub-area level.
Table 3.4 – Population Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Population density (people per ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey and Old Kent Road</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Water</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury and Walworth</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham and Nunhead</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ONS

3.18 Figure 3.2 and Table 3.4 demonstrate that areas with the highest population density include the sub-areas of Elephant and Castle, Aylesbury and Bermondsey, which are all located in the north-west and central parts of the borough. The development within these northern sub-areas is generally more compact and features mid to high-rise residential buildings, in contrast to the south of the borough, which provides lower densities and less compact development interspersed with large parks and open spaces. The southern sub-area of Dulwich has the lowest density of 54 people per hectare, which is much lower than the borough average of 99 people per hectare.

3.19 It is considered that where high population density does have an impact on usage of open space, high levels of usage can impact on the quality of open space. There will be a need to ensure that management and maintenance regimes are sufficient to support high levels of use, especially in smaller spaces in areas where access to larger open space is limited.

Housing Type

3.20 Housing type is another indicator of open space need. Similarly to population density it provides an indication of access to private open space in the form of gardens or yards. Table 3.5 indicates that the sub-areas of Bankside and Elephant and Castle have a much higher proportion of flats and apartments with 93.1% and 86.8%, respectively. Consequently, the housing stock within these sub-areas are expected to have a lower percentage of residential units with some form of private open space compared with other part of the borough, such as Dulwich.

3.21 Figure 3.3 shows the percentage of dwellings that are flats and maisonettes. Those areas with the highest proportion of flats, maisonettes or apartments are concentrated in the north-west of the borough in the sub-areas of Bankside, Elephant and Castle, Aylesbury and Bermondsey.
### Table 3.5 – Housing Stock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-area</th>
<th>Total household spaces</th>
<th>% flats/maisonettes/apartments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>6,686</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>7,013</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey and Old Kent Road</td>
<td>21,903</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Water</td>
<td>10,148</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury and Walworth</td>
<td>10,853</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>13,754</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham and Nunhead</td>
<td>20,220</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>16,169</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>106,746</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2001

### Child Densities

3.22 Child densities provide an indication of the need for children’s play provision within the sub-area. The demographic information shown in Table 3.6 demonstrates that the sub-areas with a higher proportion of children between 0-14 include Peckham, Aylesbury and Camberwell. Figure 3.3 shows the proportion of the population within each LSOA aged 0-14 years old based on ONS population estimates.

3.23 Figure 3.4 illustrates that higher child densities are concentrated in the centre of the borough in Peckham, Aylesbury and north Camberwell. It will be particularly important in these areas to ensure that there is adequate access to children’s play facilities.

### Table 3.6 - % of Population aged 0-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-area</th>
<th>% aged 0-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey and Old Kent Road</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Water</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury and Walworth</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham and Nunhead</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GLA Population Projections 2010

### Health

3.24 One of the principle factors that have an impact on the use of open space and sporting participation rates is the general health of those residing in the locality. The relatively good health of residents in the borough indicates that the number of residents able to participate in sporting activities is likely to be above the London-wide average. Canada Water and Dulwich have the highest proportion of residents with good health, with only 7.0% and 7.2% of residents...
experiencing poor health, respectively. The areas with the greatest concentrations of residents not in good health are located in the sub-areas of Aylesbury, Peckham and Elephant and Castle, as shown in Figure 3.5.

3.25 Where areas of poor health match up with areas of open space deficiency to will be important to improve access to open space, in order that healthy lifestyles can be encouraged. In some cases poor health is concentrated in areas of poor environmental quality. Provision of open space in these areas or landscaping could help improve air quality and encourage greater use of open space, which can have positive health benefits.

Table 3.7 – % of Population not in Good Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-area</th>
<th>Not in good health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey and Old Kent Road</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Water</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury and Walworth</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham and Nunhead</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2001

Indices of Deprivation

3.26 Research suggests that the propensity of people to participate in outdoor activities is influenced by the affluence of the area in which they live. For example the provision of facilities is likely to be better in more affluent areas, coupled with higher levels of disposable income available to spend on sport and leisure activities.

3.27 The Index of Multiple Deprivation is the key tool for identifying the least and most deprived areas of England. The Index is shown as a rank of all the output areas across England. Lower Level Super Output Areas (LSOAs) can also be ranked according to rank within London. Figure 3.6 shows the level of deprivation of each LSOA within the London context. For example, LSOAs identified as 0-5% most deprived are within the top 5% of LSOAs in London. Figure 3.7 shows the level of living environment deprivation, which measures the level of air quality, housing quality and road accidents.

3.28 In general, the sub-areas of Canada Water, Bankside and Dulwich do not suffer from the relatively high levels of deprivation experienced by other sub-areas in more central parts of the borough (such as parts of Peckham, Aylesbury and Bermondsey).
Composite Assessment

3.29 In order to derive an indicator of composite open space need, we have overlaid all LSOAs where the indicator is within the upper quartile of all LSOAs in the borough:
  • Medium or high population densities >167 persons per hectare.
  • Where more than 91.6% of dwellings are terraced, flats or apartment.
  • Areas with child densities above 20.8% (as a proportion of the total population).
  • Areas where the percentage of the population not in good health is greater than 10.1%.
  • Areas which are in the top 25% of most deprived LSOAs in the borough.
  • Areas which are in the top 25% of most deprived (in terms of living environment) in the borough.

3.30 Figure 3.8 overlays these six need indicators and illustrates the number of need criteria which are fulfilled by each LSOA. Generally Figure 3.8 identifies areas of greatest need as being located in the sub-areas of Elephant and Castle, Aylesbury and Camberwell. It will be particularly important to ensure access to good quality open space within these areas of high need.

Residents’ Survey

3.31 An integral component of the Southwark Open Space Strategy is to engage with residents of the borough to determine their use of and attitudes towards the Southwark’s open spaces and outdoor sports facilities. The findings of the survey form an important part of the open space needs assessment.

3.32 This section of the report provides an overview of the key findings of the residents’ survey. Further analysis of the residents’ survey findings at a sub-area level are provided within Appendix C. The objectives of the residents’ survey were as follows:
  • To identify patterns of usage among different social groups; and parts of the borough.
  • To understand the patterns of cross-border usage.
  • To assess patterns of usage and determine the purposes for which the open spaces and sports facilities are used.
  • To explore attitudes towards and perceptions of open spaces and sports facilities.
  • To identify reasons for non-use.
  • To determine issues, problems and potential improvements that could increase usage of the borough's open spaces and sports facilities.

3.33 During May and June 2011, 750 residents were interviewed in the residents’ survey. 750 residents was considered to be a sufficient sample size to identify typical views on open space across the borough, as well as specific differences across age groups, gender and location. The borough was split into eight sub-areas which are aligned with the sub-areas set out in the Southwark Core Strategy:
  • Bankside, Borough and London Bridge
  • Elephant and Castle
3.34 Demographic characteristics such as age and gender are known to have an impact on the use of open spaces and participation in sport and recreational facilities. Therefore quotas were set for age, gender and sub-area, to ensure a balanced, broadly representative sample of the borough’s population were surveyed. Sub-areas were selected using post-code boundaries.

3.35 Interviews were conducted at a range of times to target both working and non-working respondents. Experienced interviewers from Hill-Taylor Partnership undertook fifteen minute interviews using CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) systems. Atkins was responsible for checking the CATI script and briefing the interviewers.

3.36 The questionnaire was designed to gather information on how a range of open spaces and outdoor sports facilities are used. Respondents were asked questions about the open spaces and sports facilities they use. The range of questions included frequency of and purpose of visit, mode of travel and travel time and quality of the open spaces and sports facilities. The issue of non-use of open spaces and sports facilities has also been covered. All respondents were asked how open spaces and sports facilities could be improved to increase participation.

3.37 Table 3.8 demonstrates the target and actual breakdown of responses by age cohort. The table shows that the results are broadly representative of the demographic background of borough residents.

Table 3.8 - Survey Sample Parameters: Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age cohort</th>
<th>Target based on 2011 population</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Actual % achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 to 24</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 49</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 64</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 79</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GLA Population Projections/Atkins Residents’ Survey

Open Space Users and Non-users

3.38 The findings of the residents’ survey reveal 10% of respondents never visited an open space within the borough. This figure is the same when controlling for gender. An examination of age cohorts’ show that a larger proportion of those age 65-79 (20%) and 80+ (50%) do not visit open spaces
within the borough when compared with other age groupings. This may be an indication of reduced mobility amongst older age cohorts coupled with safety fears.

3.39 The geographical breakdown indicates that the highest proportion of residents that have not made use of open space are from the sub-areas of Walworth and Aylesbury (19%) and Elephant and Castle (15%), which are above the borough average of 10%. In comparison the Dulwich sub-area has the lowest proportion of non-use (at 2%). This may be a result of reduced access to open space, possibly coupled with issues related to the quality of open space in these sub-areas, although the higher rate of poor health in these sub-areas is also likely to contribute to reduced use of open space.

3.40 Of the larger publicly owned and managed open spaces Burgess Park and Southwark Park have the largest proportion of visitors (23% and 24% of all residents have visited these spaces respectively), followed by Dulwich Park receiving 14% of all respondents in the last year.

Comparison of Different Open Space Types

3.41 The most popular types of open space visited by Southwark residents are Metropolitan Parks and large open spaces with 69% of all visitations. Smaller local parks are also popular (40%), as well as Thames path/riverside walks (40%) and children’s play areas with 27%.

3.42 In comparing patterns of use between the genders a number of variations come to the fore. There is an increased tendency for men to use outdoor sports facilities (23% against 17% of women), a difference which is reversed when looking at children’s play areas, predominately used by women (37% and only 17% of men). There are no other significant gender variations with similar usage patterns for all other open space types.

3.43 Differing usage patterns are also evident for different age cohorts. 30% of people aged 16-24 visit outdoor sports facilities, significantly more than other age groups, while a larger percentage of people in the age groupings 25 – 34 and 35 – 49 visit children’s play areas. These differences highlight the different requirements and priorities of different age cohorts, younger men are more inclined to use sporting facilities while slightly older women are more inclined to use play facilities. Theses findings, while not unexpected, illustrate the need to ensure public green space can cater to the differing priorities and responsibilities of all users.

3.44 In considering the frequency of use by type of space, areas with a clearly definable recreational role attract more regular visitation. Of those who use allotments, 42% visit at least once a week while 37% of those who use outdoor sports facilities and 65% of visitors to children’s play areas also visit at least once a week.

Reasons for Use

3.45 The most common reason for visiting large open parks and open spaces are walking (47%), fresh air (38%), children’s play (32%), and exercise (26%). For smaller parks and open spaces the most common reasons are children’s play (36%) and walking (37%) while users of the Thames Path do so for walking (78%), fresh air (40%) and exercise (24%).
3.46 There are differences between age cohorts in looking at why respondents visit large open spaces. A larger percentage of 16 – 24 year olds visit large open spaces to meet friends (24%) against 17% of 25 – 34 year olds and 16% of those aged 35-49. Due to the fact younger people are more likely to visit an open space for social reasons it is reasonable to assume appropriate youth facilities are provided at some of these spaces. Canada Water recorded the highest level of total respondents who visit parks to meet friends, at 21%, compared to just 12% in Bermondsey.

Time Spent
3.47 The amount of time spent varies according to the open space type with respondents generally stating they spend longer at larger types of spaces which generally have a greater range of functions than smaller spaces. At larger open spaces only 10% spend less than 30 minutes while 42% of users spend 1-2 hours. This compares with small open spaces where 25% of users spend less than 30 minutes and only 30% stay for 1-2 hours.

3.48 Those who visit spaces with a specific recreational role tend to stay longer. Visitors to outdoor sports facilities tend to stay for 1-2 hours (30%) and 2-4 hours (7%) while visitors to allotments spend the longest length of time with 13% spending 2-4 hours and a further 13% staying for more than 4 hours. Conversely respondents who visit amenity areas spend the least amount of time with 54% spending less than 30 minutes.

Travel Mode
3.49 Residents were asked to name their usual mode of travel to open space. The vast majority of respondents visit large parks and open spaces by foot (71% in the borough as a whole, rising to 81% in the Canada Water sub-area). Smaller local parks have even higher proportions who travel by foot to reach them (90% in the borough).

3.50 In terms of car usage, a higher percentage of visitors to cemeteries use the car than any other space (48%). The types of open space with the lowest incidence of car usage are smaller local parks (4%), children's play area (4%) and amenity areas (3%).

3.51 The survey shows that the use of public transport to visit open space is generally low, with figures for the train particularly low. Respondents who use the bus do so primarily to visit large open spaces, cemeteries and the Thames Path.

Travel Time
3.52 Respondents were asked how long they spend travelling to different types of open spaces. When the results for open spaces are analysed, it is apparent that open space use is fairly localised. For most open space categories a large proportion of respondents spend less than 10 minutes travelling. The most localised open space types being amenity areas, children's play areas and small local parks. Open space categories respondents were most prepared to spend 16-30 minutes travelling to include outdoor sports facilities, larger open space, Thames path and cemeteries.

Quality of Spaces
3.53 Respondents were asked to rate the quality of open spaces; across all open spaces in the borough. The majority of respondents rated all categories of open space as being good or very good,
however some categories performed better than others indicating perceptions vary according to the type of open space. Those categories rated as being the highest quality sites are allotments (92%), large open spaces (86%), the Thames path (88%), natural green space (80.3%) and children’s play (81%). Fewer respondents rated amenity areas as good or very good (59%). Categories with a higher proportion of poor or very poor ratings include amenity areas (11%), smaller local parks (5%), outdoor sports facilities (5%) and children’s play (6%). There were no major differences between sub-areas.

Satisfaction and Quality of Life
3.54 Respondents to the survey were generally satisfied with the existing level of open space provision. Taking into consideration age and gender breakdowns there were no considerable differences in the response across the borough. However, respondents in the Dulwich sub-area recorded the highest levels of satisfaction with open space (91%, compared to 71% in Elephant & Castle).

3.55 In terms of the contribution open space plays in respondents’ quality of life, again there was some variation between the sub-areas across the borough. 94% of respondents feel open space contributes a little or a lot to quality of life in the Dulwich sub area, against 77% in Walworth and Aylesbury.

3.56 Those in the 16-24 age cohort (76%) feel open spaces contribute a little or a lot to quality of life, a lower percentage than the other age cohorts (91% of 50 to 64 year olds feel that open spaces contribute to quality of life). In addition to this a greater proportion (18%) of 16-24 year olds felt open spaces neither contribute nor under perform, compared to other age cohorts.

Non-use and Improvements to Open Space
3.57 Non users of open spaces were asked their reasons for non use. Time constraints (28%), nothing particular (19%), boring or uninteresting facilities (13%) and poor health (17%) were the most common responses. Very few respondents suggested that quality-related reasons dissuaded them, such as litter or dogs.

3.58 Patterns of existing use do not necessarily highlight all needs for open space. Residents were therefore asked what improvements could be made to encourage greater use of open space. Cleaner environments (less litter, graffiti, dog mess, etc) (19%), park rangers/wardens (12%) and more/improved safety facilities (11%) were all cited as the main priorities in the borough as a whole. However, 42% of all respondents in the borough stated that nothing would encourage them to use spaces more frequently, suggesting that investment in new facilities for some would reap little by way of increased usage.

Stakeholder Consultation
3.59 In addition to the residents’ survey, a workshop was held at Southwark Council offices in Tooley Street on 9th July 2011 with friends of parks groups, borough residents and other open space stakeholders. The workshop identified a number of qualitative issues with open space in the borough, a summary of which are presented below:
General Views on Quality and Provision

- Large parks and open spaces in Southwark are of a good quality and are supported by active community groups. Many of the parks have received funding from various sources, which has facilitated improvements to these spaces.
- However, smaller spaces were seen as vital to the accessibility of open space in the borough. Although many smaller spaces are now of good quality, there are some which required attention.
- There was a general feeling that many of the borough’s residents are not aware of the location and quality of some of the borough’s smaller open spaces.

Improving Links between Spaces

- The group considered linking spaces, including the development of a network of smaller spaces, as a key part of the strategy.
- Stakeholders suggested that spaces which are not currently in open space use should be considered for their potential as part of a wider network of open spaces.
- There is potential to use links and ‘green fingers’ in deprived areas to address problems surrounding permeability, presence of cars, crime and health aspects.
- The issue of long-term sustainable management and maintenance of green links was considered an important aspect of the strategy, in particular the protection of the long-term deterioration of open spaces. There is a need to improve lines of communication between a wide range of actors if green links are to be successful.
- Improvements to signage were seen as vital to improving links to spaces. Furthermore, open spaces need to be inviting and to have clear entrances that are welcoming to those not already familiar with the space.
- Routes through spaces are also key. Spaces are often locked at night due to antisocial behaviour, which can be a problem during winter when nights are longer. There is potential for some spaces to be unlocked to enable routes through to be maintained. Improvements to lighting and the removal of secluded areas are key to this.
- The importance of the existing character of areas was considered as something to develop and build upon. Stakeholders agreed that the approach for each area must be flexible and adapt to the given area. In particular, stakeholders were keen to build on the existing character of the railway cuttings as wildlife corridors.

Allotments and Community Gardens

- Development of community gardens were seen as an important resource for the community in providing a space for active learning that is accessible to all, unlike allotments which traditionally have restrictive access.
- There was an emphasis on the need for diversity of uses of spaces and opportunities for food growing, permaculture and education, all offering related but diverse qualities.
- Given the limited opportunities for new open space, there is potential to provide community garden land within existing larger open spaces, such as Southwark Park and Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common.
There is potential to introduce food growing across a range of smaller spaces as part of the edible gardening initiative already seen in some parts of the borough.

Amenity Spaces

- Amenity spaces are often the most accessible type of open space and can fulfil a range of needs, including for sitting out, children's play and biodiversity. The view of stakeholders was that amenity spaces therefore need to be protected wherever possible.

Biodiversity

- Whilst green roofs and walls were praised for biodiversity improvements, it was felt that long-term maintenance was often lacking. Open spaces which are publicly accessible and of community value were considered more important.
- The shift over the past few years from managing green mowed lawns to allowing meadows to develop within parks that bring additional benefits of biodiversity and educational opportunities was welcomed.
- There is support for the further development of managed meadow areas. There is also a focus on ensuring that the right type of foliage is grown that will attract a wide variety of wildlife, such as bees. It may be appropriate to identify suitable sites for hives.
- In a larger number of parks and open spaces, particularly those strong in biodiversity it would be good to improve on existing interpretation facilities. Such facilities could be accompanied by outdoor classrooms for use by school and community groups.

Crime and Antisocial Behaviour

- The number of park rangers and wardens is being reduced in the borough as whole, which may affect the safety levels of some of the open spaces. It is considered that park rangers and wardens should have stronger powers, such as the power to detain or arrest people engaging in anti-social behaviour.
- A preference was made for active frontages on ground level facing open spaces to enable passive surveillance and presence of people within open spaces. One member identified the Aylesbury Estate as an area where such lessons had been learnt.
- There was strong support for the potential to reduce crime through design. Multicoloured paving, improved lighting and the removal of secluded areas were provided as examples where design has reduced crime in the borough.

Facilities for Teenagers

- There was strong support for an improvement in the type and range of facilities for teenagers in open spaces. Extending the bike hire facility at Dulwich Park to other larger spaces, as well as the provision of innovative games and activities in smaller spaces were suggested. It was also felt that teenagers do not have well defined areas in which to spend time in parks.
- There were also suggestions to encourage a greater sense of ownership of parks for young people, particularly through the use of young friends of parks groups and greater involvement in the management of open spaces.
Key Messages

- Southwark has a relatively low proportion of the population aged over 65, an age group which typically use open space much less frequently than younger age groups, compared to London as a whole. The higher proportion of younger residents may indicate a higher level of demand for open space per population.
- The borough’s population is expected to increase by up to 19% between 2011 and 2026, which is expected to significantly increase the demand for open space. However, the borough’s population is expected to age which may reduce demand for some types of open space, including particular types of recreational facilities.
- The composite assessment of need reveals central and northern parts of the borough, including North Peckham, Elephant and Castle, parts of Bermondsey and the Aylesbury Estate as in greatest need for open space.
- Residents are generally happy with the quality of open space and recognise its contribution to quality of life. This was identified as part of the residents’ survey and confirmed in the stakeholder workshop. However there is potential for improvement, especially at smaller spaces.
- Poor quality or inaccessible spaces are not a serious issue for the borough’s residents. Most residents who do not use open spaces do so due to health reasons or time constraints. This suggests that the current level of provision is good and does not generally constrain open space use.
- The majority of residents walk to open spaces. There is a need to ensure that open spaces are accessible by foot. This means ensuring that routes to spaces are clear, severance barriers are addressed, signage is available, entrances to spaces are welcoming and that there is sufficient provision close to residential areas.
- There is strong support for linking up existing open spaces to improve accessibility and enhance the network of open spaces for biodiversity.
- Safety is still a key issue at many spaces. In response to consultation, many residents said that they were not necessarily put off from using open spaces, but would like to see an increased presence of park attendees or wardens. There was also strong support for the potential to design out antisocial behaviour.
- The stakeholder consultation revealed that there is strong support for the development of more allotments and community gardens, including new sites within existing spaces and within small amenity areas.
- Although amenity spaces can be mono-functional and are often of poor quality, they are valued highly by the local community. They provide opportunities for informal recreation close to residential areas and have potential to be improved as a biodiversity and community gardening resource.
- Teenagers are not sufficiently provided for at many open spaces. There is a need to provide a wider range of recreational opportunities for older children.
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Figure 3.6 – Overall Deprivation
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Figure 3.7 - Living Environment Deprivation
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Figure 3.8 - Composite Need Analysis
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4. Approach to Identification and Classification of Open Space

Introduction

4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises local authorities to draw up their own standards for open space, sports and recreation provision for inclusion within their local plans. These standards need to be based upon a locally based assessment of open space needs.

Planning Open Space Provision in Southwark

4.2 The NPPF advises that any assessment of open space provision should take into consideration:

• The supply of open space in Southwark, including the degree to which provision meets needs from beyond the local authority boundary.

• The accessibility of locations.

• The level of usage of facilities.

• The particular functions which certain facilities may perform, for example as a meeting place for one age group or community.

• The potential for a recreational use to contribute to wider social or regeneration objectives for Southwark.

• The potential for new use, for example by achieving dual use of a facility or by bringing a private open space into public use.

• The potential to focus improved recreational provision of a particular site, in preference to lower level use of less accessible locations.

4.3 The two main approaches traditionally used to assess open space needs are the National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) six acre standard and use of an open space hierarchy.

4.4 The NPFA standard relates playing space provision to population and recommends that there should be a minimum of 6 acres (2.34 hectares) of outdoor playing/recreational space per 1,000 people. The standard recommends that the 6 acre provision is broken down to take account of the different needs of different age groups. This standard can be easily applied but takes little account of the distribution of open space and people’s access to it.

4.5 Recreational roles can be either active/formal e.g. sports, or passive/informal e.g. dog walking. The activity may have dedicated provision e.g. sports pitches, or informal provision where there are no formal facilities but other evidence suggests an activity takes place. Non-recreational roles include the ecological, educational, social, cultural and amenity roles that an open space might play.

4.6 Although the NPPF has replaced the national planning guidance for the preparation of open space strategies set out in Planning Policy Guidance note (PPG) 17, the PPG17 companion guide is still applied. The Governments companion guide to PPG17 ‘Assessing Needs and Opportunities’ (2002) recommends that the hierarchy approach can provide the basis to develop local standards as it identifies characteristics, size and effective catchments of different types of open spaces. The hierarchy approach has been included in London development plans since 1976 and in some adopted borough Development Plans since 1989.
4.7 The London Plan (2011), in Policy 2.18, encourages boroughs to audit existing open space and assess needs in accordance with the guidance given in PPG17, towards the production of an open space strategy.

4.8 The GLA and CABE have produced best practice guidance on preparing an open space strategy (2009), which recommends that a hierarchy approach is used, but adapts the approach used in PPG17 to best reflect the types of open space found within London (Table 4.1).

4.9 The PPG17 companion guide recommends that local authorities develop their own open space typologies to reflect local characteristics and facilities and the recreational and non-recreational functions of open spaces. An understanding of the types of open space will provide a basis for analysing the results of the site audits and enable an assessment of whether the open space provision meets the needs of local people.

4.10 This study reviews the existing open space hierarchy in line with recent guidance to provide a comprehensive basis for assessing the quantity and accessibility of open spaces in Southwark.

Survey Methodology

Approach to Open Space Identification

4.11 The survey of public, private and educational open space was undertaken during May and June 2011 by appropriately qualified planning and landscape consultants. A survey pro-forma was developed to capture the key features and characteristics relating to each site. Many of the questions followed a criteria based approach to assessment informed by a survey guide to enable a consistent basis of assessment. This pro-forma and explanatory notes are attached as Appendix D.

4.12 Open space sites within the borough were identified from the following information sources:
   • A review of the Council’s Core Strategy proposals map;
   • Allotments not already designated as open space;
   • Proposal sites within the Council’s various area-based strategies; and
   • Sites noted during the site appraisal process.

4.13 The resulting list of sites was then confirmed by the Council. The total number of sites within the initial list totalled 216. Figure 4.1 illustrates all sites included within this initial list. During the site visit phase, some sites were scoped out of the assessment if they had been incorrectly identified as an open space (such as sites which have now been developed). New sites were also identified as part of the scoping work carried out during the site audits. The final number of open spaces included in the study for the borough is 215.

Relationship to 2010 Open Space Survey

4.14 It should be noted that the Council’s previous 2010 work on open space covers a larger number of sites, including a range of amenity spaces not subject to a site assessment as part of this study. The 2010 work provides a comprehensive evidence base of the typology of open space, including a range of smaller spaces. The purpose of the site assessments as part of this work is to update information related to the typology and quality of open space, and to collect additional information on the wider role and function of open space not already collected as part of the previous work.
This study has assessed all major open space in the borough, including all sites currently designated for protection and a range of other spaces, identified in conjunction with the Council, which perform an important recreational, ecological or other role and which would meet the definitions of MOL, BOL and OOS set out in the glossary of the Southwark Plan. The majority of the analysis in this report relates only to those spaces which have been subject to a site assessment, although the role of spaces not subject to an assessment is recognised and considered further in Chapters 8 and 9. It is estimated that this study has assessed over 90% of the open space considered as part of the 2010 work.

The 2010 work also included a significant amount of consultation with both users and non-users of open space and other key stakeholders. The work included a number of focus group sessions, children and young people's survey as well as other external consultation with friends of parks groups. The findings from this work have fed into the identification of open space needs work set out in Chapter 3.

**Survey Design**

Given the scale of the survey, the range of data collected on site was targeted towards functions and characteristics which were necessary in order to fulfil the purposes of the brief and meet the requirements of national planning policy guidance and the London Plan. The main objectives of the study were:

- To collect information on total amount of open space and its distribution across Southwark.
- To collect sufficient information on the function of each site to allow a classification to be made on the basis of the parks hierarchy and typology of other open spaces to inform an assessment of open space provision.
- To collect sufficient information on the condition of facilities and landscape to allow an informed assessment of the quality of each open space.
- To collect sufficient information on the roles and functions performed by each site to allow an informed assessment of the value of open spaces.

**Development of an Open Space Hierarchy**

**Current approach to open space classification**

Southwark’s current approach to the classification of open space is set out in the Adopted Core Strategy (2011). Open Space is either identified as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL), Borough Open Land or Other Open Spaces. These open space designations are identified within the Core Strategy Proposals Map and within the UDP appendices.

In addition to those open spaces, Green Chain Links and Green Chain Parks which make up part of the South East London Green Chain walking route (all within the south of the borough) are also identified within the Core Strategy.

Open Spaces designated as MOL, Borough Open Land or Other Open Spaces are protected by Strategic Policy 11 – Open Spaces and wildlife, as well as saved UDP policies 3.25, 3.26 and 3.27. The Core Strategy does not differentiate between types of open space (e.g parks, allotments, playing fields), but instead affords the highest level of protection to Metropolitan Open Land, and
the lowest to Other Open Spaces. However, some analysis of open space typologies is provided in the schedules of open space types in the UDP. These typologies were largely taken from the 2003 Open Space Study, but it is evident that these do not match up to the typologies set out in PPG17 (See Table 4.2) and the London Plan Public Park Hierarchy (see Table 4.1)

**Open Space Typology**

4.21 During the site assessments each open space was classified according to the open space typology, the typology of open space is based on the typology included within the Annex to PPG17, as illustrated in Table 4.2. It should be noted that the PPG17 typology includes parks and gardens but this is broken down further using the GLA hierarchy.

4.22 The identification of the open space type was based upon consideration of the size, its primary role and function, recreational value, access arrangements and physical character. Secondary roles were also recorded where appropriate. Public parks were classified according to the GLA hierarchy, as illustrated in Table 4.1.

4.23 Further analysis of the categorisation of open space is provided in Chapter 5.

**Approach to Public Park Provision**

4.24 As discussed above, there is no comprehensive approach to classifying open space within the borough at present. The GLA’s best practice guidance (2009), suggests that a hierarchy suggested by the guide should be used by London boroughs’ when preparing open space strategies.

4.25 For the purposes of consistency and cross-boundary thinking the GLA hierarchy provided the basis for public park classification during the survey. The term ‘Public Parks’ used within this assessment therefore refers to the types of public park identified within Table 4.1. All open spaces classified as parks within the parks hierarchy are publicly owned by the London borough of Southwark.
Table 4.1 - London Plan public park hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Space Categorisation</th>
<th>Approx size of Open Space and Distance from Home</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks and Open Spaces (Linked Metropolitan Open Land and Green Belt Corridors)</td>
<td>400 hectares, 3.2 - 8km</td>
<td>Large areas and corridors of natural heathland, downland, commons, woodland and parkland also including areas not publicly accessible but which contribute to the overall environmental amenity. Primarily providing for informal recreation with some non-intensive active recreation uses. Car parking at key locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Parks</td>
<td>60 ha, 3.2 km or more where the park is appreciably larger</td>
<td>Either i) natural heathland, downland, commons, woodland etc, or ii) formal parks providing for both active and passive recreation. Many contain playing fields, but at least 40 hectares for other pursuits. Adequate car parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Park</td>
<td>20ha, 1.2km</td>
<td>Landscape setting with a variety of natural feature providing for a wide range of activities, including outdoor sports facilities and playing fields, children’s play for different age groups, and informal recreation pursuits. Should provide some car parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Parks</td>
<td>2ha, 0.4km</td>
<td>Providing for court games, children’s play spaces or other areas of a specialist nature, including nature and conservation areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Open Spaces</td>
<td>0.4 - 2ha, Less than 0.4km</td>
<td>Gardens, sitting out areas, children’s play spaces or other areas of a specialist nature, including nature and conservation areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Parks</td>
<td>Under 0.4 ha, Less than 0.4km</td>
<td>Gardens, sitting out areas, children’s play spaces or other areas of a specialised nature, including nature and conservation areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Open Spaces</td>
<td>Variable, Where feasible</td>
<td>The Thames, canals, other waterways and associated open spaces and towpaths; paths; disused railways; nature conservation areas; and other routes which provide opportunities for informal recreation. Often characterised by features or attractive areas which are not fully accessible to the public but contribute to the enjoyment of the space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source GLA Guide to Preparing Open Space Strategies
4.26 The classification of parks within the different levels of the hierarchy was determined by considering:

- the size of the space
- the degree of public access
- usage patterns and catchment area derived from the residents' survey
- the range of facilities provided
- the physical character of the park
- the recreational value of the space.

4.27 Where a park does not fulfil the size thresholds defined for a particular park type but performs the range of functions associated with that park type, the park has been classified on the basis of its range of functions. For example, a park may be under 20 hectares in size but may well provide natural features, a range of informal recreational pursuits, outdoor sports, and children's play, and should therefore be considered a District Park despite perhaps being only 15ha in size.

4.28 Where the spaces were assessed as not having the appropriate facilities, such as children's play and other recreation, associated with the park type, the space was then classified according to the facilities it did provide. Those spaces that don't provide the required facilities could be reclassified with the introduction of facilities to meet the GLA hierarchy criteria.

Other Types of Open Space

4.29 In addition to public parks, there are a number of other forms of open space provision within the borough. These have been categorised according to nine different types of open space as defined within Table 4.2 (taken from the annex to PPG17).

4.30 It should be noted that the assessment of amenity space has not been a focus for this study. Details of the supply of amenity space can be found in Section 6 of the 2010 open space study.
Table 4.2 – Other open space provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Open Space</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Space</td>
<td>Includes informal recreational spaces and housing green spaces. This category would include green spaces in and around housing areas, large landscaped areas, and domestic gardens as well as informal 'kick-about' play areas for children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities/Playing Fields</td>
<td>Sites which are not located within a public park where the primary role is for formal recreation. Sites include tennis courts, bowling greens, sports pitches, golf courses, athletics tracks, school playing field, other institutional playing fields and outdoor sports areas. Categorise by ownership i.e. public / private / education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments/Community Gardens/Urban Farms</td>
<td>Open spaces where the primary use is allotment gardening of community farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and Churchyards</td>
<td>Open spaces that are currently or have previously been used as burial spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural or Semi-Natural Urban Greenspaces</td>
<td>Woodland (coniferous, deciduous, mixed) and scrub, grassland (e.g. downland, meadow), heath or moor, wetlands (e.g. marsh, fen), open and running water, wastelands (including disturbed ground).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic spaces/pedestrianised areas</td>
<td>More formally laid out hard surfaced public spaces including squares, pedestrian streets. These spaces would not normally have a formal recreational function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Spaces within the Grounds of Institution</td>
<td>Open space located within the grounds of hospitals, universities and other institutions which are accessible to the general public or some sections of the public. This definition also includes education sites where there is only hard surface and or amenity open space (no pitch sports provision).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for children and teenagers</td>
<td>Play areas (including LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs, skateboard parks, outdoor basketball goals and 'hanging out' areas (including teenage shelters).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other areas of Space which may not perform an open space function that is identified in one of the above types but which perform a structural or amenity role.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PPG17
Figure 4.1 – Open Spaces Assessed
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5. Supply of Open Space

Introduction

5.1 This chapter examines the current supply of open space as well as any deficiencies in open space provision within the sub-area through the application of the GLA hierarchy defined in Chapter 4. The following is included:

- An analysis of the current provision in terms of its quantity and accessibility.
- Benchmarking of existing provision against levels of provision in other boroughs.
- A recommended access standard for each level of the public park hierarchy, as well as other open space types, based upon analysis of existing and future open space need, existing usage and travel patterns.
- Application of the proposed access standard to identify deficiencies in terms of access to public parks and other open space.

Summary of Supply

5.2 Within Southwark a total of 215 spaces were identified using the methodology described in Chapter 4. Figure 4.1 illustrates the sites which were assessed as part of this study, with Figure 5.1 providing further details on the categorisation of each open space. Appendix E provides a schedule of all sites assessed along with their type, as classified according to the approach set out in Chapter 4. Together these spaces comprise some 605.5 ha of land within the borough (Table 5.1). This figure represents 21% of the total land area in the borough (2886 ha). This figure can be compared with the following sample of other London borough’s the consultants have information for:

- Wandsworth – 18% of total land area is open space;
- Westminster – 21% of total land area is open space;
- Tower Hamlets – 19% of the total land area (including housing amenity space)
- Haringey – 13% of total land area is open space; and
- Lewisham – 12% of total land area is public open space (figure not broken down by type).

5.3 Table 5.1 indicates that public parks are the most abundant form of open space provision in the borough representing 40.5% of the total open space area surveyed. These spaces include the large Metropolitan Parks of Southwark Park, Dulwich Park and Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common as well as the District Parks of Russia Dock Woodland and Burgess Park, and a large number of smaller parks distributed throughout the borough. Outdoor sports facilities, including a large number of school playing fields, the Aquarius Golf Course in Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common and a large number of sports grounds in Dulwich, have the second largest land take representing 29.1% of the total open space area assessed.

5.4 Again, it should be noted that some smaller open spaces which have not been subject to a site assessment as part of this work are not included in the analysis within Chapters 5-7. These smaller open spaces typically consist of housing amenity spaces and have been picked up as part of the open space evidence base work undertaken in 2010.

5.5 In terms of the number of spaces, small open spaces (part of the GLA parks hierarchy) represent the most common form of open space provision in Southwark with 46 sites, followed by outdoor
sports facilities/playing fields, with 33 sites. The eight sites categorised as ‘other’ are OS132 – Water Works at Nunhead, OS125 – Nunhead Reservoir, OS79 – The Stables, OS27 – King Edward III Manor House, OS41 – Surrey Docks Farm, OS12 – Grotto Open Space, OS148 – Plough Lane Pond, EC1 – Carter Place and BB2 – Crossbones Graveyard.

Table 5.1 - Total open space by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open space type</th>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Park</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Open Space</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Park Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>245.4</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities / Playing Fields</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>176.1</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments and Community Gardens</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and Churchyards</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural or Semi Natural Greenspaces</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Spaces</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenspaces within Grounds of Institution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity space</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Young People and Teenagers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Open Space Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>360.1</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Open Space</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>605.5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Atkins

5.6 Table 5.2 summarises the access arrangements to open space in the borough, whilst Figure 5.2 provides details of the access arrangements to each space. Table 5.2 shows that less than 60% of the total land area assessed is accessible to the general public, with 35% subject to restricted access. Figure 5.2 illustrates that the majority of spaces with restricted access are located in Dulwich (which largely consist of private sports clubs), although a number of water spaces are also restricted in Canada Water. Railway lines, which form an important biodiversity corridor in the borough, are clearly subject to no public access.
Table 5.2 - Access arrangements to open space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General public access</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>353.8</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De facto public access</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared/Dual Use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Access (e.g to clubs)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>211.5</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Public Access</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>605.5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Atkins

5.7 Table 5.3 demonstrates that there are clear variations between the amount of open space available within each sub-area, as well as the amount of open space which is publicly accessible. Bankside has the lowest amount of open space, with just 10.3ha, 8.7ha of which is publicly accessible, whilst Dulwich has the most with 252.4ha of open space. However, this is reduced considerably when access is taken into account, with just 95.6ha of open space which is publicly accessible.

Table 5.3 - Open space by sub-area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Area</th>
<th>Total Spaces</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Amount accessible (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Water</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>252.4</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>149.8</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>113.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>605.5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>358.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Atkins

5.8 Table 5.4 demonstrates the provision of total open space and total publicly accessible open space per 1,000 population within each sub-area. The table shows that, again, Dulwich has the largest amount of open space per population (over 7ha of total open space and 2.7ha of publicly accessible open space per 1,000 population) whilst Bermondsey has the lowest amount (0.23ha of total open space and 0.18ha of publicly accessible open space per 1,000 population).

5.9 It should be noted that the amount of open space per sub-area shown in Tables 5.3 and 5.4 are to some extent dependent on the spatial definition of sub-areas which makes an analysis of accessibility catchments to open space important. This is considered later in this chapter.
Table 5.4 – Open space per population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Estimated Population (2011)</th>
<th>Total open space per 1,000 population</th>
<th>Total publicly accessible open space per 1,000 population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>22,695</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>24,030</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>63,020</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>40,499</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Water</td>
<td>28,917</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>35,029</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>15,585</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>59,044</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>288,819</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Atkins/GLA Population Projections

Public Parks

Table 5.1 shows that there is currently a total of 245.4ha of public park provision within Southwark. In order to derive an appropriate quantitative standard for public park provision there is a need to consider:

- Levels of existing open space provision by ward and the borough as a whole.
- Indicative population thresholds required to support each type of park provision.
- Analysis of the size of parks within each level of the hierarchy to test the appropriateness of size ranges identified within the GLA Parks within the Southwark context.
- Comparative benchmarking of existing open space standards and levels of public park provision in other London boroughs.
- Access deficiencies.

Existing Level of Provision by Population

Table 5.5 shows that there is currently 0.85ha of park provision per 1,000 population in the borough. If the current quantity of park provision was maintained, this would mean the borough would have 0.72ha of public parks per 1,000 population by 2026 due to the projected increase in population.
### Table 5.5 – Parks provision per population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Park provision (ha)</th>
<th>Provision per 1,000 pop (2011)</th>
<th>Provision per 1,000 pop (2026)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Water</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>64.99</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>245.4</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GLA Population Projections 2010 and Atkins

### Benchmarking

5.12 The current level of public park provision of 0.85ha per 1,000 population can be compared against levels of public park provision in other London boroughs. However, care should be taken with direct comparisons as analysis at a sub-area level can yield different results to analysis at a borough level. The amount of open space per person at a borough level is to some extent dependent on the location of boundaries which makes an analysis of accessibility to open space important. Levels of public park provision in other London boroughs include:

- Wandsworth – 2.45ha/1,000;
- Haringey – 1.73ha/1,000;
- Islington – 0.28ha/1,000;
- Westminster – 1.86ha/1,000 (all open space);
- Lambeth – 1.54ha/1,000 (all open space); and
- Tower Hamlets – 1.91ha/1,000 (all open space).

5.13 This exercise shows that Southwark has a lower level of public park provision than Wandsworth or Haringey, but has a higher amount than Islington. Southwark also has a higher amount of open space than other Inner London boroughs of Westminster, Lambeth and Tower Hamlets in terms of total open space per population.

### Accessibility of Public Park Provision

5.14 To identify a locally based access standard for public park provision we have reviewed the appropriateness of using the catchment distances recommended at the regional level in the GLA Parks hierarchy, which are not evidence-based. To establish a locally based access standard it is necessary to consider a range of indicators to identify how well the existing distribution of provision meets the needs of the community:

- Consideration of the distribution of parks.
- Examination of existing patterns of open space access by park type considering the mode of transport and travel times.
Defining Effective Catchment Areas

5.15 Existing patterns of use provide the most robust basis upon which to base a future access standard. The telephone survey undertaken as part of the study identified usage levels, travel modes and travel times for different types of open space provision in the borough.

5.16 However, existing usage and travel patterns cannot be used directly as a basis for deriving an access standard to address future needs without considering whether a standard reflecting existing usage patterns addresses the needs of the community.

Effective Catchment Distances

5.17 The catchment distances defined below relate to the typical effective catchment area for each park type. The effective catchment area represents the area from which 70-80% of park users are likely to be drawn from. The residents’ survey has identified that respondents usually travelled for up to 15 minutes to reach larger open spaces (such as Metropolitan or District Parks) and between 5 and 10 minutes to reach smaller parks. This is in line with the GLA Hierarchy which suggests a 1.2km (15 minute walk) catchment for District Parks and a 400m (5 minute walk) for smaller parks.

5.18 An assumption is made that the catchment area and threshold population should reflect the average for each park category. Catchment area size and the number and frequency of visits may vary due to:

• The range of facilities and environments within the park and their quality and condition affect the attractiveness of the space to potential users. Parks with a wider range of facilities than may be expected will have extended catchments perhaps beyond the distance parameters identified in Table 4.1. The number and frequency of visits is also likely to be higher.

• The demographic and socio-economic structure of the population residing within the park catchment and the extent to which park facilities meet their needs.

• The pattern of land use within the park catchment particularly patterns of residential development and population density.

• The range of park and open space opportunities within the locality will influence levels of usage at individual spaces.

5.19 However, it is important to consider variations in catchment area size for spaces within the same level of the hierarchy when identifying priorities for enhancing the quality and access of spaces.
Application of Park Catchment Areas

5.20 Figures 5.3 to 5.5 demonstrate how the different types of public park are distributed throughout the sub-area and identifies their assumed catchment areas in accordance with the criteria in the Parks Hierarchy (Table 4.1) and consistent with the results of the residents’ survey. This provides a basis for identifying the parts of the borough which are not adequately served (in terms of access) by public parks.

5.21 The identification of areas of open space deficiency is very sensitive both to the actual catchments adopted for different types of parks and the manner in which they are applied. It should be recognised that the process of identifying deficiencies is a desk-top application of the hierarchy catchments and does not take into account other criteria, e.g. quality and function, which also inform the catchment of a park.

5.22 It should be noted that the straight line distance of all park accessibility catchments has been reduced by 70% to allow for indirect routes to spaces caused by the street pattern and other severance barriers.

Pocket Parks, Small Open Spaces and Local Parks

5.23 Within the borough there are 29 open spaces which fulfil the criteria of a pocket park, 45 which meet the criteria for a small open space and six which meet the criteria for a local park. Although some spaces meet the correct size criteria for a local park, some have been classified as a small local park where the range of provision and facilities do not meet the required standard for a local park.

5.24 Figure 5.3 identifies the distribution of pocket parks, small open spaces and pocket parks and areas which are outside of the catchment area for this form of provision. Spaces which meet the criteria for these spaces types outside of the borough boundary are also included.

5.25 The figure illustrates that there is a relatively good distribution of these types of smaller parks throughout the borough. The only considerable section of the borough outside of the catchment area for this form of provision is in Dulwich and Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common. However, District and Metropolitan parks can fulfil the role of smaller park types. When these spaces are considered, there is almost full coverage of these smaller park types (see section below).

District Parks

5.26 The open space assessment identified two open spaces which fulfil the criteria of a District park – Russia Dock Woodlands and Burgess Park.

5.27 Figure 5.4 identifies the distribution of District Parks within the borough illustrating areas that are outside the 1.2km catchment area. The figure shows that large sections of Bankside, Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common and Dulwich are outside of the catchment area for this type of park. However, again, Metropolitan parks can fulfil the role of smaller park types, as considered below. When these spaces (Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common, Southwark Park and Dulwich Park) are considered there is almost full coverage within the borough. The one exception is the area towards the north of the borough which covers all of Bankside and the northern parts of Elephant and Castle and Bermondsey sub-areas.
5.28 Figure 5.5 identifies the distribution of Metropolitan Parks within the sub-area. The figure again shows that the majority of the borough is within the 3.2km catchment area for this park type, although parts of Bankside, Elephant and Castle and Aylesbury and Walworth are outside the catchment area when adjusted for indirect routes to these spaces.

5.29 Figure 5.6 identifies areas deficient in access to all public parks as defined in the parks hierarchy. Park deficiency areas have been derived by considering pedestrian access to any form of public park (Metropolitan parks, District parks, Small open spaces and Pocket Parks). Other open space provision, including all types of open space not included within the Parks Hierarchy, are excluded from this figure. A catchment of 400m is shown around all parks including metropolitan parks, as this is the overall standard recommended for access to all parks by the GLA.

5.30 Those areas of the borough which are deficient in public parks are defined as those which are further than 400m from any form of public park. A 280m catchment has also been applied to take account of severance issues created by roads and indirect routes to spaces caused by the street pattern. The figure shows that the vast majority of the borough is within the recommended catchment area for public parks, although some parts of North Dulwich, as well as parts of Sydenham Hill are outside of the recommended catchment area.

5.31 It is important for the assessment to relate accessibility deficiencies (as illustrated in Figure 5.6) to the character, density and other needs of areas within the borough. Deficiency areas within areas with a high proportion of dwellings that are terraced flats or apartments, such as areas identified in Figure 3.5, are likely to be more significant than other deficiency areas as residents are less likely to have access to private gardens. Areas within wards with a more suburban character may also have significant concentrations of private open space which, although may not be accessible to the general public, provides relief from built up area and contributes towards visual amenity.

5.32 The deficiency area in North Dulwich does consist largely of houses which do have access to private gardens and open space. However, Dawson Heights housing estate, whose residents do not have access to private open space, is within this deficiency area.

5.33 The pattern of land use also influences the significance of open space for some of the deficiency areas. For example, the deficiency in access to public parks in the south of the borough is not as significant it seems, as the majority the land in this area is made up of (non-park) open space, rather than residential uses. However, the western section of the Dulwich sub-area is made up of residential uses and is deficient in access to parks.

5.34 The residents' survey reinforced the technical assessment of deficiency areas. Just 1.5% of residents stated that they do not use open space because they are too difficult to get to and over 80% were satisfied with existing levels of open space provision suggesting access to open space is not a major issue in Southwark as a whole.
Children’s Play

5.35 Open space provides an important role in serving children’s play needs. It is widely acknowledged that the importance of children’s play extends far beyond the activity itself. Play contributes towards child development through the development of a wide range of physical, social and emotional skills and abilities as well as having a positive impact on children’s health. The key issues relating to children’s play are the nature and location of play, the influence of age and gender, safety and risk issues and consideration of the types of play environments needed to meet play needs.

Approaches to Children’s Play Provision

NPFA – Original 2001 Approach

5.36 There are currently no adopted national standards relating to children’s play provision. However, a structured approach to the planning and provision of children’s play areas has been developed by the National Playing Fields Association (NPFA). The standards of provision recommended by the NPFA were revised in 2001 and reflect changing views towards children’s play provision. In particular the guidelines emphasise the need to provide both designated areas and casual play opportunities which respond to the needs of different age groups and which are of value to the development of children and young people.

5.37 The NPFA recommended a minimum standard of outdoor space for children’s play of 0.8 hectares per 1,000 people, achievable by:

- Providing Local Areas for Play (LAPs), Local Equipped Areas for Play (LEAPs) and Neighbourhood Equipped Areas for Play (NEAPs) in locations based upon walking time.
- Providing the balance as casual playing space within areas of amenity open space.

Fields in Trust

5.38 Fields in Trust is the new operating name of the National Playing Fields Association. Planning and design for outdoor sport and play updates and modernises previous recommendations made in 2001. Since the 2001 approach was published, a range of more clearly defined and adopted policies for planning standards for open space, sport and recreation including outdoor facilities for sport and play have been published. In response to the changing policy context, and to reflect the need for local determination and adoption of standards relating to quantity, quality and accessibility, in 2006 Fields in Trust commissioned independent research to undertake a survey of local planning authorities and consult with key stakeholders around the United Kingdom.

5.39 The updated recommendations, in terms of standards for children’s play, are identified in Table 5.3 and Table 5.4.
Table 5.6 - Quantity: all playing space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity - All Playing Space</th>
<th>Benchmark Standard (ha per 1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designated Equipped Playing Space</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Playing Space</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Playing Space</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7 - Accessibility benchmark standards for children’s playing space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Space</th>
<th>Walking Distance</th>
<th>Straight Line Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local areas for play or ‘door-step’ spaces - for play and informal recreation (LAPs)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local equipped or local landscaped, areas for play - for play and informal recreation (LEAPs)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood equipped areas for play - for play and informal recreation, and provision for children and young people (NEAPs)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Mayor’s approach to play standards

5.40 The GLA encourages boroughs to produce play strategies, developing local standards and indicators are an identified part of developing a play strategy. The Guide to Preparing Play Strategies states that standards for play should be developed locally with an emphasis on quality and accessibility as opposed to overly prescriptive measures of quantity.

5.41 Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation, Mayoral SPG (2008) identified regional benchmarks for play provision to provide additional guidance for London boroughs and enable benchmarking of provision. The benchmark standard of 10sqm per child is recommended as the basis for assessing existing provision and assessing future requirements arising from an increase in the child population of the area and through new developments. The GLA benchmark includes both formal and informal children’s play space.

5.42 Along with the benchmarks the SPG identifies a Playable Space Typology. This is shown in Table 5.5 (adapted for use) and can be used to classify play areas within Southwark.
Table 5.8 – Playable space typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Minimum Size</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DoorstepPlayable Space</td>
<td>100 sqm</td>
<td>A landscaped space including engaging play features for young children, and places for carers to sit and talk. No formal supervision</td>
<td>Facilities can include landscaping, climbable objects, fixed equipment, seating for carers, sand and water feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Playable Space</td>
<td>300 sqm</td>
<td>A landscaped space with landscaping and equipment so that children aged from birth to 11 can play and be physically active and their careers can sit and talk. Flexible use; No formal supervision</td>
<td>Facilities can include landscaping, equipment for swinging, sliding and climbing integrated into landscape, balls walls, kick about areas, basketball area, seating, and sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Playable Space</td>
<td>1000 sqm</td>
<td>A varied natural space with secluded and open areas, landscaping and equipment so that children aged from birth to 11 can and be physically active and they and their carers can sit and talk, with some youth facilities. Flexible use; May include youth space; May be supervised</td>
<td>Facilities can include landscaping, equipment for swinging, sliding and climbing integrated into landscape, bike, skate and skate board facilities, hard surface area, balls walls, kick about areas, basketball area, seating, and sand, shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Space</td>
<td>200 sqm</td>
<td>A social space for young people aged 12 and over to meet, hang out and take part in informal sport or physical recreational activities. No formal supervision.</td>
<td>Space and facilities for informal sport or recreation, multi ball court, basketball court, climbing wall, multi-use games area (MUGA), skate park or BMX track, seating areas, youth shelter, and landscaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use Games</td>
<td>350 sqm</td>
<td>Do not have an identified typology therefore an indicative minimum size has been applied, averaging minimum size of: Doorstep Playable Space; Local Playable Space; Neighbourhood Playable Space and Youth Space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>400 sqm</td>
<td>Open Games Area suited to a wide range of sports. All Weather and Hard-Surface.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full size basketball</td>
<td>437 sqm</td>
<td>Full size basketball court (standard size). All Weather and Hard-Surface.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mayor of London - Supplementary Planning Guidance. N.B size of Neighbourhood space amended to reflect the need for space large enough to meet NEAP.

Existing Children’s Play Provision

5.43 Dedicated children’s play provision within parks and private spaces has been assessed against both NPFA criteria for classification of a LEAP or NEAP through site assessments and the GLA Playable Space Typology. Additionally, the assessment considered the number of and range of types of activities/opportunities available, provision of informal and hard surface play areas and provision of other amenities (seating, bins etc).
5.44 Out of a total of 78 assessed open spaces in the borough, five contain some form of children's play provision, as shown in Table 5.9.

Table 5.9 - Dedicated children's play provision (assessed sites)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Doorstep</th>
<th>LEAP</th>
<th>NEAP</th>
<th>Adventure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Water</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Atkins

5.45 It is recognised that there may be other children's play space available in the borough outside of the open spaces assessed as part of this study.

Access to Children's Play Provision and Deficiencies

5.46 The current distribution of children's play provision within the borough is shown in Figure 5.7. The figure identifies the location of formal (dedicated) play provision within those open spaces assessed by this study. Again, it is recognised that there may be other children's play provision outside of the open spaces assessed which is not included within this analysis. As a result, this report has not undertaken a full analysis of accessibility to children's play spaces.

Natural and Semi Natural Greenspace

5.47 This section considers the extent to which open spaces represent accessible natural or semi-natural greenspace consistent with the English Nature definition and also analyses greenspace provision within the framework used by the GLA as part of the Mayor’s Biodiversity Strategy.

Approach to Natural Greenspace Provision

English Nature ANGST Standards – The National Recommendation

5.48 English Nature has recommended that local authorities set standards relating to natural greenspace provision known as the Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt). This guidance was formally issued in 1996 within ‘A Space for Nature’ and recommended the following standards:

- Provision of at least 1ha of Local Nature Reserve per 1,000 population.
- That no person should be located more than 300m from their nearest area of natural greenspace of at least 2ha in size.
- That there should be at least one accessible 100ha site within 5km.
- That there should be one accessible 500ha site within 10km.
These standards are used by a wide range of local authorities throughout the country to inform natural greenspace provision. However, relatively few authorities outside London have adopted formal standards of natural greenspace provision within their development plans.

The ANGSt model was reviewed by English Nature in 2003 (Accessible Natural Greenspace standards in Towns and Cities: A Review and Toolkit). The review did not alter the standards listed above but did identify a number of problems with the model.

The definition of a natural greenspace used within the model “Areas naturally colonised by plants and animals” was considered to be unclear and impractical. This definition also excludes man made types of vegetation which predominate within urban areas and which have high biodiversity value. A complete knowledge of the history of each site would be required to determine whether a site has been naturally colonised or had resulted from planting and management.

This review also identified the need for more flexibility regarding the distance and size criteria and role within the hierarchy to reflect local circumstances. PPG17 also recommends that local authorities derive locally based standards of provision rather than adopt nationally derived standards wholesale.

Section 21 of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1994, gave local authorities the power to acquire, declare and manage Local Nature Reserves (LNR’s). The LNR designation is not a lower level of designation within the hierarchy but represents sites that provide public access to wildlife and natural habitats. There are six sites in the borough which are fully or partly covered by the Local Nature Reserve designation in the borough:

- OS8 – Lavender Pond;
- OS174 – Cox’s Walk;
- OS181 – Sydenham Hill and Dulwich Woods;
- OS187 – Dulwich Upper Wood;
- OS126 – Nunhead Cemetery; and
- OS150 – One Tree Hill.

Together these sites cover an area of 59.6ha. This means that the borough has 0.21ha of Local Nature Reserve per 1,000 population, compared to the 1ha of LNR per 1,000 population recommended within the ANGSt standards. The Council may consider designating other areas of open space as LNR (such as Stave Hill Ecological Park), although they are afforded sufficient protection under the GLA’s approach, considered below.

The GLA have taken the approach whereby four different types of ecological designation have been identified under the procedures detailed in ‘Policy, Criteria and Procedures for Identifying nature conservation sites in London’ recommended by the Mayor of London in his Biodiversity Strategy (July 2002) as the basis for such work. The English Nature guidance notes that ‘The GLA approach identifies the habitat types of nature conservation interest and eventually evaluates sites to a range...
of criteria which include those of social benefit' and that 'this approach offers a pragmatic solution to the challenge of defining natural greenspace.

5.56 It is considered appropriate to assess the amount of natural greenspace in the borough by using those GLA ecological designations (also known as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation) illustrated in Figure 5.8, as these designations offer a robust definition of one ecological value of natural greenspace. These designations are identified in the Core Strategy, and shown on the proposals map.

5.57 Sites of Metropolitan Importance are those sites which contain the best examples of London’s habitats and sites which contain particularly rare species. They are of the highest priority for protection.

5.58 Sites of borough Importance are important on a borough perspective in the same way as the Metropolitan Sites are important for the whole of London. Whilst protection of these sites is important, management of these sites should usually allow and encourage their enjoyment by people and their use for education.

5.59 Sites of Local Importance are, or may be, of particular value to nearby residents or schools. These sites also deserve protection in planning terms. Local sites are particularly important in areas otherwise deficient in sites of Metropolitan and Borough Importance. Where areas of deficiency are identified, Sites of Local Importance are the best available to alleviate this deficiency (Mayor’s Biodiversity Strategy 2003).

5.60 A total of 416ha of open space assessed as part of this study is designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). When the Thames is also considered, this rises to 518ha. Table 5.10 shows the total amount of open space designated under the four types of SINC within each of the borough's sub-areas. Dulwich has the largest amount of open space designated as a SINC, with a total of 148ha, whilst just 6.4ha of open space is designated as a SINC in Elephant and Castle.

Table 5.10 - Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site of Metropolitan Importance</th>
<th>Borough Importance - Grade 1</th>
<th>Borough Importance - Grade 2</th>
<th>Sites of Local Importance</th>
<th>Local Nature Reserve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Water &amp; Rotherhithe</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155.4</td>
<td>151.9</td>
<td>178.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Atkins
Table 5.11 shows the total amount of natural greenspace per population. The table shows that the total amount of SINC designated open space in the borough is equal to 1.79ha per 1,000 population. If the current level of provision was maintained to 2026, this would fall to 1.51ha per 1,000 population due to the projected increased in the borough’s population. This compares favourably with the 1ha of Local Nature Reserve per 1,000 population recommended by English Nature. However, the definition of English Nature’s Local Nature Reserve is different to the definition used for Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation.

Table 5.11 also shows that there are wide variations in natural greenspace provision between sub-areas, with just 0.36ha per 1,000 population in Bermondsey and 4.44ha per 1,000 in Canada Water & Rotherhithe.

Table 5.11 – Total nature greenspace per population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total SINC (ha)</th>
<th>Provision per 1,000 population (2011)</th>
<th>Provision per 1,000 population (2026)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Water &amp; Rotherhithe</td>
<td>128.3</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>113.1</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>517.5</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Atkins/2010 GLA Population Projections

Local Nature Reserves are normally greater than 2ha in size, whereas there are no size thresholds when identifying Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation. In addition, Local Nature Reserves should be capable of being managed primarily for nature conservation and so that the special opportunities for study, research or enjoyment of nature are maintained (English Nature – Local Nature Reserves: Places for People and Wildlife, 2000). This means that they are often publicly accessible and include some facilities for observing nature. It is important that the potential conflicts between allowing public access to nature and protecting biodiversity are recognised. Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation are identified by habitat and species richness but do not necessarily have to provide public access or nature conservation facilities.

Access Deficiencies

When considering accessibility deficiencies, the Mayor’s Biodiversity Strategy defines an area of ecological access deficiency as an area beyond 500m walking distance to a publicly accessible open space of Metropolitan, Borough Grade I or Borough Grade II Importance (Mayor’s Biodiversity Strategy, 2003). The research has shown few people are prepared to travel more than five or ten minutes to a natural greenspace which translates to a distance of around 500m.
5.65 Figure 5.8 illustrates the 500m catchment area, when applied to these designations within sub-area. The figure shows that almost all of the borough is within the 500m catchment area to a site designated as a SINC, although parts of Bermondsey and Bankside are outside of the catchment.

Allotments

5.66 This section considers the extent of allotment provision in Southwark. It includes an analysis of existing provision, as well as a consideration of existing levels of unmet demand.

5.67 Recently interest in allotments has increased due to public awareness of ‘green’ issues and concerns over links between food and health. Modern housing developments also have smaller garden sizes, or no private outdoor space. These factors are relevant both to the over 50 demographic, which represent the main group of allotment gardeners, and the increasingly younger participant profile.

Policy

5.68 Within the policy arena, the importance of allotments is increasingly recognised as having an important role in contributing towards urban regeneration, sustainable development and quality of life. The benefits of allotments include:

- The practical value of allotments in providing access to affordable fresh vegetables, physical exercise and social activity.
- Localised food production brings environmental benefits of reducing the use of energy and materials for processing, packaging and distributing food. Allotments also perform a role in the recycling of green waste.
- The therapeutic value of allotments in promoting good physical and mental health. Gardening is identified as one of the Health Education Council’s recommended forms of exercise for the over 50s.
- Allotments are an important component of urban green space and provide a green lung within the urban environments.
- Cultivated and untended plots contribute towards maintaining biodiversity particularly where plots are maintained using organic methods.
- Allotments have an important role to play in the implementation of plans for encouraging local sustainable and community development, potential links exist with local schools, and with the mentally and physically ill and the disabled.
- Allotments have an important historical and cultural role in community heritage, values and identity.

National Context

The Allotment Acts

5.69 The legal framework for Allotments has developed in a piecemeal fashion and is encapsulated within a number of Acts identified below.
Table 5.12 - Principal allotment legislation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act and Date</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small holdings and Allotments Act 1908</td>
<td>Consolidated all previous legislation and laid down the basis for subsequent Acts. Placed duty on local authorities to provide sufficient allotments according to demand. Makes provision for local authorities to compulsorily purchase land to provide allotments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments Act 1922</td>
<td>Limited the size of an individual allotment to one quarter of an acre and specified that they should mostly be used for growing fruit and vegetables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments Act 1925</td>
<td>Required local authorities to recognise the need for allotments in any town planning development. Established ‘statutory’ allotments which a local authority could not sell or convert to other purposes without Ministerial consent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments Act 1950</td>
<td>Made improved provisions for compensatory and tenants’ rights. Confined local authority’s obligation to ‘allotment gardens’ only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 – Sport Open Space and Recreation

5.70 The national planning framework relating to allotments is set out in PPG17 published in July 2002. This guidance identifies the role of informal open space including allotments as performing:

- The strategic function of defining and separating urban areas.
- Contributing towards urban quality and assisting urban regeneration.
- Promoting health and well being.
- Acting as havens and habitats for flora and fauna.
- Being a community resource for social interaction.
- A visual function.

5.71 PPG17 also identifies the issues which Local Planning Authorities should take into account in considering allotment provision and circumstances when disposal may be appropriate.

Assessing Allotment Needs

5.72 The revised PPG17 states that in preparing development plans, Local Authorities should undertake an assessment of the likely demand for allotments and their existing allotment provision, and prepare policies which aim to meet the needs in their area.

5.73 There is no formal guidance on how allotment needs should be assessed, however the Local Government Association good practice guide ‘Growing in the Community’ (2001) identifies issues which should be considered. Local Authorities are required to provide allotments for their residents if they consider there is demand, under section 23 of the 1908 Allotments Acts (as amended). The 1969 Thorpe Report recommended a minimum standard of allotment provision of 0.2 hectares (0.5 acres) per 1,000 population. With a population of 28,917 this would equate to a provision in the borough of 58 hectares.
5.74 In 1996 the National Allotment survey identified an average provision in England of 15 plots per 1,000 households. Table 5.13 shows that the borough currently has approximately 944 plots, which equates to approximately 9 plots per 1,000 households.

5.75 Table 5.13 also shows that there are at least 797 people currently on the waiting list for allotment space in the borough (where data on the number of people on the waiting list is available). At most sites, the waiting list is up to 10 years, although there are a limited number of sites where waiting lists are around 1-2 years.

Table 5.13 – Provision of allotment plots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site Owner</th>
<th>No. of plots</th>
<th>No Waiting</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>Grove Park Allotments</td>
<td>LBS housing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8 yrs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS151</td>
<td>One Tree Allotments</td>
<td>LBS Leisure</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>Caspian Street Allotments</td>
<td>LBS housing</td>
<td>16 + Community Garden</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Bonar Road Allotments</td>
<td>LBS Leisure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.5 yrs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Bonar Road Allotments</td>
<td>LBS Leisure</td>
<td>17 and 3 half plots</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS74</td>
<td>Galleywall Road Allotments</td>
<td>LBS housing</td>
<td>none - new community wildlife garden</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Fielding Street Allotments</td>
<td>LBS housing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>4-10 years</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS72</td>
<td>Lynton Rd/St James Road Allotments East</td>
<td>LBS housing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6-10 yrs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS72</td>
<td>Lynton Rd/St James Rd Allotments west</td>
<td>LBS housing</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6-10 yrs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS141</td>
<td>Friern Road Allotments</td>
<td>LBS housing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2 yrs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS170</td>
<td>Grange Lane Allotments</td>
<td>Dulwich Estates</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2 yrs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS180</td>
<td>Gunsite Allotments</td>
<td>Dulwich Estates</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS66</td>
<td>Lamlash Street Allotments</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS133</td>
<td>Stuart Road/Nunhead Reservoir Allotments</td>
<td>Thames Water</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>5 yrs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Alscot Road Allotments</td>
<td>LBS housing</td>
<td>19 &amp; 2 disabled beds</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS78</td>
<td>Paterson Park</td>
<td>LBS Leisure</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS175</td>
<td>Grove Allotments</td>
<td>Dulwich Estates</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.5 Yrs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Brettell Street Allotment Association</td>
<td>Private landlord</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>944</td>
<td>797</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LB Southwark
5.76 There is a clear need for additional allotment space to meet unmet demand. However, allotments in their traditional sense represent space for food growing which are essentially restricted for single ownership. To meet the significant levels of unmet demand in the borough there will be a need to identify alternative methods to allotment provision, including shared community gardens. This is considered in more detail in Chapter 8.

Allotment supply

5.77 Table 5.14 shows that a total of 15.3ha of allotment land was identified as part of the site assessment process. A further 2.9ha of land used as community gardens was also identified, with one further site identified as an urban farm (OS41 - Surrey Docks Farm).

5.78 The vast majority of allotment provision is located in the south of the borough, with 8.5ha located in Dulwich and 5.9ha located in Peckham and Nunhead. By contrast, the majority of community gardens are located in the north of the borough.

5.79 Table 5.15 shows the provision of allotment and community garden provision per population within each of the sub-areas. The table shows that Dulwich has by far the highest amount of provision with 0.24ha per 1,000 population. No allotments or community gardens were recorded in Canada Water & Rotherhithe.

Table 5.14 – Allotments, community gardens and urban farms per sub-area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Allotments</th>
<th>Community Gardens</th>
<th>Urban Farms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of sites</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>No. of sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Water &amp; Rotherhithe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Atkins
Table 5.15 – Allotments and community gardens per population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Allotment Provision per 1,000 population</th>
<th>Community Garden provision per 1,000 population</th>
<th>Total per 1,000 population (2011)</th>
<th>Total per 1,000 population (2026)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Water &amp; Rotherhithe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accessibility**

5.80 The residents’ survey identified that 71% of journeys to allotments took up to 15 minutes, with the vast majority of these by foot. 15 minutes equates to a 1.2km accessibility standard. Figure 5.9 shows the catchment area applied to both allotments and community gardens. The figure shows that all of the Canada Water & Rotherhithe sub-area, and a small part of Dulwich, close to Herne Hill, are outside of this recommended catchment. New provision of opportunities for food growing should be identified to alleviate these deficiencies.

**Quality and Management**

5.81 The quality, condition and management of allotments also influence potential demand. Allotments that are well maintained and have vacant plots which are available for use with little clearance of scrub and rubbish are likely to prove more attractive than overgrown plots.

5.82 The condition and maintenance of facilities including fences, the water supply, toilets, communal huts, sheds and greenhouses, paths and waste areas will also influence the attractiveness of allotment sites to potential plot holders, particularly if it is sought to broaden demand and attract new users.

**Other Types of Open Space**

**Amenity Space**

5.83 Amenity green space provides a less formal green space experience than the parks and gardens. Amenity open space sites provide important spaces for informal recreation, including informal play and dog walking, close to where people live or work, and where access to a park may not be available.

5.84 It was not within the scope of this study to assess the quality and function of small amenity space not already designated for protection within the Core Strategy. The 2010 open space evidence base work provides details of the total quantity of amenity space within the borough. Table 5.16 below shows the nine spaces identified as amenity space as part of this study.
The role of amenity space as part of a wider network of open space in the borough is discussed in more detail in Chapter 8.

Table 5.16 – Amenity space assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space ID</th>
<th>Space Name</th>
<th>Sub-Area</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS131</td>
<td>The Gardens Square</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS163</td>
<td>Barclay Way</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS183</td>
<td>Countisbury House Lawns (Dulwich)</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS184</td>
<td>Long Meadow</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS50</td>
<td>Bermondsey Square</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS96</td>
<td>Caroline Gardens</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN3</td>
<td>Lyndhurst Square</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN5</td>
<td>Brayards Green</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Churchyards and Cemeteries

Cemeteries and churchyards are defined in PPG17 as open spaces that are currently, or have previously been, used as burial spaces. Cemeteries and churchyards can also provide facilities for sitting out, biodiversity and even children’s play in some spaces. Where churchyards meet the criteria as a park (see Table 4.1), or any other type of open space, they have been classified as such. Other cemetery sites which do not have a wider range of functions have been classified as cemeteries and churchyards, and are shown in Table 5.17 below.

Table 5.17 – Churchyards and cemeteries assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space ID</th>
<th>Space Name</th>
<th>Sub-Area</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS86</td>
<td>St Peter’s Churchyard</td>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS1</td>
<td>Christchurch Gardens</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS13</td>
<td>All Hallows Churchyard</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS18</td>
<td>St George’s Churchyard and Gardens</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS23</td>
<td>St John’s Churchyard</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS3</td>
<td>Cathedral Precinct</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS49</td>
<td>St Mary Magdalen Churchyard</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS43</td>
<td>Trinity Church Square</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS71</td>
<td>St Anne’s Churchyard</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS30</td>
<td>St Mary’s Churchyard, Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Canada Water &amp; Rotherhithe</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS39</td>
<td>Holy Trinity Churchyard</td>
<td>Canada Water &amp; Rotherhithe</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS149</td>
<td>Camberwell Old Cemetery</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>11.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS170</td>
<td>St Peter’s Churchyard (Lordship Lane)</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS126</td>
<td>Nunhead Cemetery</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>20.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS145</td>
<td>Camberwell New Cemetery and Grounds</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>17.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Playing Pitches and Other Outdoor Sports Facilities

5.87 Playing pitches and other outdoor sports facilities relates to any open space where formal outdoor recreation is the dominant use. This can include grass pitches, synthetic turf pitches, golf courses and a range of other sports facilities, managed by the private sector, educational institutions or by the Council. This study has assessed the quality and role of each site categorised as an outdoor sports facility as part of the site assessment process. Further analysis of the quality, provision and demand for outdoor sports facilities is provided in the draft Southwark Playing Pitch Strategy (2010).

5.88 Table 5.18 shows the total amount of open space classified as outdoor sports facilities by sub-area, whilst Table 5.19 shows the total provision per population. The tables show that Dulwich has by far the largest amount of pitch provision in the borough, with 3.9ha per 1,000 population compared to the borough average of 0.6ha per 1,000 population. It should be noted that pitch provision can also exist within spaces classified as a park.

Table 5.18 – Outdoor sports facilities assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of sites</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>No. of sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Water &amp; Rotherhithe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.19 – Outdoor sports facilities per population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total SINC (ha)</th>
<th>Provision per 1,000 population (2011)</th>
<th>Provision per 1,000 population (2026)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Water &amp; Rotherhithe</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>135.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>184.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Civic Spaces**

5.89 Civic spaces relate to more formally laid out hard surfaced public spaces including squares, pedestrian streets. These spaces do not normally have a formal recreational function but do help to define the character of local urban environments. Only civic spaces currently identified as Borough Open Land or Other Open Space within the Core Strategy have been assessed as part of this study. The Council’s 2010 evidence base work provides further details of the supply of civic spaces in the borough. Table 5.20 shows the total number of civic spaces subject to a site assessment, the majority of which are located in Canada Water & Rothehithe.

Table 5.20 – Civic spaces assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space ID</th>
<th>Space Name</th>
<th>Sub-Area</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS26</td>
<td>Angel Public House</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS29</td>
<td>Hope Sufferance Wharf</td>
<td>Canada Water &amp; Rothehithe</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS32</td>
<td>Knot Garden</td>
<td>Canada Water &amp; Rothehithe</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS33</td>
<td>Brunel Pump House</td>
<td>Canada Water &amp; Rothehithe</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS35</td>
<td>Albion Channel</td>
<td>Canada Water &amp; Rothehithe</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.2 – Access to Open Space
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Figure 5.3 – Accessibility to Local Parks, Small Open Spaces and Pocket Parks
Figure 5.4 – Accessibility to District Parks
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Figure 5.5 – Accessibility to Metropolitan Parks
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Figure 5.6 – Accessibility to all Park Types
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Figure 5.7 – Sites with facilities for Children’s Play
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Figure 5.9 – Allotments and Community Gardens
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6. Quality of supply

Introduction

6.1 Research focused on ‘open space’ highlights the importance placed on the quality of facilities by users.

6.2 As qualitative factors are often difficult to assess objectively, it is important to establish a methodology to enable the consistent scoring and ranking of the condition and quality of spaces. Many aspects of open space quality raise detailed issues of park management and maintenance which are beyond the scope of this study.

Quality Assessment

6.3 The range and condition of facilities within each open space were assessed using a scoring criterion method derived from the Civic Trust Green Flag standard assessment which is also consistent with the GLA guidance. The standard is based partly on a physical site appraisal of 27 criteria relating to the range, quality and condition of park facilities which accounts for 70% of the overall score and a desk research element relating to management arrangements and sustainability which comprises of the remaining 30% of the score.

6.4 In some circumstances Green Flag assessment criteria have not been used i.e. for those spaces that have been identified as railway embankments not all of the criteria are appropriate for example; “a welcoming place for all”. Open space has not been assessed by those criteria that are not appropriate for a given type of space.

6.5 The open space assessment included consideration of 18 Green Flag criteria which could be assessed through a visual appraisal of the site. The dimensions of quality considered were:

- The conservation of natural features.
- The conservation of landscape features.
- The conservation of buildings and structures.
- The provision of educational interpretation facilities.
- Standards of arboriculture and woodland management.
- Whether the space was welcoming.
- The accessibility of a site and the safety of site access.
- How well signposted the space is.
- Whether there is equality of access to and within the space.
- The safety of equipment and facilities.
- Levels of personal security within the space.
- Evidence of dog fouling and availability of appropriate provision (designated bins, dog walks).
- The appropriate provision of facilities for the type of space.
- The quality of facilities.
- The cleanliness of a site including litter and waste management arrangements.
- Standards of grounds maintenance and horticulture.
• Standards of building and infrastructure maintenance.
• Standards of equipment maintenance.

6.6 The criteria which were not assessed related to the sustainability of management and maintenance practices (4 criteria), the level of community involvement (2 criteria), marketing and promotion (2 criteria) and implementation of the park management plan (1 criterion).

6.7 Each of the 18 criteria were attributed a score between 0 and 10, where 0 is considered to be very poor and 10 is considered to be exceptional. The score for each of the criterion was evaluated against a range of issues relating to each factor these are described fully within the guide to the site survey pro-forma (refer to Appendix B). The green flag scoring system used to assess criteria within the standard is as follows:
• 0-1 Very Poor;
• 2-4 Poor;
• 5-6 Fair;
• 7 Good;
• 8 Very Good;
• 9 Excellent; and
• 10 Exceptional.

6.8 Not all of the criteria were applicable to each type of open space (e.g. conservation of buildings, equipment maintenance). Therefore an average score was derived for each open space based upon those aspects of quality considered. However a percentage score was also calculated which assumed all 18 quality variables.

6.9 For an open space to achieve the Green Flag standard the minimum quality standard required of a site is 66% (taking account of the desk top and site based aspects of the assessment).

6.10 Figure 6.1 categorises each open space according to its overall quality score. Sites of a higher quality are concentrated in the north of the borough, including Bankside, Bermondsey and Canada Water & Rothehithe sub-areas, as well as the far south of the borough within the Dulwich sub-area. Sites within the more central parts of the borough, including northern Peckham, Camberwell and the Aylesbury and Walworth sub-area were assessed to be of slightly lower quality.

6.11 Table 6.1 provides an indication of how each type of open space performs against the 18 Green Flag criteria assessed on site. The average assessed score shows the average of those variables scored at each site.

6.12 The table shows that the average quality score for all spaces assessed in the borough is 71.3%, which is the equivalent of ‘good’ under the green flag scoring system. The table also shows that there are some significant differences in average quality between different types of open space. The borough’s three Metropolitan Parks (Southwark Park, Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common and Dulwich Park) were assessed to be the best type of open space in terms of quality, scoring an average of 83.6%. Local Parks also scored well, with an average of 75.9%. In general,
larger parks scored higher in terms of quality than smaller parks. The exception to this is the District Park typology, the average of which is brought down by the relatively poor quality of the space recorded at Burgess Park.

6.13 There was also some significant variation between the different types of outdoor sports facilities. Outdoor sports facilities maintained by educational institutions (including those from the public and private sector) recorded an average quality score of 75.6% whilst outdoor sports facilities managed by the other private clubs and institutions scored lower at just 69.8%.

6.14 Natural or semi-natural greenspaces also scored relatively poorly at 64.2%. Although there are some very good quality natural greenspaces in the borough (such as OS181 - Sydenham Hill and Dulwich Woods), there are also a number of spaces which fall into this category which are not subject to the same degree of management and maintenance. Appendix E provides the overall quality score for each individual open space, along with the value scores which are discussed in the next chapter.

Table 6.1 - Quality assessment by space type (overall average scores)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space Type</th>
<th>Average quality score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Park</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Park</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Park</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Open Space</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Types</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity space</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Spaces</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenspaces within grounds of institution</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - education</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - private</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - public</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for young people and teenagers</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.15 Table 6.2 demonstrates the average score for the borough’s eight sub-areas by open space type. Again, the scores used are the average assessed criteria for scores derived from the variables assessed and do not include the variables which did not apply to the space (e.g. if an open space didn’t accommodate heritage buildings or structures the open space was not scored on this).
6.16 The average quality scores for each sub-area table reinforces the key message from Figure 6.1, namely that the central sub-areas of Aylesbury and Walworth, Camberwell and Peckham and Nunhead have lower quality open spaces than the sub-areas in the far north and south of the borough.

6.17 The table also shows that the Elephant and Castle sub-area scores the highest in terms of average quality. This is largely because the sub-area has a relatively small number of spaces assessed as part of this study, the majority of which are parks which generally tend to score higher than other types of open space. The sub-area also has a number of spaces which scored relatively high, including OS57 – West Square Garden, OS56 – Geraldine Mary Harmsworth Park, and OS67 – St Mary’s Churchyard.

6.18 There are some significant differences between average quality scores for parks between the eight sub-areas. The highest average quality score for parks was recorded in the Dulwich sub-area, with an average quality score of 76.2%. By contrast the Aylesbury sub-area recorded an average of just 65.5%, largely due to the relatively poor quality of the spaces at OS91 – Burgess Park and OS77 – Surrey Square.
### Table 6.2 – Average quality scores by type and sub-area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space Type</th>
<th>Aylesbury</th>
<th>Bankside</th>
<th>Bermondsey</th>
<th>Camberwell</th>
<th>Canada Water &amp; Rothehithe</th>
<th>Dulwich</th>
<th>Elephant and Castle</th>
<th>Peckham and Nunhead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Park</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Park</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Park</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Open Space</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Park Total</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities / Playing Fields</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments and Community Gardens</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries and Churchyards</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural or Semi Natural Greenspaces</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Spaces</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenspaces within Grounds of Institution</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Greenspace</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Young People and Teenagers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Open Space Total</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Open Space</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions and Recommendations

6.19 Open space policy has been primarily concerned with the quantity and distribution of open space. This study updates this information but also considers the range and condition of facilities within open spaces and the quality of those facilities.

6.20 Open spaces can fulfil many urban needs often in highly sustainable ways. They are generally local facilities accessible to people of all ages and backgrounds. They can be used for exercise, education, meeting people, community events, and to encourage the movement of flora and fauna. They also contribute to the visual amenity of a local area, breaking up the urban fabric and providing an escape from the traffic and built environment.

6.21 An important aspect to a qualitative assessment is the need to integrate decision-making on park improvements with the assessment of the quantity and accessibility of provision. In areas deficient in public open space and where there are limited opportunities to increase supply, (whether by the creation of new spaces, or by increasing public access to private spaces), the only way of addressing deficiency will be to ensure that the potential of existing spaces is fully realised.

6.22 The companion guide to PPG17 (2002) suggests that an understanding of the borough’s characteristics will help to inform the priority given to different parts of the strategy and can identify possible priorities for open space improvements.

6.23 The Mayor of London’s ‘Guide to preparing Open Space Strategies’ recommends which stakeholders should be consulted and in particular, how to consult the general public. Consultation with local user groups and other stakeholders help to define the sorts of facilities, amenities and activities that might be required in a certain area. The Residents’ Survey identifies the sort of improvements people would like to see happen to existing open spaces (discussed in Chapter 3).

Proposed Quality Standard

Public Parks

6.24 Public parks within the borough should be of good quality and provide the range of facilities associated with their respective tier of the parks hierarchy. The Green Flag assessment identifies spaces with a ranking of 6 and above to be considered as good quality. Those public parks which either under perform in terms of their value to the local community or their condition should be improved consistent with the guidelines identified.
7. Value of open space

Introduction

7.1 Value is a different and separate concept from quality. It relates to three things:

- **Context**: a space which is inaccessible may be of little value, irrespective of its quality. If there is a high level of open space provision in an area some of it may be of relatively little value, conversely if there is very little provision even a space of mediocre quality may be valuable.
- **Level and type of use**: context should also be interpreted in terms of use by people and wildlife.
- **The wider benefits it generates**: it generates for people, biodiversity and the wider environment.

7.2 The benefits and value of open spaces to local communities extends beyond their active recreational role. Both public and private open spaces perform recreational and non-recreational roles contributing to community and quality of life. These roles are examined under the following headings:

- The context of the open space, which largely concentrates on the local open space need within the vicinity of the space and site access.
- The recreational function performed by the open space.
- The structural role of open space in separating and defining communities.
- The amenity value of spaces.
- The ecological role performed by spaces.
- The environmental value of spaces.
- The existing educational value of spaces to the community.
- The cultural and social value of spaces.

7.3 Individual value scores for each of the above headings and for each individual space are included within Appendix F. Appendix G illustrates the scoring system used to derive the overall value scores.

7.4 The following section of the chapter examines the roles identified above in more detail, and describes how these have been incorporated into the value analysis for Southwark.

Site Context

7.5 The site context of open spaces within Southwark takes into account the degree of public access to an open space as this can impact on the overall value of the space. Open spaces with restricted public access will have a lower value to the local community than those with general public access. Additionally, the site context reflects how often the site is used by local residents, using data gathered as part of the residents’ survey (refer to Chapter 3).

Recreational Value

7.6 The recreational value of open spaces in the borough has been assessed by considering the recreational roles performed at each site and the indications of informal use. Active recreational roles include pitch sports, other outdoor sports and other active recreational activities such as allotment gardening. Informal recreational activities include walking and dog walking, children’s play, teenagers ‘hanging out’, sitting out, relaxation and other pastimes such as remembrance at memorial gardens and cemeteries.
7.7 A recreation score was derived for each open space based upon the number of active and informal recreational roles each space performed. Appendix G provides further details of the scoring system used to assess recreational value. A standardised percentage score for each space was derived.

7.8 Table 7.1 identifies the percentage of open spaces within the borough which performed selected active and informal recreational roles.

Table 7.1 – Recreational role of open spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pitch sports</th>
<th>Other Outdoor Sports</th>
<th>Children’s Play</th>
<th>Sitting Out</th>
<th>Walking/Dog Walking</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Water</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Atkins

7.9 Table 10.1 illustrates that the most common role open spaces perform is for informal recreational activities such as sitting out, followed by ‘other outdoor sports’ and walking/dog walking. Whilst the majority of open spaces could support some sort of walking/dog walking, this was not recorded as a major recreational use at many of the smaller spaces in the borough.

7.10 Using open spaces for ‘informal recreational activities’ made up a significant proportion of total reasons given for visiting open space by respondents to the residents’ survey. It is therefore important that there are sufficient open spaces providing informal recreation. By comparing the existing recreational role of open spaces with what the residents’ survey respondents stated they use open space for, it is possible to see to what degree spaces are meeting the needs of users. The most common reasons given for visiting open spaces were walking (47%) and children’s play (32%), followed by fresh air (38%) and relaxing/sitting outside (22%). It has already been mentioned that walking/dog walking, children’s play and sitting out are the most common informal recreational activity amongst spaces, indicating sufficient open space for these needs.

**Structural Role**

7.11 The structural role of open spaces as identified by the site surveys is shown in Table 7.2. These spaces form significant elements in the borough’s overall physical structure and include a combination of green open spaces, such as public parks and gardens, cemeteries, green spaces within the grounds of institutions and natural/semi natural green space. Some spaces also provide a physical and visual break between major residential areas and help to distinguish between different...
neighbourhoods and communities. The definitions used to assess each criterion are included in the guide to the proforma in Appendix D.

7.12 Table 7.2 shows that many open spaces in Southwark have a structural role, 83 open spaces in the borough fulfil at least one of the structural roles identified accounting for 85.5% of total open space in the borough. The most common structural role is contributing to the sense of place of the local area, a total of 48 open spaces meet this criterion. There are 128 sites that do not have a structural role.

Table 7.2 – Structural role of open space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Role</th>
<th>Total Sites</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearly distinguishable from the built up area providing separation between different communities</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>242.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributes to the special identity of Southwark</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>138.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates a positive and significant open space experience when passed or crossed while travelling</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>187.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributes to the sense of place in the local area.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>384.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps to define neighbourhoods within the urban area.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>412.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodates recognised and recognisable features of local importance</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>157.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total open spaces with structural role</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>510.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total open spaces with no structural role</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>516.8</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Atkins

Amenity Value

7.13 The ways in which open space contributes to the visual amenity of its area are influenced by the amount of open space in the area, the visual envelope of the open space and the contribution it makes to the street scene.

7.14 The following criteria were used to assess the amenity value of open spaces in Southwark (see the guide to the proforma in Appendix D for criteria definitions):

- Is it visible from parts of the surrounding area?
- Is it visually attractive?
- Does it have a clearly definable townscape value?
- Does it provide relief from the built up area?
- Site mitigates visual impact of unsightly land uses (buffer; bunding; screening).

7.15 The overall amenity value of open spaces within the borough is summarised within Table 7.3. This illustrates that a high proportion of open space in the borough does have amenity value. A total of 560ha of open space, or 93.8% of the total area of open space, offer amenity value based upon one or more of the criteria listed above.
### Table 7.3 – Amenity value of open space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity Value</th>
<th>No. of sites</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visible from parts of the surrounding area</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>492.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually attractive</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>478.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly definable townscape value</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>104.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides relief from the built up area</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>505.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigates visual impact of unsightly land uses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total open space with amenity value</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>560.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space without amenity value</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total open spaces with no structural role</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>516.8</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Atkins

### Heritage Value

7.16 Open spaces were identified as having heritage value if they are included on the English Heritage Register for Parks and Gardens, form part of a Conservation Area, or accommodate a Scheduled Ancient Monument within their curtilage. The criteria used to assess the heritage value of spaces are identified in Appendix E. Spaces which form part of a Conservation Area form part of the townscape of these areas and are an integral part of the setting of the built development. Those open spaces which are contemporary with the age of neighbouring buildings are of particular value.

7.17 Table 7.4 shows that 41 open spaces in the borough have a significant heritage value, which represents 196.8ha of open space (33% of all open space).

### Table 7.4 – Open spaces with heritage value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Value</th>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site is EH Registered Park/Garden</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>131.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site within Conservation Area and Contemporary with its surroundings</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>127.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Ancient Monument within site</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All sites with significant heritage value</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>196.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites without significant heritage value</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>400.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Atkins

### Ecological Role

7.18 It is recognised that many open spaces will contribute to the biodiversity of the borough, with many of the larger spaces performing some kind of ecological role. For a more detailed assessment of natural and semi-natural green space provision within Southwark, please refer to the natural and semi-natural greenspace section of Chapter 5. The criteria used to assess the ecological role of spaces are identified in Appendix G.
Environmental Role

7.19 Open spaces can provide environmental value through the inclusion of water or vegetation features. Table 7.5 shows that 67.8% of open spaces include at least one of these measures of environmental value. The site surveys also identified tranquil open spaces and open spaces providing a buffer to sources of noise or air pollution. Nearly a third of all spaces (62%) are more tranquil than the surrounding area and 39.4% of spaces provide a buffer to sources of noise. This is an important measure of value of open space particularly as peace and quiet and a place to sit and relax are often stated as a reason for visiting open space. The criteria used to assess the environmental role of spaces are identified in Appendix G.

Table 7.5 – Environmental value of open space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Feature</th>
<th>No. of open spaces</th>
<th>% of all open space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain / Flood Attenuation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake / Manmade features</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River / Natural Drainage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation forms shelter belt</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space is More Tranquil</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space provides a buffer to noise source</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All open spaces with environmental role</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Atkins

Education Value

7.20 Urban open spaces can represent an educational resource for both children and adults either on an organised basis, such as schools using open spaces for activities linked to the curriculum, or on a more informal basis (nature walks etc). Educational roles should be assessed in terms of the potential benefit to the wider community (not just schools) and include:

- **Sport / Organised Games** – Sites should be assessed for signs of existing use by schools for active recreation.
- **Nature / Environmental Study** – Sites should have a range of ecological / environmental features. For the sites to have an existing role there should be some form of interpretation provision (e.g. boards, leaflets, programme of events).
- **Historical interpretation / Understanding** – Open spaces which form part of the setting for any of the heritage designations including English Heritage Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, conservation areas, listed buildings. For the sites to have an existing role there should be some form of interpretation provision (boards, leaflets, part of trail).

7.21 An assessment of the existing and potential value for spaces informed the education component of the value assessment (refer to Appendix G).
7.22 Open Spaces in Southwark were assessed on their existing and potential educational roles. A total of 89 (42.8%) open spaces in Southwark perform at least one existing educational role. The most common existing role is for sport or organised games, with 25.5% of all open spaces providing this role.

7.23 29.3% of all sites were assessed to have the potential to introduce one or more educational roles, with 22.6% of all sites assessed having the potential to introduce opportunities for nature/environmental study. Many of these sites were located at natural/semi natural greenspace sites where existing information was assessed to be poor or unavailable.

Table 7.6 – Educational role of open spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport / Organised Games</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature / Environmental Interpretation Facilities</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Interpretation / Understanding</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Spaces with Education Role</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Atkins

Cultural / Social Value

7.24 Open spaces can also represent a source of wider social benefits and cultural value providing the setting for sport, community meetings, fairs, firework displays, picnics etc. Social benefits are recognised as perhaps the most obvious benefits and opportunities that urban open spaces provide for City living (Urban Open Spaces, 2003). The social and cultural benefits associated within open spaces include:

- Community focus – A sense of community can be provided by open spaces which host small and large events and both organised and informal gatherings. Open spaces also represent a source of local identity and pride.
- Cultural focus – Parks and open spaces are important for people from different cultures. They provide a venue for religious services, festivals and charity events.
- Social focus – Open spaces provide opportunities for social interaction and the development of social capital through family and group outings, community events and activities, meetings between friends and chance encounters. Participation in physical recreation has shown to contribute towards a reduction of incivilities and anti-social behaviour among participants.
- Health benefits – Open spaces provide benefits to health. Exercise and physical activity contribute towards physical well-being. Whilst peace and quiet, social interaction, opportunities for aesthetic appreciation and proximity to nature is beneficial to mental health and well being.
- Educational focus – Open spaces provide opportunities for children’s play which are beneficial to child development. These benefits are not confined to children’s play areas but other features and experiences on offer within open spaces. Open spaces provide visual stimulation, opportunities to improve cognitive, co-ordination and communication skills through play. Open spaces can provide a safe environment for informal play and adventure which can foster a sense of independence.
• Heritage focus – Open spaces can be of historic value and provide opportunities for people to engage and interpret with the historic environment which can provide a sense of community identity.

7.25 It was not possible to assess each of these dimensions of value for individual sites as part of the site appraisal process. Instead a score for the cultural value of spaces was derived based upon formal provision including cultural venues (amphitheatres, meeting spaces, etc), events, and public art and an assessment of the potential to support these activities or functions.

7.26 Table 7.7 summarises the existing and potential cultural roles performed by open spaces in Southwark. Nearly a third (30.3%) of open spaces already perform a cultural role either through the provision of dedicated facilities to support cultural activities or through events held within the space, whilst 15.4% of open spaces within the borough were identified as having potential to perform culture related functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue for Large Scale Outdoor Events</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Venue for Small Scale Outdoor Events</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Programme</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Hall</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Sports Hall</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All spaces with Cultural Role</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Atkins. Note: A single space can have both an existing and a potential role

Composite Value Analysis

7.27 A composite assessment of the value of open spaces was undertaken which considered the context within which the open space lies, the level and type of use associated with the space and the wider benefits it generates for people, biodiversity and wider environment. The types of value examined have been identified above.

7.28 The criteria used to assess each of these dimensions of value are described fully in Appendix G. Each of the values were weighted and given a percentage score. The value score of each space is also given in Appendix F. The value scores should be viewed as an indicator of the “richness” of individual spaces.
Almost all spaces within the study area have value of some kind along one or more dimensions described above. The open spaces which perform the most roles are likely to be the most valued spaces to the community. However, the reverse is not necessarily true. The result of the value assessment is based on measuring all the different value criteria, so although an open space may be low value, it could have one type of value that is very important for example a space may have a high environmental value, but is not used for recreation, education etc. So although a space scores low overall on value, the fact it has an important environmental value would mean that it should not be treated as surplus.

The value score should not be used to directly compare different types or sizes of open space as for example it is not expected that an amenity space within a housing area should be of the same value as a District or Metropolitan Park.

Table 7.8 shows the distribution of value scores, whilst Figure 7.2 shows the value score of each open space. There is no clear pattern to the distribution of spaces according to value. All sub-areas have spaces which score relatively high and relatively low in terms of value. However, the figure does illustrate that larger spaces, especially the borough’s four largest parks (Southwark Park, Burgess Park, Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common and Dulwich Park) all score relatively well in terms of value.

It should be recognised that scores of less than 15% indicate a given open space may be deficient (in terms of quantity, quality or access). It is important such spaces do not under perform in relation to their potential value and multi-functionality. They should be improved to fulfil any potential.

Table 7.8 shows the distribution of value score. It should be recognised that a score of more than around 15% indicates that an open space is contributing significantly to one or more dimensions of value described above. Only rarely do individual open spaces fulfil all of the dimensions of value identified in the highest category, this is why only eight open spaces score more than 50%. The
The majority of sites scored between 10 and 40%. This is likely because many sites in the borough, including small parks, amenity green spaces, natural greenspaces and playing fields often have a limited number of functions. This does not mean that these spaces are not valued, as they will often have a high amenity value score, but it means that such spaces do not offer the ‘richness’ of other spaces such as public parks.

Table 7.8 – Composite value scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Open Spaces</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-9.9%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19.9%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29.9%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39.9%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-100%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Atkins

7.34 The lowest scoring sites in terms of value include, OS186 – Gypsy Hill Railway Cutting, CW2 – The Former Nursery and OS132 – Waterworks at Nunhead. All of these spaces are currently inaccessible to the public and have few other functions and therefore score poorly in terms of value.

7.35 As mentioned above, the highest scoring spaces are the borough’s four largest parks (Southwark Park, Burgess Park, Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common and Dulwich Park). All of these spaces offer a range of recreational, cultural, environmental, ecological and educational functions and so can be considered to be highly valued by the borough’s residents. This is also supported by the residents’ survey which identified that these four spaces are by far the most well visited spaces in Southwark. The fact that Burgess Park scores highly in terms of value also illustrates that a space can be relatively poor quality but still be highly valued by local residents.

7.36 The value scores should not be viewed as a continuum. A space which has a score of 50% does not necessarily contribute twice as much value to the community as a space which scores 25%. It is important to consider each of the different dimensions of ‘value’ individually when considering the value of open space sites to the community.

7.37 The value scores provide a snapshot of existing open space value. However this is not fixed and can be enhanced over time through improvements to the open space. Some aspects of value are more easily changed than others through enhancement and improvement.
Combining Quality and Value

7.38 Assessing the quality and value of open spaces is fundamental to identifying those spaces or facilities which should be given the highest level of protection by the planning system, those which require enhancement and those which may no longer be needed for their present purpose.

7.39 The Companion Guide to PPG17 recommends using this simple high/low classification to provide a means of determining the most appropriate policy approach to each open space. It also provides a basis for linking planning, design, management and maintenance.

7.40 Table 7.9 sets out a management approach for open spaces. The aim should be to move all spaces to the top right hand corner of the table if possible, through better management.

Table 7.9 – Quality/value matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Quality/Low Value</th>
<th>High Quality/High Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wherever possible, the preferred policy approach to a space or facility in this category should be to enhance its value in terms of its present primary purpose. If this is not possible, the next best policy approach is to consider whether it might be of high value if converted to some other primary purpose. Only if this is also impossible will it be acceptable to consider a change of use.</td>
<td>Ideally all space and facilities should come into this category and the planning system should then seek to protect them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Quality/Low Value</th>
<th>High Quality/High Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wherever possible, the approach to these spaces or facilities should be to enhance their value. If this is not possible, for whatever reasons, the space or facility may be “surplus to requirements” in terms of its present primary purpose.</td>
<td>The policy approach to these spaces or facilities should always be to enhance their quality and therefore the planning system should seek to protect them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.41 The relationship between the quality and value of open spaces within Southwark is illustrated by Figure 7.3 below, which plots the quality and value scores for each open space on a graph. Appendix F and Figure 7.4 also illustrate the results of this exercise on a site by site basis.

7.42 Many of the high quality low value spaces represent mono-functional open spaces which only contribute to the community in a limited way. Within areas of identified deficiency (in terms of quantity, quality or access) it is important that such spaces do not under perform in terms of their potential value and multi-functionality and are improved to fulfil their potential.

7.43 200 of the 207 assessed open spaces score more than 15% in the value assessment which indicates that the open space is contributing significantly to one or more of the dimensions of value.
7.44 By using average scores for value and quality, it is possible to establish how many of Southwark’s open spaces are assessed as above and below the average quality and value. Table 7.10 demonstrates that 34.6% of Southwark’s open spaces are assessed as being of ‘Above Average Quality & Value’, and 11.8% are of ‘Below Average Quality and Above Average Value’. In terms of below average value spaces, 19.9% were of a high quality, 33.6% of a low quality.

7.45 Table 7.10 demonstrates the relationship between quality and value across the borough. It shows that there is little correlation in the spatial distribution of above quality and value sites, or below average quality and value sites. However, it is evident that the larger spaces are more likely to be above average quality and value than the smaller spaces.

Table 7.10 – Relationship between Quality and Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Spaces</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions and Recommendations

7.46 The value placed on open space is multi-functional and relates to a range of roles. Each open space will have a different mix of values to each individual user.

7.47 The majority of the 71 open spaces which are below average quality and value have been categorised as amenity green space, natural and semi natural urban greenspace or allotments.
With the exception of a few large natural or semi natural green spaces most spaces are below the average size of open spaces in the borough.

7.48 All of the larger spaces in the borough including Metropolitan parks and District parks, are above average value, with the majority also being above average quality (with the exception of Burgess Park).

7.49 73 spaces within the borough (34.6%) were assessed as being of above average quality and of above average value to the community. Many of the high quality low value spaces represent mono-functional open spaces which only contribute to the community in a limited way, such as amenity spaces. Within areas of identified deficiency (in terms of quantity, quality or access) which do not have other provision nearby (in Southwark or a neighbouring borough) it is important that the potential value and multi-functionality of open spaces are maximised.

7.50 Appendix F lists the open spaces in the four categories of high and low quality and value.
Figure 7.2 – Relationship between Quality and Value
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8. Meeting Open Space Needs in Southwark

Introduction

8.1 This chapter establishes a strategy to meet the needs and standards identified within study by type of open space. The recommendations are set out here on a strategic level include:

- How needs for open space can be addressed.
- A summary of how existing open space needs and deficiencies can be alleviated in each sub area through bringing forward additional provision and reconfiguring existing provision to better meet the needs of the community.
- To suggest a response to strategic development opportunities and windfall sites.
- To suggest a planning policy approach towards the protection of sites.

8.2 Recommendations on specific improvements to individual sites, as well as recommendations on how to link groups of spaces are provided in the sub-area strategies in Chapter 9.

8.3 The chapter is divided into 4 main sections

- Vision and objectives;
- Borough wide proposals and recommendations;
- Recommendations relating to planning policy; and
- Options for future management.

Vision and Objectives

8.4 To guide the strategy a draft vision and objectives relating to open space provision has been established. It responds to the issues identified through the needs assessment, residents’ survey findings and issues identified through the review of open space provision.

Vision

8.5 The suggested vision for open space in Southwark is:

“To encourage a diverse network of sustainable open space of high quality which meets the needs of those living and working within the borough and encourages the development of more inclusive communities, safeguards natural resources and cultural heritage, improves access to natural greenspace, provides recreational and educational opportunities and helps to promote sustainable development”.

Objectives

- To enhance the open space network to meet the needs of an increasing and changing population.
- To ensure that the open space network is socially inclusive and meets the needs of those of every age, gender and ethnic group.
- To increase investment in open space and prioritise investment in the types of open space that meet identified local needs.
- To establish new open spaces and improve existing spaces to address identified open space deficiencies.
• To increase the variety of environments and range of open space provision and establish clear role/function for spaces.
• To establish a series of green links between spaces which strengthens the existing network of open spaces within the borough.
• To designate and protect greenspace.
• To manage open spaces in a way which includes all key stakeholders, and strengthens community ownership of open spaces.

Borough-wide Proposals and Recommendations

8.6 To enhance the strategic open space network to meet the needs of an increasing and changing population:

8.7 Strategic open space projects should be brought forward to address the needs of a borough with a population of 343,000. These projects should include:
• Provision of additional open space within major development opportunities at Elephant and Castle and Aylesbury Estate to address the issue of low levels of quantity of open space and to improve accessibility to open space.
• Maintain high quality open spaces at Dulwich Park, Southwark Park and Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common and deliver improvement to Burgess Park so that the borough has a network of accessible, high quality Metropolitan Parks.
• Enhance the quality and value of natural and semi natural greenspace provision within the urban environment.
• Ensure that open space is well utilised, has a range of functions and is of high quality, especially in areas where the potential for additional quantitative provision of open space is limited. There is particular potential for enhancing the quality and value of smaller spaces, especially in the Peckham sub-area.
• Ensure that open space is accessible and continues to support tourism and businesses in the borough whilst meeting the needs of local residents. This is especially important in the Bankside, Borough and London Bridge sub-area.

8.8 Ensure that the open space network is socially inclusive meeting the needs of those of every age, gender and ethnic group by:
• Ensure that Southwark provides a range of open space, sport and recreation opportunities that meet the differing needs of Southwark’s diverse community.
• Encourage greater use of open spaces by non users and infrequent users by improving the range of recreational opportunities within spaces close to employment areas.
• Make open spaces feel safer to use by all sections of the population, through improving usage and movement through spaces, making open space environments less intimidating, addressing anti-social behaviour through design and addressing policing. Graffiti found on park buildings and equipment should be removed promptly.
• Improve the accessibility of spaces. Metropolitan and District parks should be accessible by bus and have adequate car parking provision. Cycle parking should be provided at all Metropolitan, District and Local Parks and other spaces with sports provision. All open space facilities should be DDA compliant.
• Provide a greater range of facilities for teenagers and young people, including a greater range of recreation opportunities and designated areas for hanging out.
• Ensure that open space in the south of the borough, notably around Dulwich, can be used by other borough residents by opening up spaces to public use and improving routes to these spaces.
• Promote social inclusion, tackle deprivation and discrimination by ensuring that the River Thames and the Thames Path are accessible to everyone.

8.9 To increase investment in open space, and prioritise investment in the types of open space that meet identified local needs:
• Widen the range of functions supported within parks to provide a variety of recreational landscapes including spaces for relaxation and sitting out as well as the provision of formal facilities.
• Establish clear character for smaller open spaces through distinctive planting, landscaping and the range of facilities on offer.
• Increase the provision of food growing opportunities throughout the borough, especially in the north where provision is limited.
• Increase the provision of natural and semi natural greenspace, especially in the north of the borough, through the creation of new habitats.

8.10 To establish new open spaces & the improve existing spaces to address identified open space deficiencies:
• Although access to open space across the borough is generally good, Southwark is under provided for in certain types of open space provision where either the quantity of provision or access to provision is less than the standards identified. The sub area strategies in Chapter 9 recommend proposals to address these deficiencies.
• Deficiencies in park provision, natural and semi natural greenspace, allotment provision, children's play and outdoor pitch sports should be addressed through specific improvements to existing spaces within the areas affected where possible, or through establishing new open spaces where opportunities arise as a result of new housing development.

8.11 To increase the variety of environments and range of open space provision and establish clear role/function for spaces:
• Deficiencies in the quality and value of spaces were identified in Chapter 8 and Appendix F. Possible measures to enhance the quality and value of spaces to the community should be pursued on a site by site basis. This is considered further in Chapter 9.
General Recommendations

8.12 The residents’ survey and stakeholder consultation suggested the following priorities for improvement:

- Litter, dogs mess and the general cleanliness of the environment were major issues highlighted in relation to open space throughout the borough. To improve the maintenance and attractiveness of all spaces appropriate litter and dog bins should be provided where existing provision is inadequate. Spaces should be managed to minimise conflict between dog walking areas and spaces for formal and informal sport and children's play.
- Smaller spaces were seen as vital to the accessibility of open space in the borough. Although many smaller spaces are now of good quality, there are some which required attention.
- Where appropriate on-site amenities including benches and toilets should be provided in scale to the size and character of the space. Improvements to these facilities was identified as a priority by the residents’ survey.
- Within parks a wider range of recreational opportunities should be provided to better meet the needs of those aged under 25 who had the lowest levels of satisfaction.
- Development of community gardens were seen as an important resource for the community in providing a space for active learning that is accessible to all, unlike allotments which traditionally have restrictive access.
- In larger parks, particularly those strong in biodiversity there is still potential to improve existing interpretation facilities. Such facilities could be accompanied by outdoor classrooms for use by school and community groups.
- The issue of long-term sustainable management and maintenance of green links was considered as important by the stakeholder consultation group. Improvements to signage were seen as vital to improving links to spaces. Furthermore, open spaces need to be inviting and to have clear entrances that are welcoming to those not already familiar with the space.
- The quality of park provision within Bermondsey and Elephant and Castle should be prioritised for improvement as the quality and satisfaction of spaces was rated lowest in these sub-areas by the residents’ survey.

Enhancing Social, Educational, Health and Cultural Value of Spaces

8.13 The social, educational and cultural value of spaces should be enhanced through the following measures:

- Improving the intelligibility of the open spaces particularly their ecological and heritage value can be achieved through sensitive and appropriate interpretation facilities. These can take the form of portable media such as pamphlets or even tours or simple display boards.
- Provision of spaces for cultural events such as band stands, amphitheatres.
- Provision of spaces for meeting and congregation to promote social interaction such as picnic areas and youth shelters and seating areas and built facilities where appropriate.

8.14 Good quality open spaces can make a significant contribution towards healthy living. Green spaces have a positive effect on the health of the population helping to reduce stress, provide formal and informal opportunities for physical activity, sport and play and provide environments for relaxation. The Council can ensure that open spaces enhance the potential for healthy living by:
• Ensuring that all residents have access to open space within a reasonable distance (as set out in open space standards).
• Increasing the range and provision of recreation types available within open spaces.

Recommendations to Improve Connectivity Within and Between Different Elements of the Borough’s Greenspace Network

8.15 There is some potential to improve links between some of the borough’s open spaces, thereby allowing or encouraging people to walk between them. This was considered to be a key priority by the stakeholder consultation group. This could be carried out comparatively easily, by reducing the impact of traffic along certain routes (possibly under the umbrella of existing safe routes to school programmes), with traffic calming measures, and making safe places for people to cross roads. These measures, in addition to the planting of shrubs and/or trees along streets, would create a more pleasant environment for walking along, whilst also providing a more continuous network for wildlife.

8.16 The aim will be to provide a series of differing lengths of routes accessible to the public, as footpaths and/or cycle routes, linking important green spaces together, and picking out areas, features and buildings of historical or other importance, to provide points of interest between them. Where possible, the start and finish points of these routes should link closely to public transport, thereby allowing ease of access to them, to a wider range of the population. The opportunity to provide missing links could be taken in conjunction with any planning proposals in these areas.

London Plan

8.17 The 2011 London Plan recognises that open space, and wider green infrastructure, functions best when designed and managed as an interdependent ‘green grid’ where the network should be actively managed and promoted to support the myriad functions it performs. The Plan states that all development takes place within a wider environment and green infrastructure should be seen as an integral element and not as an ‘add-on’. Its value is evident across all of London and at all scales and the Mayor wishes to see the network maintained and enhanced and gaps between parts of the network closed.

South East London Green Chain Network

8.18 The South East London Green Chain Network has been expanded to include a number of spaces within the south of the borough, including Dulwich Park, Sydenham Hill and Dulwich Woods and Nunhead Cemetery. Southwark officers attend the Green Chain Working party to work with neighbouring boroughs on protecting and improving the Green Chain. There is potential for these links to be extended to other spaces in the borough.

All London Green Grid

8.19 The Mayor has produced Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on the ALGG which is out for consultation until 27th January 2012. The SPG aims to promote the concept of green infrastructure, and increase its delivery by boroughs, developers, and communities, by describing and advocating an approach to the design and management of green and open spaces to deliver hitherto unrealised benefits. These benefits include sustainable travel, flood management, healthy
living, and creating distinctive destinations; and the economic and social uplift these support. The current strategy includes all of the major open spaces in the borough, including Dulwich Park, Southwark Park, Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common and Burgess Park, although no details are available yet as to the proposed links between these spaces.

Southwark Living Streets

Southwark Living Streets and Southwark Cyclists have developed a proposal for a network of safe walking and cycling routes in Southwark. It is understood that this has been discussed in broad outline with Southwark officers and elements of it have been presented to some Community Councils. Although the proposal does not represent the Council’s current policy objectives, it does provide a useful starting point from which to identify potential links between spaces.

Establishing Links between Open Spaces

8.21 The following points should be considered when identifying links between open spaces.

• Where possible routes should be in green spaces an off-road. However, there are limited opportunities to create truly off-street green links within the borough;

• There are opportunities to utilise and enhance publicly accessible linear green routes such as Greendale and Surrey Canal Walk, Deal Porters Walk, Surrey Canal Walk to Peckham, Russia Dock Woodland to Durrand’s Wharf and Greenland Dock and the Thames Path;

• Where off-road routes are not possible, quieter, suburban, tree-lined streets should be identified as potential links between spaces. This may require the enhancement of the public realm and the introduction of pedestrian and cycle crossings at particular locations to address severance issues. DfT’s Manual for Streets provides guidance on how to provide pedestrian-orientated environments;

• Suburban street patterns can often be disorientating and many of the borough’s green spaces are hidden from view. The network will need to be clearly signed, potentially accompanied by maps produced by the Council;

• There is potential to include historical, ecological and cultural information as part of these walks for leisure purposes;

• The network would need to link in with other walking and cycling initiatives including the Green Chain Network and the borough’s cycle routes;

• There is potential to enhance the network of spaces that are on, or close to, the Thames Path, as well as routes from open spaces to the Thames;

• Greening streets by planting appropriate species of trees is one of a series of measures which can be employed to improve links between open spaces. Trees provide the aesthetic qualities required in softening the hard edges of the built environment and assisting in limiting or buffering harmful emissions of air and noise pollution;

• To maximise ecological and biodiversity benefits an appropriate tree density would be approximately 80 trees per linear km or 2 per 25m on each side of the street, whichever is the greater. This would provide a continuous coverage of tree crown cover for a typical London Plane tree;

• In the context of greenway links, trees have further benefits in that tree lines can provide a buffer between the footway and the carriageway and can help give guidance to routes. The
planting of trees will also help to ensure that walking and cycling will be a more pleasant activity, even next to a busy road, continuing the greenway aesthetic onto the trafficked highway; and

- Trees act as a filter to trap toxic particles including lead and absorb gases such as carbon monoxide and sulphur-dioxide. Noise pollution is an increasingly serious form of pollution and trees can help filter out sound and provide a barrier against the drone of a busy road. Trees also provide habitats for a wide range of wildlife. They can increase the biodiversity of an area, helping to bring the countryside to the doorstep.

8.22 Chapter 9 identifies potential links between open spaces within each of the borough’s sub-areas.

Recommendations Relating to Open Space Types

8.23 This section provides a series of borough-wide recommendations for each open space type. Standards for each type of open space are considered later in this Chapter, with measures to address deficiencies at particular sites discussed in Chapter 9.

Parks

8.24 Deficiencies in the quality and value of open spaces are identified in Chapter 9 and Appendix F. Possible measures to enhance the quality and value of spaces to the community should be pursued within the open space strategy on a site by site basis. The prioritisation of sites for improvement should be guided by their position in the quality-value quadrant identified in Chapter 7, their position within the borough’s green space network including whether sites can alleviate deficiencies or lie within an area of open space need, or whether they can accommodate change or improvement.

8.25 Improvements themselves may include the simple upgrading, improvement, replacement or enhancement of existing facilities or aspects of park quality. However, within some open spaces a more comprehensive approach may be required which may include re-focusing the role of all or part of the open space in order to better meet local needs. Open space improvements should be considered within the context of future management needs and requirements. Embedding revenue generating activities within open spaces and maximising the involvement of the community and voluntary sector provide opportunities to maximise the presence of the open space within the community and make sustainable long term management of the site achievable.

Enhancing the Recreational Role of Spaces

8.26 Where open spaces do not have a positive identity or an established role, the toolkit of possible themes identified below could be employed to re-focus the role of spaces or parts of spaces. The ideas below represent suggestions for the Council to foster community discussion of the range of possibilities and do not represent solutions in themselves without appreciation of the context and issues associated with individual spaces.

- Improved community focus (amphitheatres, outdoor dining, picnic and barbeque areas, shelters and temporary structures, spaces for festivals and events).
- Outdoor cultural venue including spaces for consumption (cinema in the park, art exhibitions, sculpture trails and public art, music and performance areas, outdoor reading room) and artistic production (spaces for inspiration/contemplation, views/vistas, landscapes etc).
• The extension of the provision of outdoor gyms (enhancement of health benefits, sports facilities, trim trails).
• Tranquil spaces for respite and relaxation (Varied landscapes and possibly indoor facilities including sauna, spa etc.).
• Wireless Park – (Provision of wireless internet access in order to provide “inspirational/outdoor workspace” particularly within Country and neighbourhood Parks and spaces close to town centres. Technology can also be used to deliver historical/environmental/nature conservation interpretation.
• “Green beach” - pleasure spaces surrounding water space (i.e. lake, paddling pool/lido, fountain/water feature). Should include spaces for relaxation, sport and recreation and appropriate vegetation.
• Spaces for education (adult learning, improved interpretation, spaces for teaching cycle proficiency).
• The “extreme” park to meet the needs of older children and teenagers not well provided for within existing spaces (skateboard ramps, artificial grass skiing/long boarding slope, mountain bike trails/multi-function cycling facility, designated paths for in-line skating, outdoor climbing wall, outdoor karting/motor sports).
• Blurring the boundaries between different open space types to maximise use and shared management responsibility (e.g. a jointly provided allotment garden, community garden and outdoor classroom).
• Enabling open spaces for evening and night-time use (lighting strategy, floodlighting, embedding evening attractions).
• Consideration of spaces/facilities in the air/below ground (viewing platforms, tree walk, earth sheltered structures for changing provision etc.).

8.27 In addition to these ideas within a wide range of spaces there will be a need to embed spaces for nature, for dogs and for play.

Children’s Play and Provision for Young People

8.28 This study has identified the type and quality of children’s play provision within open spaces subject to a site assessment. However, it is recognised that this does not give a complete picture of the borough’s provision of children’s play facilities.

8.29 The Southwark Play Strategy (2007) provides a comprehensive analysis of the supply of play facilities and identifies broad areas of need, as set out below:
• There is a need for more play provision in the south of the borough, as identified by the Dulwich Community Council. The Council’s 2010 open space evidence base work and this study have also identified a lower amount of provision in the south of the borough compared to other areas.
• There is a need for more play provision that is suitable for 11-16 year olds. This was also confirmed to still be a relevant issue by the stakeholder consultation.
• Some supervised open access provision offers only a part-time service.
- There is a need for more places for children and young people with special educational needs in holiday playschemes. (i.e. there is limited access for disabled young people and those with special educational needs beyond 16 years).
- There is a need for further closed access play opportunities for disabled children, particularly those with special educational needs, requiring a secure environment.
- There is a need for more family-friendly play spaces.
- Girls are under-represented in some open access provision, including adventure playgrounds.

8.30 The stakeholder consultation also identified that there is potential to involve children and young people in decision making and the design of new facilities. This will help to engender a sense of ownership in local play spaces.

8.31 The GLA’s supplementary planning guidance on providing for children’s and young people’s play and informal recreation sets out the following recommendations for the design of new facilities. In general, the guidance drives towards the provision of children’s play equipment which is less formal and has a greater focus on natural features:

- The layout and design should start with a clear brief stating the user groups the space is intended for, management and maintenance arrangements and the key characteristics of the space, including access points and safety issues. The brief should reflect the likely population profile and be shaped by an audit of nearby spaces and facilities.
- Boundaries, for instance around areas intended for younger children, should normally be created by landscaping and planting. Fencing may limit children’s freedom of movement, makes for less flexible use and reinforces the tendency to restrict unnecessarily children’s play to specific parts of public spaces. It should be used sparingly and only where needed taking into account the character of the surrounding area and typically where there are nearby busy streets, deep open water or other hazards. Fencing may also be useful in ball courts and pitches where there is limited open space.
- Spaces should include signage at the access points stating the name of the space—, the organisation responsible for it and contact details. Signs saying ‘children may play here’ or ‘you can play here’ may be useful to signal that a space is playable, and that children’s play is a legitimate use.
- Consideration should be given to the character of the area and the nature of existing provision and deficiencies. If new play provision is proposed in Areas of Deficiency for Access to Nature, the design should incorporate higher quality natural landscaped areas. Care should be taken when considering formal play spaces and equipment in a Site of Importance to Nature Conservation (SINC), to avoid damaging the valued habitats. In these areas, natural features could provide a valuable play experience.
- Inclusive access and design are crucial if spaces are to be enjoyed by disabled as well as non-disabled children and young people. Spaces should allow children and young people with a range of disabilities, including hearing and sight impairment, to play and interact with their non-disabled peers. Appropriate layout and landscaping are crucial; specialized equipment is unlikely to be necessary. It is not sufficient to focus solely on wheelchair access, as only a very small proportion of children with disabilities are wheelchair users.
• Some zoning or differentiation of spaces for different age groups is valuable where there is enough space, and can help to reduce conflicts between users of different ages. But boundaries should be blurred, not rigid, to allow mixed use of spaces and use by family and groups of different ages. Multiple entrances, exits and routes through spaces help to ensure one age group does not dominate.

• Landscaping and natural features are invaluable in creating spaces that are attractive and maintain interest. Well-designed hard landscaping such as walls and steps can serve many uses, including informal seating, stimuli for physical play and goals and surfaces for ball games. Sand should where possible be included in spaces that are used by younger children, as it offers great potential for creative and constructive play.

• Fixed equipment provides a focus for some forms of play activity and helps to signify the target users of a space, but should not dominate. As well as physical exercise, playspace should also provide rich, multisensory experiences. Designs should be site-specific, reflecting the character of the space – its history, geography and/or culture - and creating a sense of place.

Natural Greenspace
Enhancing the Nature Conservation Value of Open Spaces

8.32 Increasing natural greenspace provision and enhancing linkages between spaces will encourage a network of linked “habitat islands” of high ecological value linked together with green chains and wildlife corridors.

8.33 The ecological value of open spaces can be improved through a variety of well established landscaping and habitat creation methods. For example, land with core areas under intensive use such as sports pitches, may have peripheral areas by the boundaries or between pitches where changes in land management may be accommodated. Enhancement strategies include:

Changes to Habitat Management

• The urban environment in which many trees, shrubs and plants exist is alien even to native species. Tree planting should include a high proportion of, or complete stock of native species, depending on the site. It is important that species and provenances suitable for the site are selected in order to achieve sustainability, especially in relation to climate change and the urban heat island effect. The use of native plants should therefore include the option of provenances from geographic regions where species are better adapted to likely climate change effects. This is also a need to consider adding native woodland herb species.

• Management of existing trees by pollarding or coppicing as appropriate, the former being traditional for willows along river corridors.

• Allow development of dead-wood habitats, retaining standing dead timber where safe to do so, and especially fallen (or stacked) dead timber.

• Where space allows, resist straight edge planting and add graded and scalloped edges of smaller trees and shrub species, again with native species of local provenance preferred.

• Provide groupings of appropriate native shrubs, particularly where lack of space or other considerations constrains the planting of large trees.

• Allow development of tall-grass/tall herb communities along the edges of shrub formations, vary and maintain by appropriate mowing regimes adopting late-summer/early autumn cuts over a 2-3 year cycle.
Where appropriate, encourage a turf of medium height rich in native grass species and native wildflowers, managed by one or two annual cuts with removal of arisings. In certain areas, higher diversity grasslands may already be present, for most areas wildflower seeding would be necessary to enhance species-poor amenity grassland. It is appreciated that enhancement of species poor amenity grassland is difficult due to the possible high nutrient status and rich topsoil in these instances. Soil stripping may be a necessary alternative with subsequent application of appropriate wildflower seed mix in an effort to increase biodiversity.

Landscape Enhancement

- Street trees should link amenity spaces with parks and natural greenspaces. To maximise ecological and biodiversity benefits an appropriate tree density would be a minimum of 80 trees per linear km or 2 per 25m on each side of the street, whichever is the greater. This would provide a continuous coverage of tree crown cover for a typical London Plane tree.
- Vary landforms to induce variation in drainage and aspect, thereby encouraging natural diversity to develop.
- Replace fences with hedgerows where appropriate.
- Seek improvements to river corridors, encourage natural river banks with geomorphologic diversity, e.g. cut cliffs, shallow-water margins and ledges, depositional bars, and encourage areas of natural riparian vegetation to form a mosaic between wooded reaches, riparian scrub and open semi-natural grassland and marsh.
- Where continuity of river corridors cannot be achieved, seek to restore connectivity through green links beyond the immediate river channel.
- Use landscaping and habitat creation schemes to improve connectivity for wildlife across sites of low diversity e.g. amenity grassland.

8.34 The open space strategy, incorporating sound management at site level, should nevertheless remain flexible so as to be able to respond to environmental change, changes that may result in increasing rarity of certain habitats or species.

Allotments

8.35 The value of allotments includes their role as:
- open space;
- providing opportunities for informal recreation;
- a sustainable food source;
- a resource for health;
- a community resource;
- an educational tool;
- a resource for biodiversity; and
- a place for composting and the management of green waste.

8.36 At present not every allotment site within the borough performs all of the above roles. All allotment sites do however form an important component of urban greenspace as defined in PPG17.
Allotments also contribute towards the landscape character of the borough by providing visual amenity in the form of relief from the built up area or by allowing views beyond the immediate area. Many allotment sites have some form of nature conservation value although those in Southwark are intensively cultivated due to high demand.

Potential may exist to increase the nature conservation value of some sites through identifying areas to develop as wildlife habitat within underutilised areas. At other sites, smaller areas could be enhanced with particular attention given to those allotments located within areas deficient in natural and semi-natural greenspace provision.

In addition to the functions outlined above, significant scope exists to develop active social and educational roles through links with schools and other community organisations. These roles can be encouraged through specific initiatives which integrate allotments within other strategies and programmes and fostering allotments within the wider community.

Proposals for new housing development should be accompanied by proposals to improve food growing opportunities, especially in the north of the borough. The nature of such improvements should reflect the additional open space needs generated as a result of the proposed development but also take into consideration average garden sizes.

Developments should also include community gardens, window boxes and planted green roofs, to provide further opportunities for gardening.

There are likely to be few opportunities to create new open space within the borough, and any new open space created is likely to be better utilised as publicly accessible park space as a result of the increased pressure on limited open space from a growing population. As a result, new allotments or community gardens may have the potential to be created at existing open spaces. There may be a need to consider compensatory mechanisms if this would result in a loss of the existing open space type. These could include the upgrading of adjacent or nearby spaces to enhance their value to users with other interests, along with careful design to ensure that popular routeways are preserved.

The LGA guide to allotment provision entitled ‘Growing in the Community’ advocates co-location of new allotments with other recreational facilities, to enable informal public surveillance and flexibility in case the demand for allotments should change in the future.

The guide also goes on to recommend that the concept of co-location might be expanded to include complementary activities within the boundaries of the allotment site, to increase the number and diversity of direct beneficiaries. These could include communally managed gardens and dedicated facilities for schools and people with disabilities. ‘Friends’ groups could be established for people who would like to be involved in helping out on the site without the commitments that plot holding entails. Activities of this kind can also go some way to addressing concerns about visual intrusion, particularly when combined with formal landscaping and strict rules on construction standards for sheds and the management of wastes. They could also (as with many continental
sites) produce amenities that people choose to view for pleasure, with the added benefit of opportunities to exchange pleasantries and receive surplus produce.

Temporary Allotment Sites
8.45 There may also be potential for temporary allotment sites within Southwark. These are typically located on land that was not acquired for the purpose of providing allotments, but which is destined for an alternative use. There are no additional legal impediments to local authorities setting up temporary allotments on suitable sites under their control in order to help meet current levels of demand. However, the LGA guide recommends that a key lesson for local authorities considering providing temporary sites, be it on their own ground or on land on short-term lease, is to make both the end use and the likely life expectancy of the site clear from the outset.

Alternative Gardening Projects
8.46 Because Southwark has very high levels of demand for allotments but limited opportunities for new provision, the borough is likely to find it very difficult to meet demand. However, there are opportunities to increase access to food growing through alternative gardening projects.

8.47 Their existence outside of statutory provision puts these projects in a much better position to raise grant funding. This increases the aggregate capital resources available to support community-based gardening activity well beyond what the authority itself can provide, without laying claims on the allotments budget.

8.48 The Council can support alternative gardening projects by offering temporary access to local authority owned land that is not suited for the creation of allotments. This may be due to the restricted scale of the site, or difficulties that would arise from attempts to exclude broader public access. Authorities can encourage other statutory bodies to follow suit.

8.49 Development sites which are currently left dormant also opens up the possibility of exploiting privately held stocks of undeveloped land for temporary gardening use. This could be in bare earth where the land is uncontaminated or in containers such as raised beds and builders bags when soil is inaccessible or suspect. Projects such as the Federation of City Farms and Community Gardens’ proposed Community Land Bank are designed to facilitate the temporary release of land for community food growing purposes.

Community Gardens
8.50 With such a long allotments waiting list, the Council should actively promote alternative means of food growing, such as community gardening. There are already a number of initiatives in Southwark that offer people opportunities to derive the benefits associated with food growing and gardening in general.

8.51 Community gardens aim to address health inequalities through ensuring that everybody is both welcome and can become involved. The promotion of mental and physical health, and building inclusive communities, are core aspects of the approach.

8.52 Environmental sustainability is also central, through the production of locally grown food and the use of techniques such as composting. There are a number of community gardens within
Southwark. Projects such as Tabard Gardens Community Allotments aim to allow local people to grow their own fruit and vegetables, learn about gardening, healthy eating and teamwork with a view to increasing the health of the local community.

8.53 The Council may consider the following when encouraging the use of community gardens:

- The development of guidelines for community groups looking to use Council owned land for community gardens and other food growing initiatives.
- The provision of advice and support to groups looking to develop community gardens and other food growing initiatives.
- Creation of a comprehensive list of community gardens and food growing initiatives in Southwark, and set up information-sharing network.
- Promotion of community gardens and other food growing initiatives to those on the allotment waiting list.

Plot Sharing

8.54 Plot sharing and plot division on existing sites are options which can go some way towards reducing waiting times for allotments. Plot sharing is also advantageous for new and inexperienced gardeners, who can benefit from working alongside an experienced allotment gardener. Half plots may also be of benefit to new gardeners and those struggling to manage their whole plot. Half plots could be offered as people reach the top of the allotment waiting list. Further splitting of plots, for example, quarter plots, will not be considered due to issues relating to crop rotation and crop disease management.

Amenity Space

8.55 Amenity space provides a less formal green space experience than the borough's parks and gardens. Amenity open space sites have the potential to provide important spaces for informal recreation, including informal play and dog walking, close to where people live or work, and where access to a park may not be available.

8.56 It was not within the scope of this study to assess the quality and function of small amenity space not already designated for protection within the Core Strategy. The 2010 open space evidence base work provides details of the total quantity of amenity space within the borough. However, this study recognises the importance of amenity space to the network of open space in the borough. The stakeholder consultation also highlighted the importance of good quality, easily accessible amenity space to local residents.

8.57 The Council’s Residential Design Standards SPD also recognises the importance of outdoor amenity space and sets out a policy which requires:

- 50sq.m communal amenity space per development.
- For units containing three or more bedrooms, 10sq.m of private amenity space.
- For units containing two or less bedrooms, 10sq.m of amenity space should ideally be provided.

8.58 Many amenity open space sites in the borough are relatively simplistic and are generally of poorer quality than other types of open space. In many cases, housing amenity space has a very limited
recreational or visual amenity role. The design and function of these spaces needs to be reviewed together with the provision of other types of provision, particularly play and youth facilities, on housing estates to ensure they add value to local residents.

8.59 Many of the borough’s development sites are of a size which will be unable to provide new park spaces as an integral part of the development. Instead, many development opportunities offer the potential for amenity space. It will therefore be critical that any new open space created as a result of new development is of high quality, is distinctive and offers an appropriate range of recreational functions.

8.60 Some amenity spaces in the north of the borough already perform a range of functions, including small spaces for community gardening, biodiversity and informal recreation.

8.61 The Parks department should work with Housing department, as well as the borough’s registered providers to identify opportunities to create amenity space on housing estates that currently have no provision, and to increase provision on estates with very little provision.

Recommendations Relating to Planning Policy

Approach to the Protection of Spaces

8.62 Consistent with PPG17 all spaces which are of value to the community should be protected. The borough’s current approach to protecting open space is set out in Chapter 2. This study does not recommend any changes to the current policy approach. However, some additional sites should be protected to maintain supply and meet open space needs.

8.63 It is recommended that all spaces assessed as part of this study (with the exception of those now developed) should be retained for open space use. This recommendation is based upon the following analysis:

- Open space needs across the borough are generally high with a relatively high population of dwellings without private gardens and high population densities in some areas.
- The level of public park provision per population is lower than other London boroughs, largely as a result of high population densities.
- The development proposals put forward in the Core Strategy are expected to generate an increase in population of 19% between 2011 and 2026. This will increase demand for open space in the borough. Current levels of open space should be protected to meet this forecast increase in demand.
- The quality and value of most open space was identified to be relatively high. This was confirmed by the residents’ survey identified a high level of satisfaction with the current level of provision, both in terms of quality and access.
- Those spaces which are of relatively low quality and value have the potential to be improved to meet the growing demand for open space, as well as potentially addressing open space deficiencies, such as access to allotments and community gardens or natural greenspace in the north of the borough.

8.64 Sites recommended for designation are set out in Table 8.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space ID</th>
<th>Space Name</th>
<th>Sub-Area</th>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Recommended Designation</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Central Venture Park</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Provision for young people and teenagers</td>
<td>Designate as BOL</td>
<td>Space performs an important role for children’s recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>Calypso Gardens</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>Designate as OOS</td>
<td>Space performs an important role for local residents’ recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>Caspian Street Allotments</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>Designate as OOS</td>
<td>Need to maintain current supply of allotments given high levels of demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>Dunstans Road Allotments</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>Designate as OOS</td>
<td>Need to maintain current supply of allotments given high levels of demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Aylesbury Road Allotments</td>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>Designate as OOS</td>
<td>Need to maintain current supply of allotments given high levels of demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Fielding Street Allotments</td>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>Designate as OOS</td>
<td>Need to maintain current supply of allotments given high levels of demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Alscot Road Allotments</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>Designate as OOS</td>
<td>Need to maintain current supply of allotments given high levels of demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW1</td>
<td>Lorrimore Square Gardens</td>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>Designate as BOL</td>
<td>Space performs an important role for local residents’ recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB1</td>
<td>Montague Close Open Space</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>Designate as OOS</td>
<td>Space performs an important riverside space of high amenity value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB2</td>
<td>Crossbones Graveyard</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Designate as OOS</td>
<td>Space has potential as park to meet projected quantity deficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB3</td>
<td>Tate Garden</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>Designated as OOS</td>
<td>Space performs an important role for local residents’ recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW1</td>
<td>St Pauls Sports Ground</td>
<td>Canada Water &amp; Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - education</td>
<td>Allocated in the Canada Water AAP for open space</td>
<td>Potential to be brought back into use for a range of open space uses. Could help to alleviate access deficiency to allotments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW2</td>
<td>The Former Nursery</td>
<td>Canada Water &amp; Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>Allocated in the Canada Water AAP for open space</td>
<td>Potential to be brought back into use for a range of open space uses. Could help to alleviate access deficiency to allotments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW3</td>
<td>Cumberland Wharf</td>
<td>Canada Water &amp; Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>Designate as OOS</td>
<td>Space is of high quality and has high amenity value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW4</td>
<td>Surrey Docks Adventure Playground</td>
<td>Canada Water &amp; Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Provision for young people and teenagers</td>
<td>Designate as OOS</td>
<td>Space is large enough to warrant protection and plays an important role in providing children’s play facilities in this location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space ID</td>
<td>Space Name</td>
<td>Sub-Area</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Recommended Designation</td>
<td>Justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW5</td>
<td>Neptune Street Park</td>
<td>Canada Water &amp; Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>Designate as OOS</td>
<td>Space is of relatively low quality and low value but does provide opportunities for sitting out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1</td>
<td>Carter Place</td>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Designate as OOS</td>
<td>Space performs an important role for local residents’ recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2</td>
<td>Diversity Garden</td>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>Designate as OOS</td>
<td>Space performs an important role for local residents’ recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN1</td>
<td>Jowett Street Park</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>Designate as BOL</td>
<td>Space performs an important role for local residents’ recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN2</td>
<td>Lyndhurst Square</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Amenity Greenspace</td>
<td>Designate as OOS</td>
<td>Space performs an important role for local residents’ recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN3</td>
<td>Montague Square</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>Designate as OOS</td>
<td>Space performs an important role for local residents’ recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN4</td>
<td>Brayards Green</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Amenity space</td>
<td>Designate as OOS</td>
<td>Space performs an important role for local residents’ recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN5</td>
<td>Buchan Hall Sports Pitch</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - private</td>
<td>Designate as OOS</td>
<td>Space performs an important role for local residents’ recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN6</td>
<td>Kirkwood Road Nature Garden</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>Designate as OOS</td>
<td>Space performs an important role for local residents’ recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>The Spinney</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>Designate as BOL</td>
<td>Space is of high quality and has high amenity value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Approach to Standards**

**Current Approach to Derivation of Standards**

8.65 Southwark’s Core Strategy (2011) and Adopted UDP (2007) do not include any open standards at present. Although there is some limited analysis of District Park and Local Park deficiency areas, there is no quantity standard for the amount of parks per 1,000 population.

8.66 Without quantity standards there is no benchmark against which existing levels provision of public parks can be measured, and it is not possible to establish the level of provision that should be provided in new developments that are in areas of deficiency.

8.67 The Council’s S106 planning obligations SPD, identifies that provision of open space will be sought based on the borough average provision (2.0ha / 1,000 open space), although this is not broken down further into open space type.

8.68 While policies for Metropolitan Open Land, Borough Open Land and Other Open Space are in place there are currently no quantity, quality or accessibility standards within the UDP or Core Strategy.

8.69 It is necessary to set locally based standards of provision for the following categories of open space where it is important that local needs are provided for locally on a consistent basis:

- public park and gardens provision;
- provision for children and teenagers;
- outdoor playing fields in secure community use;
- natural or semi natural greenspace; and
- allotment provision.

8.70 It is not appropriate to set borough-wide standards of provision for the remaining types of open space provision as these will be provided on a site by site basis as opportunities arise. However, amenity greenspace and civic spaces should be integrated within new areas of residential, mixed use and commercial development within Southwark. The exact level and type of provision should be responsive to the nature of the development and the existing level and type of provision available in the area, and should follow the guidelines set out in the borough’s Residential Design Standards SPD. In certain areas of the borough amenity greenspace and other forms of open space form an integral part of the urban fabric and contribute towards local character and distinctiveness. For this reason it is inappropriate to define either a consistent quantity or access standards relating to such provision.

8.71 PPG17 and the associated companion guide suggest there is a need for a local approach to setting open space standards, including a quantitative, qualitative and access component. This study has considered these components to recommend appropriate standards for types of open space identified above.
Approach to Derivation of Standards

**Parks**

**Quantity Standard**

8.72 Chapter 5 identified that there is a total of 0.85ha of park provision per 1,000 population. This is expected to fall to 0.72ha of park provision per 1,000 population in 2026, taking into account the projected increase in population of 54,000 people between 2011 and 2026. The residents’ survey revealed that Southwark has a relatively high level of satisfaction with the current levels of provision and quality of open space. When combined with the results of the benchmarking exercise of open space provision in other London authorities, it is considered that a standard of 0.72ha per 1,000 population is realistic. The sub-areas which fall below the 0.72ha per 1,000 population, and should be prioritised for additional park provision, are:

- Bankside, Borough and London Bridge;
- Bermondsey and Old Kent Road;
- Camberwell; and
- Elephant and Castle

**Accessibility Standard**

8.73 Access to park provision has been assessed using the residents’ survey results undertaken as part of this study. Respondents were asked how long they travelled to reach each of the types of open space they use. For larger spaces travel patterns to individual spaces were also recorded. Information was recorded on the preferred mode of transport for each type of space. By taking account of the findings of the residents’ survey it has been possible to develop access standards that reflect the current use and access patterns that occur in the borough.

8.74 Consistent with the recommendation of the Companion Guide to PPG17 the effective catchment area for users of each type of space represents the travel time/distance from which at least 70-80% of users are drawn.

8.75 Catchment areas were derived by converting travel times in to distances for the preferred travel mode for each type of provision. It is a walking-based standard, where a five minute walking time equates to a 400m distance on the ground. To represent distances on the ground as a straight line distance, a 70% multiplier has been applied to the distances so that an 400m journey is represented by a 280m catchment area (consistent with the findings of a number of planning policy studies).

8.76 These parameters recognise that people cannot always make straight line trips between their home and their nearest open space due to severance factors such as railway lines, busy roads, the location of entrances and the morphology and grain of the pedestrian route network. The adjusted catchment distance is also considered to better represent the walking distances for less mobile people, such as parents with young children, the elderly and disabled.
The open space access standards are evidence based, reflecting local patterns of usage. These are also broadly consistent with the GLA parks hierarchy (see Table 4.1). The following access standards are therefore recommended for adoption.

- All residents within the borough should have access to a Metropolitan park within 3.2km from home.
- All residents within the borough should have access to a District park within 1.2km from home.
- All residents within the borough should have access to a Local park, Small Local park or Pocket park within 400m from home.
- All residents within the borough should have access to an area of public park within 400m from home. The definition of a public park is as identified within the parks hierarchy defined within Chapter 4.

Quality Standard

Public parks within the borough should be of good quality and provide the range of facilities associated with their respective tier of the parks hierarchy. The Green Flag assessment identifies spaces with a ranking of 6 and above to be considered as good quality. Those public parks which either under perform in terms of their value to the local community or their condition should be improved consistent with the guidelines identified.

Children’s Play

Quantitative Component

We recommend that the adopted Mayor of London (GLA) playable space typology is used in order to derive standards for children’s play.

We recommend the GLA standard of 10 m² per child for new development should be adopted. However a certain level of formal provision should be included in this 10 m² standard.

Proposals for new housing development should be accompanied by proposals to improve children’s play provision. The nature of such improvements should reflect the additional play provision needs generated as a result of the proposed development. The exact form of play provision should be identified following consultation with the local community to identify local priorities.

If the proposed development is located within an identified area of deficiency for children’s play provision it will be necessary for additional land to be brought into use for the purposes of children’s play. Developer contributions towards the provision for children and teenagers would assist in meeting deficiencies in children’s play provision. It may be appropriate for such provision to be incorporated within the curtilage of the proposed development. Alternatively, a contribution to off-site provision may be appropriate.

If the proposed development is not located in an area which is deficient in access to formal children’s play provision then consideration should be given to any deficiency in quality or value of existing provision which may include improving the range facilities for particular age groups not well served at present and improving the condition of facilities provided.
Qualitative Component

8.84 Children’s play provision within the borough should be of adequate quality and provide a range of facilities associated with the size of the facility. The playable space typology should be used to assess levels of adequacy in terms of the range and quality of provision. The children’s play section earlier in this chapter provides further guidelines on the quality and design of new children’s play facilities.

Accessibility Component

8.85 All residents within the borough should have access to areas of formal and informal play provision for children and teenagers within 400m from home. Accessibility standards for different types of children’s play provision should follow the GLA guidance as follows:

- small areas of play for younger children (maximum 100m walk);
- local facilities (maximum 400m walk); and
- larger equipped areas of play for older children (maximum 800m walk).

Natural Greenspace

Quantitative Component

8.86 Chapter 5 identified that there is a total of 1.79ha of natural greenspace provision per 1,000 population. This is expected to fall to 1.51ha of park provision per 1,000 population in 2026, taking into account the projected increase in population of 54,000 people between 2011 and 2026. The residents’ survey revealed that Southwark has a relatively high level of satisfaction with the current levels of provision natural greenspace and, as such, it is considered that a standard of 1.51ha per 1,000 population is realistic. The sub-areas which fall below the 1.51ha per 1,000 population, and should be prioritised for additional natural greenspace provision, are:

- Bankside, Borough and London Bridge;
- Bermondsey and Old Kent Road;
- Camberwell; and
- Elephant and Castle

8.87 Proposals for new housing development should be accompanied by proposals to improve the provision of natural greenspace where appropriate. As much of the borough is within the recommended accessibility catchments, then consideration should be given to any deficiency in quality or value of existing natural or semi-natural greenspace areas. It is recommended that the developer will be required to make a contribution towards the enhancement of the quality of existing provision. Funding opportunities also exist to enhance and improve natural and semi-natural greenspace provision in Southwark, including the creation and enhancement of habitats for priority species.

Accessibility Component

8.88 The Mayor’s Biodiversity Strategy recommends that an ‘area of deficiency’ of natural greenspace is one that is further than 500m distance from either a Site of Borough Importance (Grade I or II) or a site of Metropolitan Importance. The Council should include the 500m catchment standard within it’s area-specific planning strategies.
Qualitative Component

8.89 Areas of natural and semi-natural greenspace should be of adequate quality and support local biodiversity. Areas of natural and semi-natural greenspace which either underperform in terms of their value to the local community or their biodiversity should be enhanced consistent with the guidelines identified in this chapter.

8.90 The quality of all open spaces have been assessed according to the Green Flag criteria, however it is not appropriate to assess natural greenspaces against the full range of Green Flag criteria used to assess parks. For natural greenspace the following criteria should be considered: whether the site is welcoming; signage; personal security; dog fouling; appropriate provision of facilities; litter and waste management and grounds maintenance.

Allotments and Community Gardens

Quantity Standard

8.91 It is not considered appropriate to set an allotment standard in the borough. This is because the last survey of allotment demand in 2009 identified very high levels of demand, although there are few opportunities to create new allotments. As a result, the creation of new private allotment space is not considered to be the most effective way to meet the demand for food growing. Instead the borough should concentrate on developing the provision of community gardens, which are already successful in Bankside and some other parts of the borough. The potential to create new community garden provision is likely to be opportunity-led. As a result, no standard per population is recommended.

8.92 Proposals for new housing development should be accompanied by proposals to improve allotment provision or other food growing opportunities, especially in the north of the borough. The nature of such improvements should reflect the additional open space needs generated as a result of the proposed development but also take into consideration average garden sizes.

8.93 Developments should also include community gardens, window boxes, planted green roofs, to provide further opportunities for gardening.

Accessibility Component

8.94 The residents’ survey identified that 71% of journeys to allotments took up to 15 minutes, with the vast majority of these by foot. 15 minutes equates to a 1.2km accessibility standard, which is recommended for adoption.

Qualitative Component

8.95 Allotment sites should be of adequate quality and support the needs of the local community. Allotment sites which underperform in terms of their value to the local community should be improved.

8.96 Other aspects of quality and management related to allotments and community gardens are considered earlier in this chapter.
Playing Pitches and Outdoor Sports Facilities

8.97 The Council’s 2010 Playing Pitch Study identifies standards for playing pitches and outdoor sports facilities.

Recommendations for Applying the Standards

8.98 In order to implement the open space and recreational standards identified within this study, a number of guidelines are outlined below. These guidelines relate to the application of quality, accessibility and quantity standards as well as more general principles.

- Defining the primary typology of each open space is important as many spaces perform more than one function. Classification will enable a clearer understanding of the requirements needed for each open space and standards to apply.

Quality:
- Developments proposed in areas deficient in quality open space will require contributions towards enhancement and improvement initiatives.
- Quality standards are incremental and do not involve land take.

Accessibility:
- Radial distances are calculated from the perimeter of the park and transcend potential physical barriers such as railway lines and main roads.
- Areas where accessibility standards to one type of open space are not met could be addressed through diversifying and reclassifying existing sites.

Quantity:
- Developments proposed in areas deficient in open spaces will require contributions towards additional provision. These new open space proposals can be either on-site or off-site.
- Consideration needs to be given to how the standards might be applied in combination as spaces are often multi-functional.
- Standards are based on best available population projections – in this case the GLA Population Projections (2010).

Proposals for Future Management

Improved Greenspace Management

8.99 This section considers ways in which spaces currently maintained by the Council can be managed more effectively. It is important to note that many open spaces in the borough are in private or other ownership, which the Council has no power to influence the management arrangements of.

8.100 Nationally, user groups often state that re-establishing a visual presence in a park is the main action that would make an appreciable difference to their perception and use of a site. The residents survey and stakeholder consultation event also identified a desire within Southwark to improve on site safety and security.
8.101 It is recommended that the Council considers changing the emphasis of frontline greenspace management from roving maintenance gangs and their replacement with teams responsible for a smaller area and potentially ‘static’ frontline staff and gardeners who take on a more direct role as “rangers” incorporating gardening (park keeper), security and ranger responsibilities. The benefits of such an approach are:

- Improvement in maintenance standards as a result of ownership and familiarity with a site.
- Increase in safety and security.
- A first point of contact for communication of problems or reporting of damage.

8.102 Several authorities have now re-instated a role for static, site based gardeners at larger parks and open spaces. In some authorities, a working arrangement with existing grounds maintenance contractors has resulted in a visible and approachable park presence during the undertaking of grounds maintenance, providing added value to maintenance contracts. Other authorities have re-thought the role of ‘park keeper’ and have attempted to break down the demarcated roles of security, maintenance and communication to promote ownership and initiative. With this approach, barriers between the three different roles are broken down so that gardeners are given a remit of interacting with the public and being a point of contact for help and security staff are given horticultural training.

Community Involvement

8.103 At the national level the process of reaching out to and engaging with local communities and relevant user groups is widely accepted as being one of the cornerstones of effective and sustainable management of urban green space. This process is happening to some degree in Southwark already and it will be important to strengthen and widen existing work on community engagement.

8.104 There are two different objectives for community engagement: one involves communication, information exchange and consultation; and the other takes the process forward into active collaboration in decision making.

8.105 Information gathering and to improve delivery - The most widespread purpose for increasing community involvement in urban green space is related to the gathering of information that will serve to improve strategic development and service delivery. This may be achieved by both indicating successful and failing aspects of current services and by directing services more closely to the needs of current and potential site users.

8.106 Collaborative approaches to site based decision making - It is at the active collaboration in site-based decision making that the involvement of communities can bring greater rewards. This stems from the feeling of ownership and empowerment in a genuine collaboration with an authority over the improvement of an open space.

8.107 The following list contains a range of mechanisms by which participation can be achieved:

- Friends and User Groups. This is the most direct mechanism by which local authorities can form direct partnerships with site users and is also the most widespread approach. It is most appropriately used in relation to the larger parks and open spaces in the borough. There are
already several friends groups in Southwark, and where appropriate, new groups should be encouraged.

- Volunteers. Volunteering in practical tasks (usually maintenance-related) can take many forms. The stakeholder consultation identified that many local residents would be very happy to contribute to the maintenance of their local space. This could be developed further to include site maintenance, tidy-ups, corporate team building, where staff ‘put something back into the community’, and the involvement of schools in urban green spaces. Within Southwark this approach would best be deployed in relation to smaller parks and areas of amenity greenspace.

- Self management. The development of self management activity on a site can be the ultimate expression of community involvement. This is already happening in the north of the borough with spaces managed by Bankside Open Spaces Trust. Full self management requires a good degree of financial control and delegation of budgets as well as the running of activities and facilities. Within Southwark the most appropriate types of self management for the Council to consider would include:
  - management of incidental green space, such as small patches of mown grass in housing areas;
  - management of particular facilities or events, such as park buildings or sports related activities; and
  - self management of particular sites, such as allotments or community gardens.

8.108 The involvement of local communities can have mixed success. The potential involvement and the role of local communities in urban parks and green spaces is particularly related to:

- The culture of the local authority and parks service. A parks service that moves away from being contract managers to a philosophy of community engagement is likely to engage the public more successfully.
- The resources available.
- The type of site. Voluntary maintenance is often related to the nature of a particular site with those sites with a wildlife focus tending to attract the most volunteers.
- Sense of ownership. Greater ownership of a site, whether through delegation of responsibility to local groups, self management of facilities through lease arrangements or full ownership through trust status encourages greater local commitment and input.
- The quality of maintenance and service delivery. The existing state of a site in terms of its maintenance quality and the extent to which its facilities meet local needs is one of the main drivers behind community involvement.

Other Management Issues Identified from Stakeholder Consultation:

8.109 Other issues related to the management of open space identified from the stakeholder consultation process, not already covered above, include:

- It was felt that the management of spaces can often be quite fragmented. There was a request for a single point of contact for issues related to parks.
- It was felt that spaces managed by the Council’s housing department are not of as high quality as other open spaces. There is potential for greater co-ordination between the parks and housing departments to share knowledge and resources.
- There is greater potential for cross-borough collaboration in the management of spaces. It is
important that Southwark work closely with the neighbouring boroughs as these peripheral spaces can provide parks and open spaces that can be utilised by Southwark’s residents.

• Currently the larger parks are well-represented by community groups. It is considered that some of these groups could be involved in helping to support and manage some of the smaller parks e.g. by assisting in setting up smaller groups to represent these smaller spaces. In addition smaller spaces that are located in close proximity to large parks could be directly linked or associated with these open spaces.

• Generally, existing lines of communication with parks groups was felt to be relatively good.

• There was a group consensus that a quarterly focus group to discuss strategic open space matters would be very useful. The focus group could then invite guest speakers from a range of active groups in the borough, such as transport planners to consider cycle routes through spaces. Members emphasised the importance of Council involvement to communicate objectives.

• The group agreed regular forum updates would also prove useful.
9. Sub-Area Strategies

Introduction

9.1 The open space needs of different areas within the borough vary. Eight sub areas have been identified based upon groups of wards which broadly correlate to the physical pattern of development and open space needs within different areas (refer to Figure 2.1 for definition of sub-area boundaries).

9.2 A strategy has been derived to meet the specific open space needs, deficiencies and opportunities within each area.

9.3 The strategy for each area is structured as follows:
- Area profile. This describes the pattern of development including the age of built development and pattern of open space provision. Any specific open space needs resulting from the demographic profile, density of development and social needs are also identified.
- Development Proposals. Development proposals present potential opportunities to create new areas of open space, but also have the potential to create additional demand. Understanding the character and scale of these new opportunities is critical to the development of a sub-area open space strategy.
- Proposals to address identified quantity and access deficiencies. For park provision, natural and semi-natural greenspace and allotments/community gardens the study has identified those areas of the borough which are deficient in provision. In addition it also has identified areas which do not have adequate access to different open space opportunities as they are located beyond the catchment area of existing spaces.
- Measures to enhance the quality and value of provision. This section includes enhancing what is good and addressing the lack of variety in terms of recreational environments and range of facilities.
- Potential linkages to the wider Green Grid/Green network. Including connections between spaces, improvements to transport corridors and proposals for greening where it is not possible to increase the area of open space to meet a deficiency.

9.4 The sub-area strategies should be read in conjunction with the sub-area open space plans at the end of this Chapter.

Bankside, Borough and London Bridge

Area Profile

9.5 Bankside, Borough and London Bridge is a very diverse area which has been subject to considerable change in recent years. The sub-area has been designated an opportunity area in the London Plan and the draft Bankside, Borough and London Bridge SPD which relates to the area recognises that there are tremendous opportunities to create a world city quarter containing successful business districts, sustainable residential neighbourhoods and world class services.

9.6 The continuous, traffic-free walking route along the south bank of the Thames has helped create a chain of high quality visitor and cultural attractions in the north of the sub-area, whilst other parts of the area consist of social housing estates (especially towards the southern sections of the sub-
area), commercial offices, mixed use units and a wide range of private sector housing built during the past 300 years, with some units even older.

9.7 The Bankside Urban Forest Framework has identified that the area situated between Blackfriars Road and Borough High Street has remained largely free from a clear identified structure: ‘The marginal use of the urban interior and its separation from the river edge was cemented by the construction of the viaducts and Southwark Street. This physical disconnection was reinforced by the change of use along the river edge through the 1980’s and 90’s. Large scale commercial, institutional and leisure uses rapidly replaced the grain of the wharfs. This pattern of development has continued with increasing intensity and is evident in the latest planning applications for large scale, high-rise office, residential and cultural buildings’.

9.8 The sub-area has a relatively limited amount of open space provision, consisting largely of small squares and churchyards, which is typically of a dense urban environment within central London, although there is provision for court sports and children’s play at a number of small open spaces towards the south of the sub-area.

9.9 The sub-area has a total of 0.25ha of park provision per 1,000 population, which is well below the standard of 0.72ha per 1,000 population. This is expected to fall to just 0.20ha per 1,000 population in 2026 as a result of population growth. The area is also deficient in the amount of natural greenspace available, with just 1.22ha per 1,000 population (which will fall to 0.97ha per 1,000 population in 2026) compared to a standard of 1.51ha per 1,000 population.

9.10 Many of the sub-area’s open spaces include garden beds that are managed by the Bankside Open Spaces Trust (BOST). Open space in the sub-area appears to be well used, with a number of community events focused on open spaces. Perhaps as a result of the limited amount of open space and the involvement of BOST, the quality of many spaces is generally quite high, although there is still some scope for improvement.

9.11 The sub-area has the highest proportion of the population aged 15-29 in the borough, and also the lowest proportion of those aged under 15 and over 60. The demographic structure of the sub-area indicates that demand for open space is high, despite the limited range of provision. The area also accommodates a very high proportion of residential units which do not have access to private open space and also has a relatively high population density, despite much of its floorspace being used for non-residential uses. The sub-areas daytime population is very high as a result of the degree of employment generating uses, which puts further pressure on the limited open space provision.

9.12 Despite relatively low levels of provision, satisfaction of open space, the contribution to quality of life and opinions on quality were all relatively high.
Development Proposals

9.13 The Bankside, Borough and London Bridge Draft SPD identifies the following development proposals to 2026:

- Over 1,900 new homes. GLA population estimates project an increase of approximately 6,000 residents.
- 400,000sqm – 500,000sqm of additional business floor space, much of which will help meet central London’s need for high quality office space. This is expected to generate around 25,000 new jobs by 2026 across a range of industries.
- The two key locations for major development are located in the northern area of Blackfriars Road and the London Bridge Opportunity Area.

Proposals to Address Deficiencies

9.14 The key open space deficiencies in Bankside, Borough and London Bridge are:

- Most parts of the sub-area are outside of the recommended catchment areas to District and Metropolitan parks.
- Some parts of the north west of sub-area are deficient in access to all park types.
- The sub-area is below the quantity standard for public park provision.
- The sub-area is below the quantity standard for natural greenspace.
- There is poor access to outdoor sports facilities.
- Relatively poor access to allotments and community gardens.

9.15 Proposals to address these deficiencies are:

- Look for opportunities to create new open space to bring the sub-area closer to the borough standard on sites including Crossbones Graveyard and as part of the development around the Tate Modern area.
- Implement new civic space and public realm improvements as part of the Bankside Urban Forest Framework.
- Continue to work with Bankside Open Spaces Trust (BOST) to improve the quality and range of activities at open spaces and support the edible Bankside project.
- Improve links to the Thames Path from other parts of the sub-area.
- Improve links to Burgess Park and Southwark Park.

Measures to Improve Quality of Spaces

9.16 The majority of open spaces in the sub-area are of good quality and are valued by the local community. Spaces which are below the borough average for quality and value, and should be the focus of improvements, are shown in Figure 9.1, including:

- Christchurch Gardens (OS1). Potential to improve landscaping and facilities to address park deficiency in this area.
- Marlborough Playground (OS17). Potential to improve landscaping and access.
- Leathermarket Gardens (OS20). Potential improvements to biodiversity
Potential Improvements to Linkages between Spaces

- The Thames Path is a key route through the sub-area. The Thames itself is perhaps Bankside’s most important open space and helps to define the character of the sub-area. There is potential to provide links from other parts of the sub-area to link into the Thames Path.
- There is potential to improve links between the cluster of open spaces around Redcross Way. Many of these spaces are hidden from view and could be linked together by more effective signage and tree planting.
- There is also potential to link to other parts of the borough, including Elephant and Castle and Bermondsey, as well as Burgess Park and Southwark Park, in order to address the deficiency in access to larger open spaces.

Elephant and Castle

Area Profile

9.17 Elephant and Castle is the smallest of the borough’s eight sub-areas but is an area designated for major regeneration and change. Elephant and Castle has the status of an opportunity area in the Southwark Plan and the London Plan, with just under half of the sub-area designated as a development site. It is also part of the wider cross borough strategy to develop London South Central as an area that functions fully as part of Central London.

9.18 London South Bank University (LSBU) is a significant owner and occupier of land and buildings and the Keyworth Street/Borough Road area and has something of the activity of an urban university campus. There are also a wide range of commercial uses scattered throughout the sub-area, as well as a mix of housing stock.

9.19 The area has a relatively limited range of open space, consisting mainly of small parks and open spaces. The far west of the area also accommodates Geraldine Mary Harmsworth Park, which the Imperial War Museum sits within. The quality of open space was generally deemed to be relatively good during the site assessments.

9.20 The sub-area has a total of 0.7ha of park provision per 1,000 population, which is below the standard of 0.72ha per 1,000 population. This is expected to fall to 0.56ha per 1,000 population in 2026 as a result of population growth. The area is also highly deficient in the amount of natural greenspace available, with just 0.38ha per 1,000 population (which will fall to 0.31ha per 1,000 population in 2026) compared to a standard of 1.51ha per 1,000 population.

9.21 The sub-area has the highest population density of any sub-area in the borough. Furthermore, the area has the second highest proportion of housing units with no access to private open space (after Bankside). Both of these indicators suggest high demand for open space within the sub-area.

9.22 Satisfaction with open space was the lowest of any sub-area in the borough. However, opinions on quality were relatively good, which suggests that the lack of satisfaction is largely a result of the lack of quantity or range of open space. Residents of Elephant and Castle were also more likely to suggest that safety fears prevent the use of open spaces.
Development Proposals

9.23 The Core Strategy has identified that the sub-area will accommodate a total of 4,000 net new homes and 45,000sq.m of additional shopping and leisure space. The GLA population projections estimate that the population will increase by 25.8% to 19,602.

9.24 Comprehensive redevelopment is proposed at the Heygate Estate which presents the opportunity to create new open space.

Proposals to Address Deficiencies

9.25 The key open space deficiencies in Elephant and Castle are:

• Most parts of the sub-area are outside of the recommended catchment areas to District and Metropolitan parks.
• The sub-area is below the quantity standard for park provision.
• The sub-area is below the quantity standard for natural greenspace provision.
• Poor access to outdoor sports facilities.
• Relatively poor access to allotments and community gardens.

9.26 Proposals to address these deficiencies are:

• Create new open space, potentially as a new Local Park, as part of the comprehensive redevelopment of the Heygate Estate.
• Provide new open space on Carter Place if the opportunity arises.
• Improve the public realm and provide links to Bankside and the Thames Path, linking in with the Bankside Urban Forest Framework.
• Investigate the potential to introduce new habitat creation at Nursery Row Park.

Measures to Improve Quality of Spaces

9.27 Figure 9.2 shows all spaces which are below the borough average for quality and value. Pullens Gardens (OS75) is a space where quality is particular poor and where there is potential to improve pathways and landscaping.

Potential Improvements to Linkages between Spaces

9.28 There is also potential to link to other parts of the borough, including Bankside, Bermondsey and Aylesbury. Green links should be provided to the Thames Path, Kennington Park, Southwark Park and the improved Burgess Park.

Bermondsey and Old Kent Road

Area Profile

9.29 Bermondsey is one of the larger sub-areas in the borough, consisting of a range of residential, retail and other commercial uses. Although not the largest in terms of area, Bermondsey accommodates over 63,000 people, which is the largest of any of the borough's sub-areas. The character of the area in the west of the sub-area is closer to that of Bankside and Elephant and Castle, with denser
residential units and flexible workspace. The south of the sub-area accommodates is focused on
the Old Kent Road, which is itself a significant severance barrier. The south of the sub-area also
contains a range of industrial employment uses.

9.30 Bermondsey has very little open space, with the lowest amount of open space per population of
any sub-area in the borough. The majority of open space consists of small parks which are relatively
well distributed throughout the sub-area. However, the sub-area is bordered by Burgess Park on
the south west and Southwark Park on the north east which provides opportunities to access these
larger spaces.

9.31 The sub-area has the lowest level of park provision in the Borough with a total of 0.17ha of park
provision per 1,000 population, and is well below the standard of 0.72ha per 1,000 population.
This is expected to fall to just 0.13ha per 1,000 population in 2026 as a result of population
growth. The area is also highly deficient in the amount of natural greenspace available, with just
0.36ha per 1,000 population (which will fall to 0.29ha per 1,000 population in 2026) compared to
a standard of 1.51ha per 1,000 population.

9.32 Bermondsey has the third highest population density in the borough after Elephant and Castle and
Aylesbury and Walworth. Given the size of the sub-area, this demonstrates that the built up area is
relatively dense. Over 83% of all residential units are estimated to have no access to private open
space.

Development Proposals

9.33 There are no specific housing or employment targets for the sub-area. It is understood the Council
will prepare guidance setting out targets for the Old Kent Road area. There is also existing planning
guidance on the Bermondsey Spa area, although housing and employment targets are not
apparent. The GLA population estimates project that the population of the area will increase by
25% (an additional 16,000 people). This will clearly increase the demand for open space in the sub-
area.

9.34 There are a number of smaller sites identified in the Core Strategy for development which may be
able to support the provision of new open space.

Proposals to Address Deficiencies

9.35 The key open space deficiencies in Bermondsey are:
• The sub-area is below the quantitative standard for parks.
• The sub-area is below the quantitative standard for natural greenspace.
• There is a quantitative lack of allotments and community gardens.

9.36 Proposals to address these deficiencies are:
• Work with Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Green Enthusiasts (BARGES) to introduce new natural
greenspace to existing sites, including the potential to introduce new habitat creation.
• Improve access to existing open spaces, including strong links to Burgess Park and Southwark
Park, as well as the Thames Path.
• Look for opportunities to increase the provision of parks to get closer to the borough’s recommended standard.

Measures to Improve Quality of Spaces

9.37 Figure 9.3 shows all spaces which are below the borough average for quality and value. Dickens Square (OS44) is in particularly poor condition and requires improvements to landscaping and access to the site. Swanmead (OS60) is also in below average condition and has potential for some minor improvements to benches and play equipment.

Potential Improvements to Linkages between Spaces

9.38 Given the limited opportunities to create large new open spaces to meet the growing population, providing links to the existing open spaces of Burgess Park and Southwark Park will be critical to maintaining access to open space. There is also potential to improve links within and to the Thames Path.

Canada Water and Rotherhithe

Area Profile

9.39 The Canada Water and Rotherhithe sub-area is unique in the borough in that much of the development in the area has taken place during the past 30 years. Historically, the area was home to the Surrey Docks, which by the end of the Second World War covered an area of about 186 hectares, 85% of the peninsula. By 1969, the last docks had closed and after lying derelict for a decade, the London Docklands Development Corporation (LDDC) was given responsibility for developing the area. Around 90% of the docks were filled in and some 5,500 new homes built, alongside new open spaces, retail, leisure and industrial development.

9.40 Building heights and residential densities are generally higher around the periphery of the AAP area and lower in the centre. Much of the area around Surrey Docks ward in particular has a suburban feel.

9.41 At the heart of the sub-area are the Surrey Quays shopping centre, including retail sheds and Surrey Quays Leisure Park. Built in the late 1980s and 1990s, this out-of-town retail park has around 40,000 sqm of shopping space.

9.42 The sub-area is relatively well provided for in terms of open space, both in terms of the quantity and range of open space available. Spaces include Southwark Park, Russia Dock Woodlands, a series of inland water bodies and a range of smaller public parks and squares. The sub-area has the second highest amount of open space per person in the borough with 1.53ha per 1,000 population, and therefore is above the standard of 0.72ha per 1,000 population. The sub-area also has a high amount of natural greenspace, with 4.44ha per 1,000 population (which will fall to 3.55ha per 1,000 population in 2026 as a result of population growth), and which is well above the standard of 1.51ha per 1,000 population.

9.43 Due to the amount of open space available and the more suburban housing densities found in many parts, the overall population density in the area is relatively low. However, there are pockets...
of high density, particularly located around Greenland Docks and in Rotherhithe. The sub-area has a relatively young population which indicates high demand for open space per population.

Development Proposals

9.44 The Canada Water AAP states that the area will accommodate 2,500 new homes, largely located towards the central area (close to Canada Water station), as well as employment generating uses which will provide an additional 2,000 jobs.

9.45 There are also a number of development sites which have the potential to be brought forward as new open spaces.

Proposals to Address Deficiencies

9.46 The Canada Water and Rotherhithe sub-area is relatively well provided for in terms of open space. However the following deficiencies have been identified:

- There are no allotments/community gardens in the sub-area which means the area is deficient in access to this open space type. There is potential to address this by introducing facilities within new and existing open spaces.
- Although this report has not undertaken a detailed analysis of the supply of children’s play facilities, the infrastructure background paper which supports the Canada Water AAP (CD CW18) identified that there was a deficiency in access to children’s play in the north of the sub-area. This can be addressed by providing new children’s play facilities within development opportunities to the north of the area.

Measures to Improve Quality of Spaces

9.47 The quality and value of open space in Canada Water and Rotherhithe is generally good. However, Figure 9.4 shows that the following sites have potential for improvement:

- Improve the quality of landscaping and security at Deal Porters Walk (OS34).
- Bring Surrey Docks Sports Ground (OS6) back into use.
- Improve the quality of open space at St Pauls Sports Ground (CW1).
- Introduce new open space uses at the Former Nursery (CW2).
- Provide improvements to the athletics track and ancillary buildings at Southwark Park (OS33).
- Investigate the potential to introduce new habitat creation at Kings Stairs Gardens (OS28).
- Improve the range of facilities at Durands Wharf (OS40)

Potential Improvements to Linkages between Spaces

9.48 Canada Water and Rotherhithe has a good range of open spaces, some of which are already well linked together by green routes. However, there is potential to improve links including:

- Links between Southwark Park, Greenland Dock and Russia Dock Woodland through the new development opportunities within the town centre area.
- Potential to improve links from the Thames Path into Russia Dock Woodland.
Aylesbury and Walworth

Area Profile

9.49 The sub-area is focused on the Aylesbury Estate, which is an area of social housing constructed between 1966 and 1977. The estate is subject to severe deprivation and is home to over 7,500 people and includes several schools, offices and community buildings and some limited retail. The estate will be completely redeveloped as a new residential community (see below). The wider area includes East Street, Walworth Road, Old Kent Road, and Burgess Park, which includes a mix of retail and a variety of housing stock.

9.50 The sub-area has the highest level of park provision per population, largely because Burgess Park forms about 25% of the total area. The sub-area also has a range of smaller open spaces including a number of allotments and smaller parks. Although not assessed as part of this study, housing amenity space also provides a significant open space resource in this area.

9.51 In total, the sub-area has a total of 2.33ha of park provision per 1,000 population, which is well above the standard of 0.72ha per 1,000 population. This is expected to fall to 2.1ha per 1,000 population in 2026 as a result of population growth. The area also meets the Borough's natural greenspace standards with 2.24ha per 1,000 population (which will fall to 2.01ha per 1,000 population in 2026) compared to a standard of 1.51ha per 1,000 population.

9.52 The Aylesbury and Walworth sub-area has some of the overall highest levels of need for open space as a result of the high rates of poor health, high levels of deprivation, high population densities and high child densities. The residents’ survey identified that residents of the sub-area were more likely to rate the quality of open space as poor than in other areas of the borough.

Development Proposals

9.53 The Aylesbury AAP identifies the potential for 4,200 new residential units. GLA Population projections estimate that the population of the sub-area will increase by 11% to 25,200.

9.54 The comprehensive redevelopment proposals present an opportunity to reconfigure the existing provision of open space, creating new ‘green fingers’ which will link the new residential units with Burgess Park. Burgess Park itself will also be subject to major improvements.

Proposals to Address Deficiencies

9.55 Because Burgess Park forms a significant amount of the sub-area, the area does not suffer from many qualitative or accessibility-related deficiencies. However, the quality of the current Burgess Park was assessed to be relatively low, although this is being addressed as part of the £6million renovation of the park. There is also potential to expand the community gardens at Burgess Park if demand is strong enough. It should be noted that since the resident’s survey and assessment were carried out, considerable investment has already been made to Burgess Park, although further investment to improve even more of the park is also needed.

9.56 The redevelopment of the Aylesbury Estate also presents an opportunity to create a series of ‘green fingers’ from the improved Burgess Park into the new development, linking Surrey Square and Faraday Gardens with the park.
Measures to Improve Quality of Spaces

9.57 Figure 9.5 shows all spaces which are below the borough average in terms of quality and value. Spaces which are in particular need of investment are:

- Aylesbury Allotments (401);
- Fielding St Allotments (409);
- Forsyth Gardens (OS90);
- Surrey Square Park (OS77); and
- Burgess Park (OS91).

Potential Improvements to Linkages between Spaces

9.58 There is potential to improve links between Burgess Park, which is well located in the centre of the borough, to other major open spaces including Southwark Park, Kennington Park and the smaller open spaces in Peckham and Camberwell. The ‘green fingers’ proposed as part of the Aylesbury AAP linking the new development with Burgess Park will also help to connect the proposals with this important open space.

Camberwell
Area Profile

9.59 Camberwell is a mixture of relatively well preserved Georgian and twentieth century housing, including a number of social housing estates. The north of the sub-area is focused around Camberwell Green and Camberwell Road, which includes a range of retail provision, whilst the south of the sub-area includes a range of residential units.

9.60 The distribution of open space in the sub-area is relatively good, although there is a lack of larger open space and natural greenspace. However, the sub-area is bordered by Burgess Park to the north and Ruskin Park to the south which provide good access to larger open space outside of the area.

9.61 The sub-area has a total of 0.27ha of park provision per 1,000 population, which is below the standard of 0.72ha per 1,000 population. This is expected to fall to 0.23ha per 1,000 population in 2026 as a result of population growth. The area is also deficient in the amount of natural greenspace available, with 0.47ha per 1,000 population (which will fall to 0.42ha per 1,000 population in 2026) compared to a standard of 1.51ha per 1,000 population.

9.62 Camberwell has a relatively high population density and high child densities. The residents’ survey identified that local residents viewed the quality of local open space as relatively good, with satisfaction levels also relatively high.

Development Proposals

9.63 The Council is due to begin work on the Camberwell SPD in Spring 2012. There are no housing or employment targets within the Core Strategy for this sub-area. The GLA Population Estimates project that the population of the sub-area will increase by 14% to 46,000. However, there are few major development opportunities identified within Camberwell.
Proposals to Address Deficiencies

9.64 Camberwell is relatively well served by open space, with a good distribution of small parks within Camberwell and relatively good access to larger spaces outside of the sub-area. However, there are deficiencies in the quantity of allotments and community gardens. New community garden space could be created within Nairn Road Nature Garden, or within a section of one of the parks in the north of the sub-area (such as Brunswick Park). There is also potential to bring Benhill Road Nature Garden back into use for community gardening/natural greenspace.

Measures to Improve Quality of Spaces

9.65 Camberwell has a number of spaces that are not fulfilling their current potential, many of which are located in the south of the sub-area closer to Dulwich. Figure 9.6 shows all spaces which are below the borough average for quality and value. Quality improvements are particularly required to:

• Nairn Grove Nature Garden (OS134);
• Greendale Playing Field (OS128);
• Benhill Road Nature Garden (OS97); and
• Greendale Artificial Pitch (OS129).

Potential Improvements to Linkages between Spaces

9.66 There is potential to improve links between Burgess Park and the smaller parks and open spaces within Camberwell. There is also potential to create routes linking Greendale and Dulwich with other parts of the sub-area and extending links to Dulwich.

Peckham and Nunhead

Area Profile

9.67 The Peckham and Nunhead sub-area is varied in character with Peckham, in the north, quite distinct from Nunhead, in the south. Peckham has been subject to significant change in recent years, with the development of new homes, two new parks and a range of community facilities. Peckham has some pockets of severe deprivation. Nunhead lies to the south east of Peckham bounded by Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common and the borough boundary with Lewisham. It is a quiet residential area predominantly made up of Victorian terraced housing.

9.68 In total, the sub-area has a total of 1.1ha of park provision per 1,000 population, which is above the standard of 0.72ha per 1,000 population. This is expected to fall to 0.96ha per 1,000 population in 2026 as a result of population growth. The area also meets the borough’s natural greenspace standards with 1.92ha per 1,000 population (which will fall to 1.67ha per 1,000 population in 2026) compared to a standard of 1.51ha per 1,000 population.

9.69 Building heights and residential densities are generally higher in the centre of the sub-area around Rye Lane and Peckham High Street and lower in the surrounding areas. Much of the area is residential with Peckham town centre, the borough’s largest shopping area, running north to south through the centre along Rye Lane.
Population densities within the sub-area as a whole are not as high as other parts of the borough, however, Peckham does have some areas of particularly high population density, whilst Nunhead is generally lower density. The sub-area has one of the highest levels of ill-health in the borough and also the highest child density in Southwark.

The residents' survey revealed that, although the perception of quality of open space was in line with the wider borough, the level of satisfaction with open space in general is one of the lowest in the borough. This suggests that there are concerns either with the quantity or range of open space provision.

Development Proposals

The AAP sets a target of 2000 new homes to 2026, the majority of which will be located in the Peckham core action area. GLA population estimates project that the population will increase by 14.8% to 67,754. The variety of development sites also present opportunities to increase the provision of open space.

Proposals to Address Deficiencies

Access to parks and natural greenspaces is relatively good throughout the sub-area. The south of the sub-area has a greater amount of park provision per person, although Burgess Park provides opportunities to access larger open spaces for residents in the northern part of Peckham. There is a need to increase the provision of public parks and natural greenspace wherever possible within the north of the sub-area.

Proposals to address these deficiencies are:
- Reintegrate the northern section of Cossall Park (formerly part of Tuke’s school) to the existing protected open space.
- Improve links to Burgess Park and Peckham Rye Park & Peckham Rye Common.
- Investigate the potential to improve the quality and range of provision at the amenity space at Meeting House Lane.

Measures to Improve Quality of Spaces

Spaces in Peckham generally scored lower in terms of quality than other spaces in the borough. Those spaces which are below the borough average for quality and value are shown in Figure 9.7. The following spaces should be prioritised for improvements:
- Goldsmith Road Nature Garden (OS103);
- One Tree Hill (OS150);
- Brayards Green (PN5); and
- Kirkwood Road Nature Garden (PN7).

Potential Improvements to Linkages between Spaces

Peckham has the most significant linear greenspace in the form of the Surrey Canal Walk linking Burgess Park with Peckham town centre. There is potential to extend this link southwards through
the town centre to connect with Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common. There is also potential to improve connections to the spaces in the east of the sub-area and to link in with Nunhead Cemetery and the existing Green Chain Network.

**Dulwich**

**Area Profile**

9.77 Dulwich has a character which is distinct from many other parts of the borough. It has a range of historic qualities and a strong local identity, with a wide range of open space. The south of the sub-area includes a large body of open space which is managed by the Dulwich Estate. Whilst some of the open spaces managed by the estate are publicly accessible, many are leased by sports clubs and other providers that restrict access. The northern sections of the sub-area are suburban in character, consisting largely of semi-detached housing with private gardens.

9.78 Open space helps to define the character of the sub-area, with spaces such as Dulwich Park forming a key focus for the community. Open space is generally of very high quality, although there are some spaces which require investment.

9.79 The significant level of outdoor sports provision concentrated in the sub-area mean that residents from other parts of the borough, as well as other boroughs in south London, travel to use the facilities.

9.80 In total, the sub-area has a total of 0.91ha of park provision per 1,000 population, which is above the standard of 0.76ha per 1,000 population. This is expected to fall to 0.76ha per 1,000 population in 2026 as a result of population growth. The area also meets the borough’s natural greenspace standards with 4.1ha per 1,000 population (which will fall to 3.73ha per 1,000 population in 2026) compared to a standard of 1.51ha per 1,000 population.

9.81 Dulwich has the lowest population density in the borough. It also has very low levels of deprivation and levels of ill-health are generally low. However, there are pockets of relatively high population density and deprivation north east of Dulwich Park, possibly related to the Dawson Heights social housing estate. The telephone survey identified that residents of the sub-area rated the quality of open space higher than in any other sub-area. Furthermore, satisfaction with open space was also very high.

**Development Proposals**

9.82 Development proposals are limited in Dulwich. The only significant proposal is the Dulwich Hospital site in the north of the sub-area. The site may have potential to deliver small scale open space uses. The GLA Population Estimates project that the population of the sub-area will increase by 10% (the lowest in the borough) to 38,528.

**Proposals to Address Deficiencies**

9.83 As mentioned above, despite having a relatively high amount of open space per person, there are some relatively large areas of the sub-area that are considered as deficient in access to parks. The majority of these areas consist of suburban housing with access to private open space, although
there are some areas, such as the Dawson Heights estate, which do not have such access. There is potential to provide new open space as part of the redevelopment of the Dulwich Hospital site. There is potential to improve the recreation facilities at Dawson Heights, creating a new small park which would help to alleviate access deficiencies in this area. Encouraging private open space to open for public use and improving links to these spaces will also help to overcome deficiencies.

9.84 The Southwark Play Strategy also identified that there is insufficient children’s play facilities within the sub-area. There is potential for new children’s play facilities to be secured at Dawson Heights (OS155), as well as at Long Meadow (OS184).

Measures to Improve Quality of Spaces

9.85 Figure 9.8 shows all spaces which are below the borough average for quality and value. The following sites have potential to be improved in terms of quality:

- St Peter’s Church Yard (OS170)
- Dawson Heights (OS155)
- Herne Hill Cycle Stadium (OS146)
- Long Meadow (OS184).

Potential Improvements to Linkages between Spaces

9.86 A number of major open spaces throughout Dulwich are already linked by the Green Chain Network and it will be important that these links are maintained and enhanced. There is also potential to improve links between spaces within the sub-area and other sections of the borough. Links should be improved to Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common and to Camberwell via Greendale.
Potential for new open space to be created at Crossbones Open Space as part of wider development opportunities

Potential to improve access to Little Dorrit Park

Potential to improve quality of Christchurch Garden

Potential improvements to biodiversity to Leathermarket Gardens

Potential to strengthen connections between open spaces around Redcross Way

Potential to improve the design and layout of Mint Street Park

Potential to improve landscaping and access at Marlborough Playground

Sub-area strategy for Bankside, Borough and London Bridge
Sub-area strategy for Elephant and Castle

- Potential for new park to be created as part of major development opportunity
- Potential for green link to improved Burgess Park
- Recommended boundary change to the area of protected open space at Victory Community Park
- Recommended boundary change to the area of protected open space at Nursery Row Park
- Provide new open space on Carter Place, if the opportunity arises
- Recommended boundary change to the area of protected open space at Geraldine Mary Harmsworth Park

Sub-area Strategy for Elephant and Castle
Potential to improve quality and access at Dickens Square

Recommended boundary change to the area of protected open space at Salisbury Row Park

Potential to improve benches & play equipment at Swanmead

Improved green links to Southwark Park & Burgess Park

Sub-area strategy for Bermondsey and Old Kent Road
Potential for quality of St Paul’s Sports ground to be improved, including improvements to Synthetic Turf Pitch

Potential for Surrey Docks Sports Ground to be brought back into use

Potential for landscaping improvement at Deal Porters Walk

Potential site for biodiversity improvements at Kings Stairs Gardens

Potential for new civic spaces and children’s play facilities as part of new development

Potential to improve quality of athletics track and ancillary buildings at Southwark Park

Potential for improvements at Durand’s Wharf

Sub-area strategy for Canada Water and Rotherhithe
Potential to improve quality of children’s play equipment at Forsyth Gardens

Potential to improve quality of Burgess Park

Potential for green fingers providing links from new development into Burgess Park

Sub-area strategy for Aylesbury and Walworth
Sub-area strategy for Camberwell

- Potential to improve quality and access at Benhill Road Nature Garden
- Potential to bring Nairn Grove Nature Garden back into use
- Potential to improve links through to Dog Kennel Hill Open Space
- Potential to improve the range of facilities at Greendale Playing Fields
Sub-area strategy for Peckham and Nunhead

- Potential for biodiversity improvements at Jowett Street Park
- Potential to improve quality at Meeting House Lane space
- Potential for improvements to quality of Goldsmith Road Nature Garden
- Reintegrate the northern section of Cossall Park (formerly part of Tuke’s school)
- Potential for improvements to playing field and ancillary facilities at Homestall Road Playing Field
- Potential for improvements to benches and paths at One Tree Hill

www.southwark.gov.uk

Southwark Open Space Strategy
Potential to provide new open space on the Dulwich Hospital site

Potential to improve quality of Velodrome

Potential to extend open space into Dulwich Upper Wood

Potential to improve entrances at Belair Park

Potential to improve landscaping and introduce children’s play at Long Meadow

Potential to improve route from Grange Lane through to Sydenham Hill Wood

Potential to improve quality of St Peter’s Church Yard

Potential to improve quality of Dawson Heights. Potential for community garden, landscaping and children’s play

Sub-area strategy for Dulwich
Appendix A
Strategic and Policy Context
A.1 Strategic and Policy Context

A.1.1 This section of the report sets out the relevant policy context with regard to open space, sport and recreation.

National Policy

**National Planning Policy Framework - NPPF**

A.1.2 The need for an open space strategy is set out in national and regional government guidance, including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and the London Plan. This strategy has been developed in accordance with the relevant guidance.

A.1.3 This strategy uses the definition of open space that is set out in the NPPF. The NPPF defines open space as all open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water (such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs) which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as a visual amenity.

A.1.4 The types of open space that may be of public value and are included as part of this work, include:

- Parks and gardens;
- Natural and semi natural urban green spaces;
- Green corridors;
- Outdoor sports and play facilities;
- Amenity spaces;
- Provision for children and teenagers;
- Allotments, community gardens and urban farms;
- Cemeteries and churchyards; and
- Civic spaces.

**PPG17 – Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation (2002)**

A.1.5 According to Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 – Planning for open space, sport and recreation (2002), open spaces, sport and recreation underpin people’s quality of life and are fundamental in delivering broader government objectives, these include:

- Supporting an urban renaissance;
- Promotion of social inclusion and community cohesion;
- Health and well being; and
- Promoting more sustainable development.

A.1.6 In establishing the value of existing recreational facilities to the community and the need for new facilities, PPG17 recommends that Local Planning Authorities should undertake robust assessments of the existing and future needs of their communities for open space, sports and recreational facilities. Guidelines describing how such assessments should be completed are set out in Assessing Needs and Opportunities: A companion guide to PPG17 (ODPM, 2002). This study addresses almost all of the issues pertaining to playing pitches and allotments which are identified in the guide.

A.1.7 The guidelines recommend that audits of local space needs should:
• Cover the differing and distinctive needs of the population for open space and built sports and recreational facilities including those working in and visiting areas.

• Include audits of existing open space, sports and recreational facilities including usage, accessibility, costs and opportunities for new open space and facilities. Audits should establish the quantity of spaces.

• Identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses.

A.1.8 PPG 17 advises Local Authorities to use the information gained from their assessment of needs and opportunities to set locally derived standards for the provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities in their areas. Such standards form the basis of redressing quantitative and qualitative deficiencies through the planning process. The companion Guide to PPG 17 provides guidance as to how local authorities should identify and apply provision standards based upon assessments of local need.

A.1.9 PPG 17 recommends that any assessment take into account:

• Overall level of supply in Southwark, including the degree to which provision meets needs from beyond the local authority boundary.

• Accessibility of locations.

• Level of usage of facilities.

• Functions which certain facilities may perform, for example as a meeting place for one age group or community.

A.1.10 Research undertaken by Atkins on behalf of the London Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC 2000) identified that whilst standards may provide a useful basis for comparison, it is generally considered on their own, standards are inadequate in addressing a wide range of mainly qualitative factors that include issues such as sustainability and biodiversity, accessibility and socio-economic trends in planning and also the changing use and function of open space.

A.1.11 The assessment of demand is not a precise science and many of the established standards are essentially intuitive rather than based on the up to date research into how people use open space.


A.1.12 Working with the Grain of Nature: A Biodiversity Strategy for England sets out the Government’s vision for conserving and enhancing biological diversity in England. It includes the broad aim that ‘planning, construction, development and regeneration should have minimal impacts on biodiversity and enhance it wherever possible’.

A.1.13 The Government’s objectives for planning are:

• To promote sustainable development by ensuring that biological and geological diversity are conserved and enhanced as an integral part of social, environmental and economic development and use of land integrate biodiversity and geological diversity with other considerations.

• To conserve, enhance and restore the diversity of England’s wildlife and geology by sustaining, and where possible improving, the quality and extent of natural habitat and geological and geo-morphological sites; the natural physical processes on which they depend; and the populations of naturally occurring species which they support.

• To contribute to rural renewal and urban renaissance by:

  - Enhancing biodiversity in green spaces and among developments so that they are used by wildlife and valued by people, recognising that healthy functional ecosystems can contribute to a better quality of life and to people’s sense of well-being; and
- Ensuring that developments take account of the role and value of biodiversity in supporting economic diversification and contributing to a high quality environment.

A.1.14 PPS9 sets out a number of key principles to which Regional Planning Bodies and local planning authorities should adhere to in order to meet the objectives that have been set out for planning. Those that are relevant to this Strategy include:

- Development plans and policies should be based upon up-to-date information about the environmental characteristics of their areas, including relevant biodiversity and geological resources in a given area. Local authorities are asked to assess the potential to sustain and enhance identified resources.

- Plan policies should aim to maintain, and enhance, restore or add to biodiversity and geological conservation interests. In taking decisions, local planning authorities are asked to ensure appropriate weight is attached to designated sites of international, national and local importance; protected species; and to biodiversity and geological interests within the wider environment.

A.1.15 These principles need to be taken into account as the Southwark Open Space Strategy is expected to contribute to Southwark's planning policies. PPS 9 makes mention that Local Authorities should take an integrated approach to planning for biodiversity and geo-diversity when preparing planning policy documents.

Draft PPS – Planning for a Natural and Healthy Environment (March 2010)

A.1.16 This draft Planning Policy Statement (PPS) was published for consultation in March 2010. The draft PPS contains policies focused on planning for the natural environment including green infrastructure, open space, sport, recreation and play while at the same time moving the matter into the context of the government's agenda for encouraging healthier living and environments.

A.1.17 The consultation document outlines that it is intended, in its final form, that the proposed PPS will supersede PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation; PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation; PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (paragraphs 21-23, 28-29, and 33); and PPG20: Coastal Planning (paragraphs 2.9, 2.10 and 3.9).

A.1.18 It is envisaged that the draft PPS will be consistent with cross-Government initiatives, particularly those already discussed:


- Be Active, Be Healthy – A Plan for Getting the Nation Moving (Department of Health, February 2009) sets out the Government’s strategy for promoting physical activity in our everyday lives alongside sport and based upon local needs, with particular emphasis upon physical activity legacy of the 2012 London Olympic and Paralympic Games. A key objective is creating active environments: ensuring that people have access to high quality open spaces and that new developments seek to increase opportunities for physical activity.

- The Play Strategy (Department of Children, Schools and Families and Department of Culture, Media and Sport, December 2008) sets out the Government’s long term vision for play which includes the provision of a range of safe exciting places for children of all ages to play close to where they live.

A.1.19 In May 2010 the Government published its white paper: Planning for a Sustainable Future. Amongst the white paper’s proposals was a commitment to produce a more strategic and clearly focused national policy framework with Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (PPS1) at its heart.
A.1.20 A key objective of the new, single PPS is identified in the consultation document as bringing together related policies on the natural environment alongside policies concerned with open and green spaces in rural and urban areas to ensure the planning system delivers healthy, sustainable communities which adapt to and are resilient to climate change and gives the appropriate protection to the natural environment. Another stated objective for the streamlining and consolidation of policy in this area is to deliver, for the first time, planning policy on green infrastructure. It is outlined that key considerations for green infrastructure are the functions or ecosystem services it provides and should therefore be considered at a broader scale than is necessary for individual areas of open space. In summary the draft PPS recognises that there are subtle differences between planning for open space and planning for green infrastructure.

A.1.21 It is envisaged that encouraging local authorities to take a more strategic approach to ‘green infrastructure’ should give them a better understanding of their existing green infrastructure network and its functions.

A.1.22 It is noted within the consultation document that the Government continues to support the need to make adequate provision of land and facilities for sport, recreation and children’s play, and intends to maintain existing policies in PPG17. Local planning authorities will continue to be required to protect from development existing land and facilities unless it can be demonstrated that they are surplus to requirements. Where deficits are identified, local planning authorities should identify opportunities to improve provision either by providing new facilities or by making better use of existing ones.

Building Health: Creating and Enhancing Spaces for Healthy, Active Lives

A.1.23 Building Health (2007), the result of a partnership between the National Heart Forum, Living Streets and the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) set out to increase awareness of the public health role of the organisations concerned with urban design and improving the public realm, in particular in relation to population levels of physical activity, and to facilitate implementation of good health-promoting practice. Aspects of the report focusing on, Urban Green Space and Outdoor Playing Space are of particular relevance.

A.1.24 The provision of green spaces within the urban environment has always been strongly linked to promoting good health while public parks account for one-third of all public green space contained within the urban areas of England. The report outlines that due to the competing demands of Local Authority statutory duties there has been a shift in government priorities away from the provision of public parks and green spaces.

A.1.25 The Report encourages Local Authorities to take the following action to maximise the potential health benefits of Urban Green space:

- Local authorities should restructure their departments to bring together into one unit all those responsible for the planning, design, management and maintenance of parks and urban green spaces. This should be seen as a green or natural ‘public realm’.

- Local authorities should develop partnerships with local, regional and national organisations to enable joint funding and ownership programmes to improve parks and green spaces to maximise their health benefits.

A.1.26 With reference to outdoor playing space the report outlines that the built environment has a significant impact on health through a number of interrelated issues including the provision of outdoor facilities and opportunities for play, active recreation and sport for both children and adults. Outdoor facilities are described as including playing fields, recreation grounds and play areas.

A.1.27 Reference is made to the health benefits from good-quality parks and green spaces in terms of reducing obesity, decreasing the risk of coronary heart disease and strokes, and reducing daily stress.
A.1.28 The report identifies priorities as safeguarding and improving outdoor facilities for sport and physical activity, the accessibility of outdoor playing space and better protection for and reinvestment in outdoor facilities.

A.1.29 Local Authorities are encouraged to:

- Link policy on open space to transport policy. Open space should be accessible for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport, and have adequate cycle parking, and promote active travel.
- Seek developer contributions for outdoor sport, play and open space facilities.

**Sport England – Spatial Planning for Sport and Active Recreation**

A.1.30 Planning for Sport & Active Recreation (2005) is based on the document Land Use Policies for Sport (LUPPS, 1999). It sets out the planning objectives for Sport England and the rationale behind them. Key planning policy objectives (PPO) that are most relevant to this Strategy include:

- PPO1: To ensure that a planned approach to the provision of facilities and opportunities for sport and recreation is taken by planning authorities in order to meet the needs of the local community. The level of provision should be determined locally, based on local assessments of need and take account of wider than local requirements for strategic or specialist facilities.
- PPO5: To promote detailed local assessments of playing field requirements using the methodology as outlined in ‘Towards a Level Playing Field’.
- PPO7: To support the development of new facilities, the enhancement of existing facilities and the provision and/or improvement of access to the natural environment which will secure opportunities to take part in sport and which can be achieved in a way which meets sustainable development objectives.

**The Play Strategy (December 2008)**

A.1.31 The Play Strategy (Department of Children, Schools and Families and Department of Culture, Media and Sport, December 2008) sets out the Government’s long term vision for play which includes the provision of a range of safe exciting places for children of all ages to play close to where they live. The Government’s ambition is to make this the best country in the World for children to grow up. Through children and communities’ involvement in the design and planning of these spaces, it is envisaged that play areas will be valued locally and continue to reflect the distinct needs of each community. The strategy sets out how the Government expects to deliver its vision for 2020, supporting local delivery partners to make a reality of children’s right to play, as stated in Article 31 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. The strategy defines play as children and young people following their own ideas and interests, in their own way and for their own reasons, having fun while respecting themselves and others. The Government’s vision for play states:

- In every residential area there are a variety of supervised and unsupervised places for play, free of charge.
- Local neighbourhoods are, and feel like, safe, interesting places to play.
- Routes to children’s play space are safe and accessible for all children and young people.
- Parks and open spaces are attractive and welcoming to children and young people, and are well maintained and well used.
- Children and young people have a clear stake in public space and their play is accepted by their neighbours.
- Children and young people and their families take an active role in the development of local play spaces.
Play spaces are attractive, welcoming, engaging and accessible for all local children and young people, including disabled children, and children from minority groups in the community.

A.1.32 To achieve this vision, the *Fair Play* document outlined the Government’s proposals to:

- Invest £235 million over 2008-11 to develop up to 3,500 public play areas.
- Support 30 local authorities to develop adventure playgrounds or play parks aimed at 8-13 year olds in disadvantaged areas.
- Work with councils to ensure play areas are stimulating, exciting and attractive to children – ensuring the involvement of children, families and communities.
- Drive local performance with a new national indicator from 2009.
- Develop and test volunteering opportunities to support play.
- Work with planners, developers and transport officers to create neighbourhoods that meet the needs of children and families.
- Boost the qualifications and skills of the workforce that supports and supervises play.

A.1.33 The strategy sets out five overarching areas of action to improve play opportunities for all children:

- **More places to play**: responding to children’s demands for high-quality play spaces in every area.
- **Supporting play throughout childhood**: improving provision through a range of settings for children of all ages.
- **Playing safely**: providing safe, accessible and stimulating places for children to play.
- **Child-friendly communities**: engaging communities and involving children in decisions.
- **Embedding play in local priorities**: ensuring leadership and effective delivery in every local area.

### Fields in Trust – Planning and Design for Outdoor Sport and Play (2008)

A.1.34 Fields in Trust is the operating name of the National Playing Fields Association. *Planning and design for outdoor sport and play* updates and modernises previous recommendations made in ‘The Six Acre Standard’. Since ‘The Six Acre Standard was last published in 2001, a range of more clearly defined and adopted policies for planning standards for open space, sport and recreation including outdoor facilities for sport and play have been published. In response to the changing policy context, and to reflect the need for local determination and adoption of standards relating to quantity, quality and accessibility, in 2006 Fields in Trust commissioned independent research to undertake a survey of local planning authorities and consult with key stakeholders around the United Kingdom. It was decided that FIT should recommend Benchmark Standards to planning authorities and others. These benchmark standards are recommended as a tool for assisting the development of local standards. The guidance states that the updated recommendations are very similar to previous recommendations in ‘The Six Acre Standard’. A summary of the benchmark standards outlined by this document follows.

### Benchmark Standard Recommendations for Outdoor Sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of local authority</th>
<th>Benchmark Standard (ha per 1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Quality – Outdoor Sport

A.1.35 Fields in Trust recommends the use of Technical Performance Quality Standards such as those published in ‘Design and Maintenance of Outdoor Sports Facilities’ for both pitches and other outdoor facilities, namely cricket, bowls and croquet.

A.1.36 Observational methodologies can also prove helpful as a starting point. Methods which might be considered include that provided in Sport England’s electronic toolkit and the ‘traffic light code’ being developed by the Football Association.

### Accessibility – Playing Pitches

A.1.37 Playing pitches should be available within 1.2 km of all dwellings in major residential areas.

### Accessibility – Other Outdoor Sports

A.1.38 Athletics – one synthetic track with floodlighting per 250,000 people living within 30 minutes drive time of the proposed location.

A.1.39 Tennis – community tennis courts within 20 minutes travel time (walking in urban areas).

### Benchmark Standard Recommendations for Outdoor Play

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Local Authority</th>
<th>Benchmark Standard (ha per 1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accessibility Benchmark for Children’s Playing Space

A.1.40 Accessibility benchmarks for children’s playing space are set out in Table A.4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of space</th>
<th>Accessibility catchment (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local areas for play or ‘door-step’ spaces - for play and informal recreation (LAPs)</td>
<td>Walking distance: 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local equipped or local landscaped, areas for play - for play and informal recreation (LEAPs)</td>
<td>Walking distance: 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood equipped areas for play - for play and informal recreation, and</td>
<td>Walking distance: 1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Policy

The London Plan – July 2011

A.1.41 The London Plan sets the strategic context for open space planning which is based on protecting and promoting the network of open spaces throughout London. The London Plan sets out the spatial planning framework for London. Its policies aim to ensure that London authorities:

- Realise the value of open space and green infrastructure.
- Protect London’s green belt, metropolitan open land and local open spaces, and support regional and metropolitan park opportunities.
- Support the creation of networks of strategic open space such as green chains and green corridors.
- Create new open space in areas of deficiency and promote improvement to existing provision.
- Require boroughs to prepare open space strategies to protect, create and enhance all types of open space in their area.
- Ensure that children have safe access to good-quality, well-designed, secure and stimulating play and informal recreation provision.
- Protect and improve biodiversity, tackling deficiencies in access to nature.
- Protect and promote trees, woodland, and geo-diversity.
- Improve access to the countryside and the quality of the landscape in the urban fringe.

Green Infrastructure and Open Space

Policy 2.18: Green Infrastructure: the network of open and green spaces.

A.1.42 The Mayor will work with all relevant strategic partners to protect, promote, expand and manage access to London’s network of green infrastructure. This multi-functional green and open network will secure benefits including, but not limited to, biodiversity, landscape, culture, building a sense of place, the economy, sport, recreation, local food production, mitigating and adapting to climate change, water management and the social benefits that promote individual and community health and well-being.

A.1.43 The Mayor will pursue the delivery of green infrastructure by working in partnership with all relevant bodies, including across London’s boundaries, as with the Green Arc Partnerships and Lee Valley Regional Park Authority. The Mayor will publish supplementary guidance on the All London Green Grid to apply the principles of the East London Green Grid to green infrastructure across London.

A.1.44 In areas of deficiency for regional and metropolitan parks, opportunities for the creation of green infrastructure to meet this deficiency should be identified and their implementation be supported such as in the Wandle Valley Regional Park.

A.1.45 Enhancements to London’s green infrastructure should be sought from development and where a proposal falls within a regional or metropolitan park deficiency area, it should contribute to addressing this need.

A.1.46 Development proposals should:
• Incorporate appropriate elements of green infrastructure that are integrated into the wider network of green infrastructure.

• Encourage the linkage of green infrastructure, including the Blue Ribbon Network, to the wider public realm to improve accessibility for all and develop new links, utilising green chains, street trees, and other components of urban greening.

A.1.47 Boroughs should:

• Follow the guidance in PPG 17 and undertake audits of all forms of open space and assessments of need. These should be both qualitative and quantitative, and have regard to the cross-borough nature and use of many open spaces.

• Produce Open Space Strategies that cover all forms of open space and the interrelationship between these spaces. These should identify priorities for addressing deficiencies and should set out positive measures for the management of green and open space. These strategies and their action plans need to be kept under review. Delivery of local biodiversity action plans should be linked to open space strategies.

• Ensure that in and through DPD policies, green infrastructure needs are planned and managed to realise the current and potential value of open space to communities and to support delivery of the widest range of linked environmental and social benefits.

• In London’s urban fringe, support through appropriate initiatives, the Green Arc vision of creating and protecting an extensive and valued recreational landscape of well-connected and accessible countryside around London for both people and for wildlife.

A.1.48 The Mayor strongly supports the protection, promotion and enhancement of London’s open spaces and natural environments.

Policy 7.17: Metropolitan Open Land.

A.1.49 The Mayor strongly supports the current extent of Metropolitan Open Land (MOL), its extension in appropriate circumstances and its protection from development having an adverse impact on the openness of MOL.

A.1.50 The strongest protection should be given to London’s Metropolitan Open Land and inappropriate development refused, except in very special circumstances, giving the same level of protection as in the Green Belt. Essential ancillary facilities for appropriate uses will only be acceptable where they maintain the openness of MOL.

A.1.51 Any alterations to the boundary of MOL should be undertaken by boroughs through the LDF process, in consultation with the Mayor and adjoining authorities.

A.1.52 To designate land as MOL boroughs need to establish that the land meets at least one of the following criteria:

• It contributes to the physical structure of London by being clearly distinguishable from the built up area.

• It includes open-air facilities, especially for leisure, recreation, sport, the arts and cultural activities, which serve either the whole or significant parts of London.

• It contains features or landscapes (historic, recreational, biodiversity) of either national or metropolitan value.

• It forms part of a Green Chain or a link in the network of green infrastructure and meets one of the above criteria.

A.1.53 The policy guidance of PPG 2 on Green Belts applies equally to Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). It has an important role to play as part of London’s multi-functional green infrastructure and the Mayor is keen to see improvements in its overall quality and accessibility. Such improvements are
likely to help human health, biodiversity and quality of life. Development that involves the loss of MOL in return for the creation of new open space elsewhere will not be considered appropriate. Appropriate development should be limited to small scale structures to support outdoor open space uses and minimise any adverse impact on the open character of MOL. Green chains are important to London’s open space network, recreation and biodiversity. They consist of footpaths and the open spaces that they link, which are accessible to the public. The open spaces and links within a Green Chain should be designated as MOL due to their Londonwide importance.

**Policy 7.18: Protecting local natural space and addressing local deficiency**

A.1.54 When assessing local open space needs LDFs should:

- Include appropriate designations and policies for the protection of local open space.
- Identify areas of public open space deficiency, using the open space categorisation set out in Table 7.2 as a benchmark for all the different types of open space identified therein.
- Ensure that future open space needs are planned for in areas with the potential for substantial change such as Opportunity Areas, Regeneration Areas, Intensification Areas and other local areas.
- Ensure that open space needs are planned in accordance with green infrastructure strategies to deliver multiple benefits.

A.1.55 Use the CABE Space/Mayor of London Best Practice Guidance ‘Open Space Strategies’ as guidance for developing policies on the proactive creation, enhancement and management of open space.

**Biodiversity**

**Policy 7.19 – Biodiversity and Access to Nature**

A.1.56 The Mayor will work with all relevant partners to ensure a proactive approach to the protection, enhancement, creation, promotion and management of biodiversity in support of the Mayor’s Biodiversity Strategy. This means planning for nature from the beginning of the development process and taking opportunities for positive gains for nature through the layout, design and materials of development proposals and appropriate biodiversity action plans.

A.1.57 Any proposals promoted or brought forward by the London Plan will not adversely affect the integrity of any European site of nature conservation importance (to include Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Ramsar, proposed and candidate sites) either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. Whilst all development proposals must address this policy, it is of particular importance when considering the following policies within the London Plan: 1.1, 2.1-2.17, 3.1, 3.3, 5.14, 5.15, 5.17, 5.20, 6.3, 7.14, 7.15, 7.25, and 7.29.

**Policy 7.21 – Trees and Woodlands**

A.1.58 Trees and woodlands should be protected, maintained, and enhanced, following the guidance of the London Tree and Woodland Framework (or any successor strategy). In collaboration with the Forestry Commission the Mayor will produce supplementary guidance on Tree Strategies to guide each borough’s production of a Tree Strategy covering the audit, protection, planting and management of trees and woodland. This should be linked to the borough’s Open Space Strategy.

A.1.59 In terms of LDF preparation:

- Boroughs should follow the advice of PPS 9 to protect ‘veteran’ trees and ancient woodland where these are not already part of a protected site.
- Boroughs should develop appropriate policies to implement their borough Tree Strategy.
Policy 7.24 – Blue Ribbon Network
A.1.60 The Blue Ribbon Network is a strategically important series of linked spaces. It should contribute to the overall quality and sustainability of London by prioritizing uses of the waterspace and land alongside it safely for water related purposes, in particular for passenger and freight transport. Regard should be paid to the Thames River Basin Management Plan.

Land for Food
Policy 7.22 – Land for Food
A.1.61 The Mayor will seek to encourage and support thriving farming and land-based sectors in London, particularly in the Green Belt.
A.1.62 Use of land for growing food will be encouraged nearer to urban communities via such mechanisms as ‘Capital Growth’.
A.1.63 LDF preparation: Boroughs should protect existing allotments. They should identify other potential spaces that could be used for commercial food production or for community gardening, including for allotments and orchards. Particularly in Inner and Central London innovative approaches to the provision of spaces may need to be followed, these could include the use of green roofs.

Children’s Play
Policy 3.6: Children and young people’s play and informal recreation facilities
A.1.64 The Mayor and appropriate organisations should ensure that all children and young people have safe access to good quality, well-designed, secure and stimulating play and informal recreation provision, incorporating trees and greenery wherever possible.
A.1.65 Development proposals that include housing should make provision for play and informal recreation, based on the expected child population generated by the scheme and an assessment of future needs. The Mayor’s Supplementary Planning Guidance ‘Providing for Children and Young People’s play and informal recreation’ sets out guidance to assist in this process.
A.1.66 Boroughs should:
- Undertake audits of existing play and informal recreation provision and assessments of need in their areas, considering the qualitative, quantitative and accessibility elements of play and informal recreation facilities.
- Produce strategies on play and informal recreation supported by LDF policies to improve access and opportunity for all children and young people in their area.

Burial Spaces
Policy 7.23 – Burial Spaces
A.1.67 The Mayor will work with boroughs, cemetery providers and other key stakeholders to protect existing burial spaces and to promote new provision.
A.1.68 LDF preparation:
A.1.69 Boroughs should ensure provision is made for London’s burial needs, including the needs of those groups for whom burial is the only option. Provision should be based on the principle of proximity to local communities and reflect the different requirements for types of provision.

Mayor of London Biodiversity Strategy
A.1.70 The Mayor’s Biodiversity Strategy sets out criteria and procedures for identifying land of importance for London’s biodiversity for protection in planning policies and identifying areas of deficiency in access to nature. Protecting the sites at all levels, serves to protect the significant areas of Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) priority habitat in London and most priority species.
However, protection of biodiversity outside designated sites will also be needed. The Mayor and the London Biodiversity Partnership have identified targets in Table 7.3 for the recreation and restoration of priority habitats, as recommended in PPS 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation. Broad areas where habitat restoration and recreation would be appropriate have been identified for each of the priority habitats.

A.1.71 Map 7.1 is an example of one of the maps showing the spatial distribution of the priority habitats that will be published by the London Biodiversity Partnership. It is intended that this will be developed as an interactive tool to assist implementation of the regional habitat targets. Priority should be placed on connecting fragmented habitat and increasing the size of habitat areas to increase a species’ resilience to climate change. Priority Species are identified in a BAP at any level (UK, London, borough).

Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation

A.1.72 The London Plan Consolidated with Alterations since 2004 (2008) in Policy 3D.13 Children and young people’s play and informal recreation strategies, outlines the requirement for borough’s and partners to ensure that all children have safe access to good quality, well designed, secure and stimulating play and informal recreation provision and the need for London boroughs to prepare play strategies to improve access and opportunity for young people in their area. Play strategies should provide comprehensive guidance on play provision, high quality design and integration of play provision into overall Open Space Strategies. To assist with such strategies, the Mayor produced a Guide to Preparing Play Strategies (2005).

A.1.73 London Play was commissioned by the Mayor of London to develop a Guide to Preparing Play Strategies (2005), a companion document to the Guide to Preparing Open Space Strategies. The guide sets out the methods for providing accessible children’s spaces with high quality, free and inclusive play opportunities.

A.1.74 The Mayoral SPG - Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation (2008) aims to help those involved in planning local neighbourhoods to engage with young Londoners to deliver real improvements in the quality of play spaces. The SPG relates to the implementation of Policy 3D.13 (2008) and acts as a companion to the Mayor’s Guide to Preparing Play Strategies. The SPG is tasked with providing more detailed guidance to assist with the implementation of Policy 3D.13 with particular emphasis on benchmarking.

A.1.75 The Guide to Preparing Play Strategies highlights the need to develop standards for play provision locally with an emphasis on quality and accessibility as opposed to overly prescriptive measures of mere quantity. This reflects Government policy guidance on recreation and open space (PPG17) which recognises that it is important to modify standards to reflect local need, identifying that consultation on children’s play needs and consideration of the socio-economic context of an area will enable boroughs such as Southwark to adapt measures accordingly. As a result The SPG indicates that the use of benchmark standards is recommended to establish:

- the Quantitative requirement for play provision;
- accessibility to play provision; and
- the Quality of play provision.

A.1.76 Benchmark Standards for Play and Informal Recreation: Draft SPG (2006) leads on from the Guide to Preparing Play Strategies. The Draft SPG indicates that in order to ensure future provision that meets the needs of children and young people, boroughs will need to assess not only the quantity, quality and current usage of existing play spaces and facilities but the current accessibility of the public realm against the needs of children and young people. “The preparation of play strategies will provide comprehensive guidance on play provision including quantitative and qualitative deficiencies in provision relative to future need as well as mechanisms to address these”.
A.1.77 The Draft SPG states that the development of benchmark standards for play and recreation will provide additional guidance to London boroughs in developing play strategies and a focused play policy and assist in securing funding for new and improved provision. “Standards should link to Play and Open Space Strategies and reflect local circumstances and needs”.

A.1.78 The value of setting standards have been summarised below:

- To establish a baseline level of provision for comparative purposes.
- To establish local and community needs.
- To enable an objective assessment of where the worst deficiencies in provision are located and for action to be taken.
- To set appropriate targets and priorities for different groups.
- To support external funding bids.
- To provide a negotiating position to secure on-site provision and where appropriate commuted payments as part of new development proposals.
- To address diversity issues and the sometimes differing needs of boys, girls, disabled children and those from minority ethnic groups.


A.1.79 The Mayor has produced a Guide to Preparing Open Space Strategies. It sets out how boroughs should undertake audits of existing open space and assessments of need in their area, considering both the qualitative and the quantitative elements of open space, wildlife sites, sports and recreational facilities, as part of an open space strategy. This strategy should take into account the cross-borough nature and use of many open spaces in London.

Open Space Strategies – Best Practice Guidance (Draft) 2008

A.1.80 The draft guidance provides advice on assessing the quantity and quality of open spaces and on identifying the needs of local communities and other users of open spaces. It also suggests ways of promoting open space improvements, including funding, the use of planning obligations and how to effectively engage the local community and establish collaborative partnerships.

Local Policy

Southwark Core Strategy

A.1.81 The Core Strategy, adopted in April 2011, is the key policy document. The Strategy is the first of a suite of development plan documents that will replace the adopted Unitary Development Plan over the next year or so. It puts forward a spatial vision, strategic objectives and policies for growth in the borough over the next 15 years, including locations for proposed new housing, retail and business development.

A.1.82 The main spatial themes that relate to open spaces include:

**Themes 1: Improving individual life chances**

A.1.83 Strategic Objective 1C – Be healthy and active indicates that open spaces will be protected so that local community will be able to enjoy using these spaces, including parks, nature reserves and the River Thames.

A.1.84 Strategic Objective 1E – Be safe identifies that the borough should be a safe place for people to live, visit and work.
Themes 2: Making the borough a better place for people

A.1.85 Strategic Objective 2F - Conserve and protect historic and natural places seeks to ensure that open spaces and biodiversity will be protected, made more accessible and improved.

A.1.86 The key policies of the Core Strategy in relation to open space are set out as follows:

**SP4 – Places for learning, enjoyment and healthy lifestyles**

A.1.87 Southwark Council will aim to develop flexible community spaces that can be shared by many groups. In particular, it supports the retention and improvement of facilities which encourage physical activity and promotes healthy lifestyles.

**SP11 – Open spaces and wildlife**

A.1.88 Southwark Council will support the protection of borough’s open space network, which includes sites of importance for nature conversation, Metropolitan Open Land, parks and other open spaces. There is a focus on protecting woodland and trees and encouraging green corridors along with improving access to and links between open spaces.

**Draft Southwark Playing Pitch Strategy 2009**

A.1.89 The draft Playing Pitch Strategy, published in 2009 provides an analysis of the existing provision of sports pitches within the borough including the quantity, quality and accessibility of existing provision and consideration of future needs through assessing changes in demand.

A.1.90 Playing fields and pitches offer a valuable resource for informal sport and play areas in Southwark. It is important to consider the changing characteristics of Southwark’s population as this may influence participation levels in different sports and therefore the demand for certain types of pitch facilities.

A.1.91 The main aims of the strategy are to:

- Protect current levels of provision through the planning process.
- Ensure that the type of facilities available meets the needs of a wide cross-section of the community, including adults and juniors.
- Improve and make accessible, playing pitches and ancillary facilities throughout the borough.
- Support the development of local sports clubs in meeting Sport England and wider NGB participation targets.
- Improve the health and wellbeing of residents by providing high quality opportunities for sporting activities.

A.1.92 Southwark’s playing pitches have an important role to play in increasing physical activity levels and improved health benefits in the borough. The Strategy seeks to ensure that is an accessible distribution of quality pitches and ancillary facilities that will be adequate for all current and projected increases in demand.

**Southwark’s Sport and Physical Activity Strategy 2009-2013**

A.1.93 The Strategy sets out a comprehensive action plan for sport and physical activity in Southwark. The broad aim of the strategy is to increase sport and physical activity participation in the borough. In seeking to raise activity levels across the borough, it is important that people have access to appropriate facilities and opportunities that meet their identified needs.

A.1.94 The strategy covers a four year period (2009-2013) and responds to a number of strategic drivers and local opportunities. The seven priority ‘workstreams’ for the future delivery of the strategy are as follows:

- Using physical activity for both the prevention and management of ill-health.
Maximising the use of planning policy in providing for sport and physical activity.

Providing a network of appropriate places and spaces for sport and physical activity.

Improving access and choice for the whole population.

Building and maintaining an effective multi-agency delivery system for sport and physical activity.

Maximising the use of London 2012 to promote physical activity.

Maximising the impact of all resources.

A.1.95 Southwark’s parks and opens spaces provide an opportunity for people to engage in a range of formal and informal physical activities. By delivering the right quality and types of open spaces in the most appropriate locations this can lead to the development of a network of open spaces that actively promote physical activity and sport to take place.

Disability and Access Strategy for Sport and Physical Activity

A.1.96 Disability sport and physical activity is a strong priority for the borough. This Strategy recognises the importance of inclusion and participation as well as access to sport by disabled people.

A.1.97 The action plan published in January 2009 focuses on directing local resources for this important area of sports development and disability provision. The Southwark Community Sport and Physical Activity Network (ProActive Southwark) was created to review local sports and physical activity provision and is responsible for the delivery of the action plan.

A.1.98 The priority themes for the action plan are summarised as follows:

- communications and dissemination of information;
- workforce development and disability awareness;
- facilities improvement;
- targeted resources and activity;
- school sports and community links;
- setting standards;
- cross partnership planning; and
- community and Voluntary sector support.

A.1.99 By overcoming the barriers to participation in sport for disabled people and other groups through the initiatives identified in Southwark’s Disability and Access Strategy, this will assist in raising physical activity levels and involvement in sporting activities for these identified groups.

Young Southwark: Children and Young People’s Participation Framework (2008)

A.1.100 This framework has a particular focus on encouraging children, young people and families to lead healthier lifestyles. The Young Southwark Partnership, is the Children’s Trust that is responsible for delivering the ‘Every Child Matters’ agenda which has five key outcomes:

- Be healthy;
- Stay Safe;
- Enjoy and achieve;
- Make a positive contribution; and
- Achieve economic well-being.
A.1.101 The framework supports Young Southwark’s commitment to engaging actively with children and young people in the design, delivery and review of services, priorities and policy choices. It aims to develop mechanisms and links between different groups, such as school councils, youth councils and youth forums in order to gather views on how their needs can be met.

**Southwark Play Plan (2008 – 2012)**

A.1.102 Southwark Play Strategy sets out Southwark Council’s commitment to support and develop play opportunities for children and young people in policy development, planning and service delivery.

A.1.103 The following priorities have been identified for improving play provision across the borough:

- Identify, monitor and fill the gaps in provision of services, and where necessary, invest in facilities to ensure that such services can be provided across the borough, through a strategic approach to commissioning.
- Ensure all children and young people have access to good quality play provision by improving the quality and availability of supervised and unsupervised play opportunities and by addressing the variable quality of services by adopting the Quality in Play standards framework.
- Improve and increase the level of services for disabled children and young people and those with special educational needs by addressing the main barriers to access and the factors that influence take up in provision, such as providing provision where access is made easier.
- Implement a whole systems participation framework to ensure children and young people are engaged in service design and delivery.
- Reconfigure play services in Southwark so that it is equipped to meet the challenges identified in “Activities for Children and Young People” to be delivered against the action plan contained in the Play Strategy.

A.1.104 The Play Strategy aims to promote the creation and maintenance of stimulating and challenging play environments that enable children and young people to develop their abilities. The Strategy promotes engagement with local children and young people to ensure that the right type of facilities to meet their specific needs. It is important that such play facilities are accessible and are of a suitable quality and quantity to encourage children and young people to utilise them.

**Southwark Strategy for Older People 2006-10**

A.1.105 The Strategy focuses on improving the health and well-being of older people. The plan focuses on encouraging older people to stay socially and physically active by making sure that the types of activities they want are available and that they are able to access these. The Council is engaged in a number of projects that involve:

- Supporting older people to encourage each other to take part in physical exercise.
- Encouraging older people to attend exercise and relaxation classes.
- Mapping all of the services in Southwark that are suitable for older people and improving their accessibility.
- Working with leisure centres to make the centres more user friendly to older people.

A.1.106 Southwark’s parks and open spaces have a key role to play in both the physical and mental health of older people, by providing an environment for relaxation, exercise and social engagement. It is important that these spaces are easily accessible and of suitable quality to encourage their use by this age group. This Strategy also promotes active engagement with older people to ensure that the correct types of facilities are made available to meet their specific needs.
The Safer Southwark Plan aims to deliver on the ‘staying safe’ part of the national ‘Every Child Matters’ agenda. The Safer Southwark Partnership undertakes an annual review of crime and anti-social behaviour trends for the borough and results in resourcing recommendations for the rolling plan.

The plan considers that the ‘constructive use of leisure’ is important as it provides young people with activities to do that may contribute to the reduction of local youth crime. The Southwark Community Games programme provides a range of sporting activity across all community council areas utilising facilities in parks and on estates. There are also a number of projects managed by community wardens that respond to local issues, e.g. a cycling course for Peckham young people at Herne Hill velodrome. The Safer Southwark Plan recognises the importance of providing quality open spaces and facilities that provide the right type of facilities to suit the needs of young people. These facilities can promote educational development, increase physical activity levels that have health and well-being benefits and ultimately discourage young people from engaging in more anti-social activities.

The Southwark Biodiversity Action Plan outlines how Southwark Council will work with its partners to conserve, enhance and promote biodiversity in the London over the period 2006 to 2010. The five key objectives for the plan include:

- Objective 1 - To protect biodiversity in Southwark’s parks and open spaces.
- Objective 2 - To enhance habitats in parks and open spaces.
- Objective 3 - Promote biodiversity in parks and open spaces.
- Objective 4 - Create a high quality sustainable environment through biodiversity actions.
- Objective 5 - To ensure that everyone has an equal opportunity to share prosperity within the borough and to improve the quality of life for those most disadvantaged through biodiversity actions.

The action plan also encourages the development of Working Groups that are responsible for delivering three Habitat Action Plans for Parks and Open Spaces, Woodland and Private Gardens. The green spaces in Southwark perform a vital functions as areas for nature conservation and biodiversity. It is important that these spaces are maintained as they also assist in supporting regeneration and improving the quality of life for communities by providing visually attractive and accessible open spaces.

The Report provides an update on the actions and achievements of the Southwark Biodiversity Partnership. This aim of the partnership is to conserve, enhance and promote biodiversity across the borough, in line with national and regional priority habitat and species targets.

The Report puts forward opportunities that could assist Southwark Council in continuing to deliver its Biodiversity Action Plan “Work for Wildlife”, published in 2006. The 2007 report identified that potentially the number of SINC’s in Southwark should be increased with several sites justifying designation as SINC’s, which includes:

- Durand’s Wharf;
- Surrey Canal Walk;
- King Stairs Gardens;
- Deal Porters Walk; and
• Nursery Row Park.

A.1.114 The management of biodiversity is particularly important in Southwark as the conservation and enhancement of habitats and species assists in improving the overall health of the borough, providing educational opportunities and making the borough a greener place.

Parks Action and Improvement Plan

A.1.115 A series of park management plans have been produced for ten key parks within the borough. The purpose of the plans is to set out the key aspirations and action points for the further enhancement of these significant public open spaces, which are outlined as follows:

Bermondsey Spa Gardens

A.1.116 This plans sets out a number of targets and aspirations for the management for Bermondsey Spa Gardens over the period 2007 to 2016, as set out below:

• Improve signage e.g. community notice boards.
• Maintain security e.g. effective collaboration between Wardens, Community Outreach team and Area Parks Manager.
• Maintain park cleanliness e.g. effective borough wide grounds maintenance contract.
• Engage with community e.g. develop park volunteer workforce.
• Raise further awareness of dog fouling, e.g. repainting bins, campaign and events.
• Increase biodiversity in the park e.g. planting of a wild flower meadow.
• Enhance sustainability e.g. increase conservation, develop park volunteer workforce, enhance relationships with voluntary and community sector and develop a site specific management plan.

Brimmington Park

A.1.117 This plans sets out a number of targets and aspirations for the management of Brimmington Park over the period 2010 to 2012, as set out below:

• Improve entrances, e.g. through introducing some more planting at each entrance point, hanging baskets throughout park.
• Improve signage e.g. community notice board.
• Raise further awareness of dog fouling, e.g. campaign and events.
• Broaden the user base e.g. through the activities of Community Outreach team.
• Maintain security e.g. effective collaboration between Wardens, Community Outreach team and Area Parks Manager.
• Maintain park cleanliness e.g. effective borough wide grounds maintenance contract.
• Management practices should take into account the most recent developments in sustainable practices.
• Enhance sustainability e.g. increase conservation, enhance relationships with voluntary and community sector and develop a site specific management plan.

Russia Dock Woodland

A.1.118 This plans sets out a number of targets and aspirations for the management of Russia Dock Woodland over the period 2009 to 2018, as set out below:

• Improve signage e.g. community notice board and map boards for navigation.
• Introduce signage outside of park.
• Maintain security e.g. effective collaboration between Wardens, Community Outreach team and Area Parks Manager, installation of CCTV.
• Maintain park cleanliness e.g. effective borough wide grounds maintenance contract.
• Management practices should take into account the most recent developments in sustainable practices.
• Enhance sustainability e.g. increase conservation, develop park volunteer workforce, enhance relationships with voluntary and community sector and develop a site specific management plan.

Southwark Park
A.1.119 This plans sets out a number of targets and aspirations for the management of Southwark Park over the period 2009 to 2012, as set out below:

• Maintain signage, update as necessary.
• Promote park through educational/interpretational means e.g. leaflets, trails, signage.
• Broaden the user base e.g. through the activities of Community Outreach team.
• Maintain security e.g. effective collaboration between Wardens, Community Outreach team and Area Parks Manager along with CCTV.
• Explore potential for partnership working and establishing horticulture apprenticeship programmes.
• Enhance sustainability e.g. sustainability guidelines for all new buildings, develop energy action plans for all the park’s buildings, create spring and summer meadows, increase conservation areas, enhance the quality of water bodies and enhance relationships with voluntary and community sector.
• Encourage routine tree maintenance in line with the borough-wide Tree Strategy.

Brunswick Park
A.1.120 This plans sets out a number of targets and aspirations for the management of Brunswick Park over the period 2010 to 2019, as set out below:

• Introduce signage outside of park to encourage visitors.
• Improved planting project to ensure entrances are inviting and have a strong visual impact.
• Maintain security e.g. effective collaboration between Wardens, Community Outreach team and Area Parks Manager.
• Maintain park cleanliness e.g. effective borough wide grounds maintenance contract.
• Enhance opportunities for wildlife e.g. installation of bird boxes.
• Management practices should take into account the most recent developments in sustainable practices.
• Enhance sustainability e.g. increase conservation, develop park volunteer workforce, enhance relationships with voluntary and community sector and develop a site specific management plan.

St Mary’s Frobisher Park
A.1.121 This plans sets out a number of targets and aspirations for the management of St Mary’s Frobisher Park over the period 2011 to 2014, as set out below:
• Improve entrances e.g. introducing some more planting at each entrance point, hanging baskets throughout.

• Improve signage e.g. additional community notice boards.

• Broaden the user base e.g. through the activities of Community Outreach team.

• Maintain security e.g. effective collaboration between Wardens, Community Outreach team and Area Parks Manager.

• Raise further awareness of dog fouling, e.g. campaign and events.

• Maintain park cleanliness e.g. effective borough wide grounds maintenance contract.

• Management practices should take into account the most recent developments in sustainable practices.

• Enhance sustainability practices e.g. more detailed site specific management plan.

• Encourage community involvement e.g. facilitating a Friends group.

Dulwich Park

A.1.122 This plans sets out a number of targets and aspirations for the management of Dulwich Park over the period 2009 to 2012, as set out below:

• Broaden the user base e.g. through the activities of Community Outreach team.

• Maintain security e.g. effective collaboration between Wardens, Community Outreach team and Area Parks Manager along with CCTV. A close relationship is maintained with the local Police in monitoring this open space.

• Maintain park cleanliness e.g. effective borough wide grounds maintenance contract.

• Proposal to help control the numbers of cars entering the car park at peak times.

• Explore potential for partnership working and establishing horticulture apprenticeship programmes.

• Proposal for a new boathouse.

• Enhance sustainability practices e.g. sustainability guidelines for all new buildings, develop energy action plans for all the park’s buildings, create spring and summer meadows, increase conservation areas, enhance the quality of water bodies and enhance relationships with voluntary and community sector and develop a parks volunteer workforce to maintain and manage a number of wildlife areas.

Sunray Gardens

A.1.123 This plans sets out a number of targets and aspirations for the management of Sunray Gardens over the period 2009 to 2018, as set out below:

• More signage by the lake to indicate that there is a specific spot for bird feeding.

• More signage being put in place by North Dulwich train station.

• Maintain security e.g. effective collaboration between Wardens, Community Outreach team and Area Parks Manager. A close relationship is maintained with the local Police in monitoring this open space.

• Encourage wildlife opportunities e.g. bat boxes close to the lake.

• Maintain park cleanliness e.g. effective borough wide grounds maintenance contract.
• Enhance sustainability practices e.g. site specific management plan, increase conversation areas, enhance relationships with voluntary and community sector and develop a parks volunteer workforce to maintain and manage a number of wildlife areas.

**Geraldine Mary Harmsworth Park**

A.1.124 This plans sets out a number of targets and aspirations for the management of Geraldine Mary Harmsworth Park over the period 2010 to 2019, as set out below:

- Improve entrances, e.g. more planting at each entrance point.
- Introduce signage outside the park to encourage visitors.
- Broaden the user base e.g. through the activities of Community Outreach team.
- Raise further awareness of dog fouling, e.g. campaign and events.
- Enhance sustainability practices – site specific management plan.
- Engage with community to enhance the ecology of the site.

**Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common**

A.1.125 This plans sets out a number of targets and aspirations for the management of Peckham and Rye Park over the period 2009 to 2012, as set out below:

- Resurfacing of car park, installation of speed bumps.
- Consideration of designated routes for cyclists.
- Encourage more events into the park e.g. summer theatre programme.
- Introduce a seasonal programme of conservation and installation of more bat/bird boxes.
- Enhance sustainability practices - develop a parks volunteer workforce to maintain and manage a number of wildlife areas.

**Southwark Corporate Plan**

A.1.126 The Corporate Plan summarises the council’s priorities for the period 2009 to 2011 setting out key measures and milestones to monitor progress.

A.1.127 ‘Promoting healthy and independent living’ is a key theme of the plan that seeks to ensure the continued maintenance and investment in public spaces and leisure facilities to promote healthy, active lives.

A.1.128 Another major theme is ‘valuing the environment’, which focuses on maintaining a clean and green borough for local people, to encourage a feeling of safety, as well as ensuring people can enjoy the parks and open spaces for physical activity, events and community activities.

A.1.129 Within Southwark it is important that the parks and open spaces are well-maintained and of a sufficient quality, as these spaces perform a vital role in providing communities with a sense of place, opportunities for recreation, relaxation, health and fitness and opportunity for events that reinforce social cohesion.

**Better Bankside Urban Forest Framework**

A.1.130 The urban design strategy and framework for Bankside Urban Forest is a programme of works that aims to improve the quality of the public realm and landscaping in the Bankside area, stretching from the riverside to the Elephant and Castle, and between Blackfriars Road and Borough High Street.

A.1.131 Southwark council has worked collaboratively with Better Bankside and the Tate to drive forward the concept of the urban forest, which will create a network of green connections between the emerging developments in Bankside and the existing open spaces across Southwark.
The key projects that are illustrated in the framework include:
- creation of a Tate Modern playground;
- the creation of a planted arch;
- widening of Flat Iron Square;
- improvements and landscaping along Redcross Way; and
- transformation of the Great Suffolk Street arches.

The framework seeks to promote significant environmental improvements (with an emphasis on heritage and sustainability) to the Bankside area. The success of this strategy in achieving these high quality environmental improvements is reliant upon the active participation and collaboration of many agencies, organisations, developers and the council.

**North Southwark Play and Open Space Assessment**

The assessment (published in February 2009) provides a general perception of the quality and location of the play and open spaces for the Elephant and Castle Regeneration Area that was obtained from site visits. The types of sites include Metropolitan Open Land, borough Open Land and other open spaces that are featured within the Southwark plan, such as Burgess Park and Geraldine Mary Harmsworth Park.

The Open Space assessment provides a summary of the character and quality of the landscape and facilities, movement and permeability, enclosure of the space development and location and accessibility of the open spaces. As the assessment only provides a brief summary within a limited study area, it is necessary to undertake a more robust qualitative and quantitative assessment of all the open spaces in the borough as a whole.

**NHS Southwark’s Strategic Plan 2010-2015**

The five year NHS Strategic Plan sets out an ambitious programme to improve health and the provision of healthcare for Southwark residents. The Plan commits the NHS to working in partnership with a range of organisations across the Borough, including the Council, on improving health for local residents. This includes plans to tackle unhealthy weight and increase levels of physical activity. Good quality open space is vital in achieving these objectives, with well designed open spaces linked to an increase in physical activity and exercise, an improvement in people’s mental well-being and longer life expectancy.

**Tree Management Strategy**

The Southwark tree management strategy sets out a policy framework for the trees owned, managed and protected by the Council. The key objective of the strategy is to improve the maintenance and management of the Borough’s trees in order to enhance the condition and overall safety of Southwark’s tree stock. The strategy recognises that trees have a wide range of environmental, aesthetic, economic, health and biodiversity benefits and should be protected where necessary. Trees form a key part of the character of the Borough’s open spaces and also help to facilitate green links between spaces along quieter streets.

**Cemetery strategy**

The Cemetery strategy establishes our commitment to preserve cemetery land for use as burial grounds. Cemeteries are recognised as appropriate use of Borough Open Land and Metropolitan Open Land and are a valued resource of open space in the borough. The strategy addresses the shortfall of burial space in the borough’s cemeteries and sets out a detailed action plan to ensure the continuity of burial provision within Southwark until 2035. In making provision for burials the Council places a priority on the use of any currently unused land within its existing cemeteries.
Air Quality Improvement Strategy and Action Plan

A.1.139 The air quality strategy details how we plan to make air quality a priority in the process of carrying out our work. This plan will be reviewed in 2017.

A.1.140 The air quality action plan contains measures that we propose to improve air quality in Southwark. These measures range from reducing the impact of traffic pollution to how we monitor air quality within the borough. The action plan will be reviewed annually.

Byelaws for Pleasure Grounds, Public Walks and Open Spaces

A.1.141 These byelaws control activities in pleasure grounds, public walks and open spaces. This includes byelaws on protecting these public spaces, their wildlife and the public, horse riding, cycling, children's play areas, dangerous games and sports, protection of waterways, powered model aircraft and provides for the removal of offenders.
Appendix B
Summary of Sub-Area Strategies
# B.1 Borough, Bankside and London Bridge

## B.1.1

The Bankside, Borough and London Bridge Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is currently at draft stage. Table b.1 provides a summary of the development proposals set out within the SPD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>Amount Required</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Units:</strong></td>
<td>1,900 new homes required to 2026 – generally as part of mixed use flat schemes and warehouse conversions</td>
<td>Vision/ Sec. 4.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affordable Housing</td>
<td>For developments of 10+ units:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Market Housing</td>
<td>• 35% affordable housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 60% two or more bedrooms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At London Bridge and north of Blackfriars Road, 10% min. of dwellings must have three or more bedrooms; elsewhere, this figure is 20%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Max. of 5% studios and only for private housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 10% min. to be wheelchair accessible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Must meet minimum overall floor sizes (p.29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>650 – 1100 habitable rooms per hectare forms the general density target for the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Land Allocations</strong></td>
<td>400,000 sq m to 500,000 sq m additional business floorspace (particular focus on meeting high quality office demand for Central London)</td>
<td>Vision – Sec. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Floorspace</td>
<td>25,000 new jobs to 2026 across a range of industries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job Creation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population Growth</strong></td>
<td>Existing c. 14,000 and projected to grow</td>
<td>Sec. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
<td>Existing provision includes the following main sites as well as several smaller spaces:</td>
<td>Fig. 1/ Sec. 2/ App. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing Provision</td>
<td>North</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Needs</td>
<td>Bankside and the Thames;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potters Fields Park (refurbished 2007);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jubilee Walk;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tate Modern Gardens;                                     <strong>South</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leathermarket Gardens; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mint Street Park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In general, the spaces in the north area along the Thames provide relief for visitors to relax and host events; in the south the spaces are quieter and focus on meeting the needs of the local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Includes as well as several smaller spaces:
Development Type | Amount Required | Reference
--- | --- | ---
population in terms of sports and leisure facilities. There are three SINCs in the area:  
- River Thames;  
- Leathermarket Gardens; and  
- Snowfields Nature Garden. Amenity areas within estates provide opportunities for access to nature, gardening and food growing.

Issues/needs noted in the strategy:
- Additional greenery required to offer shading.
- Increased opportunities to experience wildlife and nature required.
- Improved safety and connectivity for walking and cycling desired.
- Lack of a major park and access to nature, with few accessible sites of nature conservation importance, esp. in the north.
- Many of the green spaces are well used and would benefit from improvement, including the addition of opportunities for food growing.
- Green spaces on Guy’s Hospital site are inward looking and need to be better linked to become community assets, connected to the green links through Bermondsey Village.
- ‘Capital House and Beckett House’ is identified as one of a series of important sites and includes open space in need of preservation and enhancement – this is included within the SPG proposals for the site, including delivery of public access to the space.

Future Proposals

B.1.2 The SPD makes a general commitment to ‘protection and improvement’ of the parks, gardens and other open spaces in the area. Achieving an increase in the amount of shading and greenery in the area, to help adapt to hotter summers, is presented as important within the SPD. This will also assist in overcoming identified issues in terms of the lack of opportunities for people to experience nature and wildlife.

B.1.3 Creating green links and the delivery of connectivity between green spaces is presented as highly desirable through the SPD, together with the need to ensure public and communal spaces are child friendly and offer opportunities for informal play and interaction.

B.1.4 Safety and security is a key issue in the SPD. The principles of Secured by Design are supported as a means of using design to discourage crime and anti-social behaviour.

B.1.5 The greenspace network proposals are depicted within the Vision, reproduced here:
Reference is made to the following as key development initiatives with an element of open space within them:

- The creation of London Bridge station as a ‘destination’ to deliver an attractive, convenient, lively and friendly environment. The SPD states that ‘a new public plaza will be created linking The Shard/London Bridge Tower and London Bridge Place to a remodelled bus station and the entrance to the above ground station’.

- Delivery of connectivity between proposals in Borough, Bankside and London Bridge and the neighbouring area of Elephant and Castle – specific reference is made to sharing social and economic infrastructure, including sports, leisure and community facilities and there is a commitment to coordinating growth and development across the boundary. Borough High Street will be a key focus of linkages and the SPD states that there will be better links through the inn-yards to quiet spaces off the High Street. Proposals for regeneration of Blackfriars Road South will also link to Elephant and Castle.

- There is a commitment within the Vision to delivering a ‘good quality network of public spaces and links between them’, and improving quality. Trees and landscaping improvements will be used to make the area greener. This is connected to delivering improved walking and cycling networks, also linked to the Legible London Signage Project, which is noted in Appendix 3 as being underway.

- There is a commitment to delivering enhancement to the Hospital Precinct to knit it into London Bridge. This includes creating a mix of uses that draw activity into the precinct, improve public access to and the quality of green spaces in the precinct and delivering the transformation of Boland House forecourt into a public square. Other proposals for the London Bridge sub-area include creating a major new cultural facility next to Potters Field Park.

- Major public realm improvements are to be delivered at Blackfriars Road North. Particular reference is made to the intention to cluster tall buildings around the northern end of the road, creating a backdrop to the provision of new public spaces. Reference is also made to improving Nelson Square Gardens; and extending Christ Church Gardens through the provision of a connected open space within the Blackfriars Road Site Development Proposals. These proposals form part of the Borough and Bankside Streetscape.
Improvement Project, approved in 2007. This Project will deliver 21 new public realm, open space and transport projects across the Borough and Bankside Community Council Area.

- Bermondsey Streetscape Improvement Programme was approved in 2008. It includes 31 new public realm, open space and transport projects across the Bermondsey Community Council area. This includes the improvement of spaces within the Bermondsey Conservation Area. Specific schemes referenced in the SPD include improving St Mary Magdelene Churchyard; completing the final stage of the Tanner Street Park refurbishment; and the general improvement of spaces and addition of facilities into spaces to meet community needs.

- London Bridge Business Improvement District (BID) Street Enhancement Plan is a project that aims to deliver pocket parks, providing a complement to the existing provision of small-scale public spaces serving the local working community. Examples include providing a public space at the intersection of Ewer Street and Union Street, creating pedestrian priority along Ewer Street to link with the new laneway precinct; and creating a new park behind Tate Modern as part of the new extension.

- The Strategy for the Park Street area includes the following public realm projects:
  - Creating a new green space on the Crossbones Graveyard site.
  - Upgrading the existing pocket park on corner of Maiden Lane and Park Street to make it more inviting and open to the street, as well as providing seating closer to the road.
  - Improving green spaces in Gatehouse Square to create a more effective open space for the area.
  - Opening up the entrance to Southwark Bridge Road.
  - Developing green links through the area linking existing pocket parks to the local green chain network (part of the larger Green Chains project across the South East of London – see the development descriptions for Dulwich).

- Bankside Urban Forest will improve public spaces and create better access into areas south of the River and to and from the new Blackfriars Station. This includes extending and improving Flat Iron Square to make it a focal point in the Park Street area. Bankside Urban Forest is proposed to improve public spaces and accessibility². Details are provided in Appendix 7 of the SPD and reproduced here:

  ‘Bankside Urban forest is a programme of works to improve the quality of the public realm and landscaping in the Bankside area, stretching from the riverside to the Elephant and Castle, and between Blackfriars Road and Borough High Street. Southwark Council has worked closely with Better Bankside and the Tate to drive forward the concept of the urban forest, which sets out an approach with a ‘Forest’ identity to creating a network of green connections between the emerging developments in Bankside and the existing open spaces across Southwark’.

- In the borough (west) area, the following open space improvements are referenced:
  - Improving Mint Street Park by opening the park to the street, greening over redundant road-heads and improving play facilities, landscaping and seating.
  - Creating a green corridor linking Little Dorrit Park and the St George the Martyr churchyard on Tabard Street and north-south between Mint Street Park and the new Crossbones open space.

² The SPD states that any proposals or public realm projects relating to the Riverside Walk should involve the National Trails Office.
- Improve Little Dorrit Park to improve pedestrian links between Borough High Street and Southwark Bridge Road via Redcross Way.

- Bankside Urban Forest will improve public spaces and create better access into areas south of the River.

- Providing good quality green spaces on estates, including spaces for food growing.

- The Light and the End of the Tunnel project is transforming 10km of railway viaducts (1000 adjoining arches) into light and safe passageways. Funds have been used to clean, illuminate (with white light), commission public art and transform the pedestrian environment to make the viaducts safe and functional spaces.

- Stoney Street/Winchester Walk transport and streetscape improvement scheme focuses on enhancing the public realm and movement around Borough Market.

- Phases 2b and 2c of the Whites Ground skate park improvement scheme are supported. These will deliver a new youth facility. In addition, there is a commitment to improvements to play-spaces and multi-games courts in parks and residential areas.

B.1.7 Planning obligation priorities are identified within the SPD. These priorities include increasing the quality and quantity of open spaces; and increasing the quality of the public realm. The SPD identifies the following open spaces as priorities for improvement:

- New Crossbones Open Space;

- Little Dorrit Park improvements;

- St James Churchyard refurbishment;

- Nelson Square improvements;

- Webb Street Park improvements;

- Tanner Street Park improvements;

- St John’s churchyard extension;

- Mint Street Adventure Playground and Park improvements;

- Improvements to and the provision of new play facilities and playgrounds across the area;

- Improvements to Snowsfields; and

- Green links between open spaces.

B.2 Elephant and Castle

B.2.1 The Elephant and Castle Enterprise Quarter SPD, adopted by the Council, provides a development strategy for the Elephant and Castle Area. Table B.2 summarises the scale and type of development set out in the document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>Amount Required</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affordable Housing</td>
<td>6000 new homes in the Central Activities Zone (CAZ) of the London Plan (2011) between 2001 and 2026. Affordable element of new schemes to be 50:50 social rented and intermediate housing. No specific target provided for the Elephant and Castle area.</td>
<td>Southwark Plan Policy 6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Type</td>
<td>Amount Required</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Land Allocations</td>
<td>• Floorspace&lt;br&gt;• Job Creation&lt;br&gt;4200 new jobs in the CAZ of the London Plan (2011) between 2001 and 2026.&lt;br&gt;No specific target provided for the Elephant and Castle area.</td>
<td>The London Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Growth</td>
<td>Not referenced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (parks, amenity space, natural greenspace, cemetery, children’s play facility, allotment)</td>
<td>This part of North Southwark is lacking in open space and existing open spaces are under pressure.&lt;br&gt;There is no public open space within the Enterprise Quarter (EQ) – the closest open spaces lie on the edges of the area and are poorly connected to the EQ.&lt;br&gt;The SPD states that ‘generally pedestrians experience the area as an environment that is defensively designed and feels hostile’. There is a recognised need to reduce the negative effect of transport on the quality of the public realm, particularly in respect of:&lt;br&gt;• St. George’s Circus, where the highway design allows vehicles to move at traffic speeds that intimidate pedestrians.&lt;br&gt;• junction of Southwark Bridge Road and Borough Road, where there is no formal pedestrian crossing .&lt;br&gt;• junction of Keyworth Street and Southwark Bridge Road, where the design of the space is dominated by highway requirements rather than meeting the needs of pedestrians.&lt;br&gt;There are issues associated with failure of the built environment to adequately/ appropriately enclose public space, resulting in adverse effects on the success of spaces.&lt;br&gt;St George’s Circus is identified as requiring specific action, delivering an enhanced public realm that reflects the heritage of the built form in this area.</td>
<td>Appendix I pt. 5&lt;br&gt;SPD p.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Future Proposals**

**B.2.2** The Vision for the EZ is:

“A distinctive university quarter, part of a thriving and sustainable town centre, that supports a range of university related and other businesses, including recreation, entertainment and cultural uses, and also accommodates a variety of residents and local facilities and services. A place that is safe and convenient on foot, with attractive public streets and spaces and memorable buildings to enjoy.”

**B.2.3** The public realm development framework is based on the following elements:
• Traffic free public spaces, where pedestrianisation or pedestrian priority is implemented to create new pedestrian space, including key public space nodes.

• Green links, forming safe pedestrian links with good surveillance.

• Strategic gateways to the area as a whole, which link the EQ to other areas and to public transport nodes. These use public spaces to ‘announce’ the destination, including tree planting and structural hard landscaping to complement a limited range of high quality materials that will create unity across the EQ. There are also a number of gateways into the heart of the area, which link the university to the wider area and to public transport nodes.

• Improvements to key streets (project 5c relates to the boulevard enhancement of Borough Road through the planting of street trees and a formal lighting scheme; project 5b relates to similar boulevard treatment for Newington Causeway; and there will also be a project for London Road, to be determined once there is clarity regarding Cross-Rail Tram proposals in this location).

• Improvements to secondary pedestrian routes/service routes.

• Other aspirational elements; and other transport improvements to pedestrian, cycle and bus facilities. These are yet to be fully defined within the strategy, but will adhere to the following principles.
  - All EQ uses and users can benefit from a high quality public realm and all developments will place some demands on the public realm within the EQ. All developments should therefore contribute towards public realm improvements.
  - The key public realm projects are those to provide public space for pedestrians in order to help address the impact on existing public open spaces, and those to facilitate connections to public transport nodes on-foot.
  - All developments should contribute towards one or more of these projects.

B.2.4 The SPD places considerable emphasis on the significant role that the London South Bank University (LSBU) has in shaping the development of this area, primarily arising from the scale of landholdings, local employment contribution (1,700 staff and £650m p.a. contribution to the UK economy) and substantial student population, recorded at 23,754 in 2006/07. In addition, the SPD notes that the LSBU Estate Plan forecasts significant growth in student numbers between 2004 and 2020, associated with a requirement for an additional 33,000spm of additional floorspace to accommodate them.

B.2.5 The SPD cites one of the main opportunities as being the creation of a sense of place that feels like a university quarter with ‘an outward-looking urban campus that is attractive and welcoming to everyone, including University staff, students and visitors but also local residents and employees.’ Reference is made to the need to create a variety of places and spaces for people to enjoy, both to facilitate movement around the area, but also to encourage people to stop in them. The core objectives for the public realm are as follows (SPG sec. 2.2.4):
  • “Create a safe and attractive public realm that maximises pedestrian space and pedestrian priority.”
  • Create a sense of place through introducing a consistent character suitable for a university quarter, with variations for different streets and spaces.
  • Introduce a variety of public spaces including public open spaces, green links, roof gardens and public squares and aim to promote and support biodiversity.”
B.2.6 There is an aspiration within the SPG to reinforce the character of strategic gateways into the area from the north, with specific reference made in Section 3.4 to:

- St. George’s Circus, to reinforce the character of the circus, to increase the area of usable pedestrian space around the perimeter of the circus and to enhance the setting of listed buildings and the monument.

- Newington Causeway/ Borough Road junction, in association with development of the Triangle site, to create a sense of place and to make the pedestrian areas of each space more usable.
• To reinforce the formal ‘boulevard’ character of streets leading to St. George’s Circus, supplementing the existing mature street trees on Lambeth Road and Borough Road where necessary and introducing new tree planting on London Road.

B.2.7 The strategy envisages that a pedestrian priority space should be created at the heart of the EQ area to accommodate informal pedestrian activity as well as movement (p.18). The SPD also states that ‘developments will be encouraged to provide public space or public open space on-site or off-site in appropriate locations, such as those identified within this SPD’ (section 3.4).

B.2.8 Planning contributions will be used to deliver the public realm elements of the SPD. In particular, it is states that housing developments will be expected to either provide or contribute towards the provision of public space/public open space, reflecting and seeking to address the general lack of local amenity space in the area.

B.2.9 The Public Realm principles set out in the SPG include:

• “To establish a character for each of Newington Causeway and Southwark Bridge Road as ‘urban streets’, through the coherent use of high quality landscape design, materials and details.
• To create a pedestrian priority area with limited vehicular access to act as a public space for the area, along Keyworth Street, Southwark Bridge Road (south), Ontario Street and the London Road car park.
• To create ‘green links’ through the area to link into the Keyworth Street pedestrian priority area and to each of the open spaces on the periphery. These links should be attractive for pedestrian use, with street trees and planting where possible within the street space and in private areas that adjoin the street.
• To contribute towards the creation of a strategic pedestrian link between Elephant and Castle and the River Thames at Tate Modern, by providing a pedestrian route following the east side of the railway.
• To provide public spaces to act as focal points within the area:
  - at the junction of Thomas Doyle Street and Keyworth Street; and
  - within the Triangle Site, as part of a development of that site.
• To enhance the pedestrian environment at gateways into the LSBU ‘urban campus’ at:
  - the junction of Borough Road/ Southwark Bridge Road;
  - Ontario Street where it meets London Road; and
  - Southwark Bridge Road, where it meets Newington Causeway.
• To encourage the introduction of public or semi-public courtyards, with tree planting and other soft landscape where possible, as part of development proposals.
• To consider opportunities to integrate public art into the public realm either as part of development proposals or within streets and spaces.
• To help make sure that the micro climate in all parts of the public realm is comfortable for use and supports a wider variety of pedestrian activity, both in terms of movement but also more static, social activities.
• To investigate opportunities for sustainable design in the public realm, including the potential for sustainable urban drainage systems, energy efficient lighting and sustainable procurement of materials”.

B.2.10 The SPG identifies seven key development opportunities within the EQ. The public realm elements of the proposals for these opportunity sites are summarised here:
- St George’s Circus – LSBU Site: creation of a semi-public external courtyard space for LSBU; and potential for the creation of courtyard/atrium space to link new development to the listed terrace of buildings that front the Circus.

- Borough Road – LSBU Borough Road and Tower Buildings: creation of a public space as a setting for the Borough Road Building when approached from Borough Road east; review of potential to provide a public space fronting Kell Street, to be framed by taller buildings; and, if a pavilion is created at the corner of Borough Road/Southwark Bridge Road, develop new areas of public realm.

- The Triangle Site: creation of a courtyard space with public access within the site; and creation of an element of the ‘green links’ network to link the EQ with open spaces, via a route between the railway arches and Newington Causeway.

- TfL Railway Sidings: decking of the sidings to provide amenity space to the west of Notre Dame School, to include space for the school and amenity space for the development.

Figure B.3 - Public Realm Strategy – Elements and Projects: Elephant and Castle

Table B.3 - Summary of Development Proposals: Walworth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>Amount Required</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Affordable Housing                    | Part of the Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area, required to contribute to the 6,000 new homes to 2026 target.  
  Envisages that delivery in Walworth will be flats. | Sec. 3/Sec. 5 – character and quality                                         |
<p>| • Market Housing                        |                                                                                  |                         |
| Employment Land Allocations             |                                                                                  | Sec. 3                  |
| • Floorspace                            | Part of the Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area, required to contribute to the 4,200 new jobs to 2026 target. |                         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>Amount Required</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Creation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Growth</td>
<td>Not referenced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (parks, amenity space, natural greenspace, cemetery, children’s play facility, allotment)</td>
<td>None at present. Requirement for amenity space to serve planned new mixed use development proposals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Future Proposals**

1.2 The creation of a new public square at Walworth Square/ Faraday Square, located immediately to the north of the existing Town Hall, is the main public space proposal within this action area, which forms part of the wider Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area. In addition, there is a proposal to remodel Heygate Street to create a tree lined boulevard. The area will benefit from the railway arch refurbishment proposals designed to deliver new active uses.

1.3 The development principles governing the AAP are illustrated in the public realm strategy. This envisages the creation of partially enclosed courtyard amenity spaces. The principles of greatest relevance in considering the development of the public realm include:

- Enclose private/ shared amenity/ landscaped spaces to the rear, overlooked by residential uses and balconies.
- Provide a high standard of residential amenity in terms of privacy and outlook, natural daylight and sunlight, ventilation, amenity space, safety and security for existing and new residents.

The SPD indicates that public realm improvements form one of the topics for planning obligation negotiations – this will form a key delivery mechanism.
B.3 Canada Water and Rotherhithe

B.3.1 The Canada Water Area Action Plan (AAP) is a plan to regenerate the area around Canada Water. It sets out a vision for how the area will change over the period leading up to 2026. This is
supported by a strategy with policies put in place by to achieve this vision, as well as a delivery plan for implementing the vision.

B.3.2 The Plan includes proposals to expand retail provision within the main town centre area of Canada Water by 35,000sq.m, as well as a minimum of 2,500 net new homes in the Core Area between 2011 and 2026. Outside the Core area, there is capacity for around 800 additional homes.

Approach to Open Space

B.3.3 The approach to open space in the plan is set out in Policy 18: Open spaces and biodiversity, which explains that the strategy is to protect and maintain and improve a network of open spaces (shown indicatively on Figure 10 within the Plan), green corridors and habitat for wildlife. The policy specifically seeks (in line with the Core Strategy) to:

- Protect important open spaces as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL), Borough Open Land (BOL) and Other Open Space (OOS).
- Allocate The Former Nursery and St Pauls Sports Ground as open spaces and bring them back into active use.
- Protect Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) and ensure that development does not result in a loss of biodiversity.

B.3.4 Development in the core area must:

- Provide high quality public open spaces. These should have variety of functions, which could include a market, children’s play areas, performance space, ecological and learning areas, places to sit, relax and take part in recreational activities such as fishing.
- Provide safe, direct and attractive pedestrian and cycle routes to connect open spaces and help link space into the surrounding network.
- Improve the overall greenness of the area, through planting street trees, creating living roofs and walls and providing habitats for wildlife which increase biodiversity.

Approach to Children’s Play

B.3.5 The Plan’s approach to children’s play is set out in policy 19: Children’s play space, which states that ‘Development should have access to sufficient play space for children and young people. Doorstep and local play facilities for children should be incorporated into developments’. The Council also requires s106 planning obligations to improve play facilities, which include neighbourhood and youth facilities, which are not provided on site.

B.3.6 The AAP also identifies accessibility standards for a range of children’s play types, which are consistent with the London Plan and the Major’s SPG on Providing for Children and Young People’s Informal Play and Recreation. The AAP identifies that all residents within the Core Area will be within easy walking distance of

- Small areas of play for younger children (maximum 100m walk);
- Local facilities (maximum 400m walk);
- Larger equipped areas of play for older children (maximum 800m walk).

New Proposals for Open Space

B.3.7 Two key sites within the AAP are identified for new open space uses:
CW AAP1: St Pauls Sports Ground

B.3.8 With the provision of new playing pitches at Mellish Fields, St Paul’s Sports Ground which was managed by Bacon’s College is no longer in use. The AAP states that the Council will consider the most appropriate role for St Paul’s Sports Ground through the preparation of the open spaces strategy (this study) and the Capital Investment Strategy.

CW AAP13: The Former Nursery

B.3.9 The Former Nursery has not been used for a number of years. The Council has allocated funding through the Cleaner Green Safer Programme to bring it back into active use as an open space.

B.4 Walworth and Aylesbury

B.4.1 The Aylesbury AAP presents a development strategy for the redevelopment of the Aylesbury Estate and surrounding area. The development proposals contained within the document are summarised in Table B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>Amount Required</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units:</td>
<td>Aim to replace the existing 2,700 homes with 4,200 new, mixed tenure homes. 23% will be houses.</td>
<td>AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affordable Housing</td>
<td>CISH Level 4 as a minimum standard for new homes.</td>
<td>Sec. 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Market Housing</td>
<td>50% of the homes in the AAP area will be affordable and 50% will be private. The AAP provides variable targets for the different phases of the development. Policy BH4 indicates the mix of house sizes</td>
<td>Policy BH3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seeking a PFI for the delivery of phases 2 and 3, which would see 1000 new homes, of which 400 would be affordable council owned new homes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Land Allocations</td>
<td>2,500 sqm of employment floorspace at Thurlow St/East St.</td>
<td>COM2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Floorspace</td>
<td>2,500 sqm of health facilities floorspace in the AAP; plus 1,500 sqm social care space within the Aylesbury Resource Centre at Westmoreland Road</td>
<td>COM3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job Creation</td>
<td>1,150 sqm pre-school facilities across 3 or 4 locations</td>
<td>COM4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500 sqm flexible community space for arts and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,750 sqm of A class floorspace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Growth</td>
<td>Not referenced</td>
<td>Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (parks, amenity space, natural greenspace, cemetery, children’s play facility, allotment)</td>
<td>A network of improved and properly managed open space will be created, including the complete revitalisation of Burgess Park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing Provision</td>
<td>The total requirement for public open space associated with the proposed redevelopment of the estate will be broadly comparable to now; however, the difference will be delivered through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Type</td>
<td>Amount Required</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enhanced quality, security, lighting, play facilities and maintenance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Future Proposals**

**B.4.2** The AAP for Aylesbury essentially provides proposals for demolition and redevelopment of the Aylesbury Estate. The Vision for Aylesbury includes becoming known for an outstanding environment, comprising excellent parks and great streets and squares that are accessible to all. The image will be one of creating a place for families, with spaces and places being designed with this aspiration in mind. A masterplan has been developed for the estate. This includes the following key open space features:

- “A redesigned and improved Burgess Park – a destination ‘World Park’ for South London.
- Westmoreland Road Square – a major new plaza to provide the setting for new community facilities and shops.
- Three Green Fingers – providing high quality local open space that link Burgess Park with the rest of the AAP area.
- **11 Improved good quality open spaces, including Burgess Park and Surrey Square Park**.

**B.4.3** Section 4 of the AAP is titled ‘Public life: Better and safer streets, squares and parks’. It includes proposals and a series of policies to deliver the public realm elements of the vision and masterplan, supported by design guidance (presented in Appendix 6 of the AAP). There will be about 60ha of public open space within or immediately available to the development, including Burgess Park, which is 46 hectares, Surrey Square Park and Faraday Gardens. The AAP states that this is about the same as at present, but the quality of the open space, security, lighting, play facilities and maintenance will all be far better and the spaces will be easier to get to. Key elements are as follows:

- The street network will take a grid-block form and comprise the following elements, all of which will be designed to function as public spaces, incorporating planting, greenspace, attractive boundary design and hard surfaced spaces (Policy TP1 emphasises the role of streets in delivering the walking and cycling network):
  - Thurlow Street will be the main local street for the new neighbourhood.
  - Albany Road will be a calmed route and will be better integrated with the park so that it is perceived as a route through the park.
  - A Community Spine will connect public transport routes and town centres with the main schools and some of the community facilities in the action area core.
  - Three green fingers will run from Burgess Park into the AAP area connecting with Surrey Square Park, the Missenden Play area and Faraday Gardens. They will be designed to enable many more properties to have a frontage along pleasant green spaces.
Policy PL5 provides for new development to deliver a high quality network of public open spaces of differing sizes and functions. The spaces should be well connected, offering good pedestrian and cycle routes; as well as incorporating small children’s play areas where they are associated with residential development – Policy PL6 stipulates 10 sqm of children’s play space per child bed space; the former to be delivered with selected housing blocks and the latter to be incorporated into larger areas of public open space. In addition, detailed landscaping plans will be required as an integral part of development proposals. Provision is also made for private open space within Policy PL7.

Requirements for play space are set out in the supporting text for Policy PL6. They indicate a need for approx. 3 ha. of children and youth play space. Accessibility standards are set at 400m to a local park; 100m to small areas of play for younger children; and 400m for larger equipped areas of play for older children, reflecting the standards in the London Plan and the Mayor’s SPG on Providing for Children and Young Peoples Informal Play and Recreation. A larger area of neighbourhood play is planned for Burgess Park, to be accessibly located near Albany Road and Chumleigh Gardens.

Improvements are planned to Surrey Square Park. These will focus on enhancing the ecological value, usability and attractiveness of the space.

Policy PL8 relates specifically to Burgess Park. The policy aim is to redesign the park such that it becomes a more varied, interesting and attractive place, enticing people to play sport, visit and spend time within it, in a safe and healthy environment. Proposals for building heights around the park will see much taller buildings fronting the north side of the park – this will provide a more
distinctive and attractive termination to views northwards and better reflect the scale of the space, providing a more appropriate sense of enclosure and offering greater potential for natural surveillance.

**B.5 Peckham and Nunhead**

B.5.1 Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan, May 2011. This document is being consulted upon until 30 September 2011.

Table B.5 - Summary of Development Proposals: Peckham and Nunhead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>Amount Required</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Target of 2,000 in next 15-20 years, 1,500 of which to be within the core action area. Development should reflect the density zones of the London Plan. For 10+ dwellings, 35% affordable homes; an overall min. target of 700 affordable homes over the AAP period. 50% of affordable housing to be intermediate housing and 50% to be social rented. A min. of 35% of developments of 10+ dwellings in Livesey, Peckham, Nunhead and the Lane to be private homes, with an overall min. target of 700 private homes in this area. There are requirements for creating additional family homes across the AAP area.</td>
<td>AAP, Policies 21 – 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Market Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Land Allocations</td>
<td>Estimated capacity figures are provided for a combination of retail and employment floorspace associated with key sites in the AAP (27 were consulted upon). These are detailed on a site-by-site basis in Section 5.2 of the AAP.</td>
<td>Section 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Floorspace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job Creation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Growth</td>
<td>45,000 people at the 2001 census – projections by the GLA indicate a young population with large increases in 20-29 year olds and decreases in 35-44 year olds in the Peckham Community Council area; contrasting with projections of an ageing population in the Nunhead and Peckham Rye Community Council area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (parks, amenity space, natural greenspace, cemetery, children’s play facility, allotment)</td>
<td>Around 25% of the area is protected open space. Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common is the largest open space, extending over 40 ha. and designated as Metropolitan Open Land and a SINC Nunhead Cemetery is the second largest open space, also designated as Metropolitan Open Land and a SINC. It was established in 1840 as one of London’s ‘magnificent seven’ gothic Victorian cemeteries. Other larger spaces include: • Burgess Park; • Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye</td>
<td>Sec. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing Provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>AAP, Fig. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Development Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Required</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Camberwell Cemetery;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One Tree Hill; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Camberwell Old Cemetery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of the Peckham Partnership, 2,000 new homes and 2 new parks have been developed in recent years. There has been significant investment in active play facilities at Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common, Central Venture Park, St Mary Frobisher, Brimmington Park, Leyton Square and Goose Green.

Nunhead Green lies within the heart of the area. In general terms, the north has relatively few open spaces, whereas the south has a much higher number that are much larger in size.

There are five conservation areas, covering approximately 11% of the area and including some of the open spaces:

- Caroline Gardens;
- Holly Grove;
- Nunhead Green;
- Nunhead Cemetery; and
- Honor Oak Rise.

A small part of Sceaux Gardens also falls within the area.

---

### Future Proposals

#### B.5.2 Key challenges and opportunities for the area are set out in the AAP. Of relevance to open space, the list includes the following:

- “Look after important open spaces such as Nunhead Cemetery and improve the accessibility and quality open spaces especially in the north.
- Make sure new development has a minimal impact on the environment and includes improvements for biodiversity, follows the energy hierarchy and meets our environmental targets set out in the core strategy”.

#### B.5.3 The Vision for the Action Area includes an aspiration to use new development as a means of making streets and public places greener, more pleasant, accessible and safe. Reference is also made to improving the ease of walking and cycling. Nunhead Cemetery is referenced as making a contribution to the area’s special character and noted to require protection and enhancement.

In addition, the Vision includes improvement of Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common as the largest open space in the action area – proposals include a new play area; a new One O’Clock club building; and resurfacing of two football pitches (these projects form part of Policy 14 of the AAP). Homestall Road will benefit from enhanced sports provision, with plans for a new grassed football area, changing rooms and an all-weather floodlit pitch. Brayards Green also features in the Vision, as an example of other open spaces that will be protected and improved.

#### B.5.4 The AAP includes a series of objectives, organised into themes. Where these themes incorporate elements of relevance to the management and delivery of open spaces, they are summarised below:
• Theme 2: Community Wellbeing, improving individual life chances: ‘Promoting a network of high quality and easy to access open spaces that serve a range of functions, including recreation and children’s play, sports facilities, nature conservation and food growing’.

• Theme 3: Traffic and Transport, improved connections: ‘Making Peckham and Nunhead a more convenient and comfortable place to access and move around by walking and cycling’.

• Theme 5: Natural Environment, sustainable use of resources: ‘To protect, maintain and improve the quality, quantity and accessibility of open space. To promote opportunities for wildlife and protect sites of nature conservation value. To reduce the impact of development on the environment and help tackle climate change, air quality, pollution, waste and flood risk’.

• Theme 6: Design and Heritage, attractive places full of character: ‘Conserve and enhance the historic environment and use the heritage of places as an asset to promote positive change’.

B.5.5 Actions are described for delivering enhancement to the Peckham neighbourhoods over the next 15 years. These include:

• ‘Improving key pedestrian and cycle connections and wayfinding.’

• Protecting and enhancing open spaces. This includes protecting new open spaces at Warwick Gardens, Jowett Street Park and Central Venture Park and Brimmington Estate Allotments.

• Providing additional protection to sites of importance for nature conservation. This includes a new designation for Surrey Canal Walk and Warwick Gardens’.

B.5.6 Policy 9 of the AAP has been developed to address aspects of Theme 2 through open space. The policy wording is:

To provide open space to a good standard as a network of accessible, high quality open spaces for residents and visitors to enjoy that strengthen local character, promote nature conservation, exercise and food growing by

• Continuing to protect Metropolitan and borough open land from inappropriate development.

• Continuing to protect Other open space listed in the fact box from development unless there is nearby provision in the local area.

• Protecting the following additional open spaces from inappropriate development as Other open space: Brimmington Estate Allotments, Calypso Gardens, Central Venture Park, Brayards Green, Buchan Hall sports pitch, Jowett Street Park and Cossall Park.

• Increasing accessibility to open spaces by walking, cycling and public transport and by providing new entrances where they would be appropriate.

• Improving the quality of open spaces and provision of activities for enjoyment.

B.5.7 The text supporting the policy states that: ‘We are currently preparing an Open Spaces Strategy to set out standards and an action plan to ensure the appropriate quality, quantity and accessibility of open spaces. In the meantime we have protected new spaces that local residents have identified as being important to the community and worthy of protection. Some of these are new since the adoption of the Southwark Plan in 2007. These meet Other open space criteria except the extension to Cossall Park which meets the borough open land criteria. Part of this park was previously annexed to the Tuke School which has now moved to north Peckham. As part of the redevelopment of the former Tuke School, we will restore the original boundaries of Cossall Park to return the previously annexed school playground to the park. This will protect it from future development.’
B.5.8 Under Theme 5, Policy 28 relates to SINCs. This policy includes an intention to designate two new sites of importance for nature conservation at Surrey Canal Walk and Warwick Gardens. In addition, the policy is to continue to protect sites of importance for nature conservation from inappropriate development.

B.5.9 Policy 30 has emerged in support of Theme 6. It includes a requirement for delivering clearly defined streets and spaces with varied character and uses. Specific reference is made to: increasing green spaces, children’s play, sports facilities and green routes in Peckham Town Centre and Queens Road; protecting and enhancing open spaces such as Central Venture Park, Warwick Gardens, Jowett Street Park and Brimmington Estate allotments along with creating green routes; protecting and enhancing open spaces such as Nunhead Green along with creating green routes in Nunhead Town Centre; and protecting and enhancing open spaces such as Brayards Green, Buchan Hall sports pitches and extensions to Cossall Park along with creating green routes in Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common and Nunhead neighbourhoods.
Figure B.6 - Existing and Proposed Protected Open Spaces: Peckham and Nunhead AAP
B.6 Dulwich

B.6.1 Draft Dulwich SPD, March 2009 – has the status of a material consideration, amplifying the policy set out in The London Plan and the Southwark Plan 2007. The guidance will apply formally upon adoption of the Core Strategy. Separate arrangements apply for property within the 1500 ha. of land that forms the Dulwich Estate – all developments that are within the Dulwich Estate should consult the Dulwich Estate Scheme of Management before submitting a planning application.

B.6.2 The review has also considered:

- Dulwich Village Conservation Area Appraisal – February 2006;
- Stradella Road Conservation Area Appraisal (Draft);
- The Gardens Conservation Area Appraisal; and
- The Sunray Estate Conservation Area Appraisal.

### Table B.6 - Summary of Development Proposals – Dulwich

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>Amount Required</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affordable Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Market Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Land Allocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Floorspace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job Creation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Growth</td>
<td>Estimated total in 2009 of 34,000 residents, with a projected low annual growth rate of 2% based on changes between 2001 and 2008.</td>
<td>Sec. 2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Open Space (parks, amenity space, natural greenspace, cemetery, children’s play facility, allotment) | Existing provision is characterised by large areas of open space (33% of total area), surrounded by residential neighbourhoods. Parts of Dulwich are particularly leafy, open and green, developed at much lower density than other parts of London containing suburban Victorian Housing that is predominantly detached and semi-detached. Existing assets include:  
  • Grade II Listed Belair Park⁴, forming the setting to Grade II* Listed Georgian Belair House.  
  • Dulwich Wood: The designation encompasses public parkland, woodland playing fields and sports grounds, the golf course and allotments.  
  • Dulwich Village Conservation Area: includes a strong sense of openness delivered by many playing fields, parks, tree-lined roads and large gardens. | Sec. 2.3 Con. Area Appraisals |

---

⁴ Belair Park is Grade II Listed on English Heritage’s Register of Historic Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England
The Gardens Conservation Area: residential area with a strong relationship to the large area of Peckham Rye Common Park and Peckham Rye Common, which forms a large open space to the east.
- Dulwich Park, which includes historic woodland such as Sydenham Hill
- Cox’s Walk, which provides an important pedestrian link through many of the area’s open spaces.

B.6.3 The SPD states that:

“Much of the open space is good quality and provides a range of functions from public parks to private sports fields, nature reserves to a golf course. Open spaces are also used for allotments, sport pitches and community places such as the Scouts hut. There is a skateboard park in Belair Park and football pitches in Dulwich Park for young people. Dulwich Park is the main focus for community activity and is in the centre of Dulwich Village. Dulwich Park and Belair Parks are highly valued by the local community and provide a range of activities for all groups in the community.”

B.6.4 Many of the parks within the area are also designated as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) on account of their ecological value. Designated sites include:
- Dulwich Woods (also a Local Nature Reserve);
- Sydenham Hill Woods;
- Dulwich and Sydenham Golf Course;
- Dulwich Upper Wood;
- Sunray Gardens; and
- Belair Park.

Future Proposals

B.6.5 The SPD includes guidance that aims to protect and improve open spaces throughout the area. This reflects the Vision for Dulwich, as it is expressed in the Southwark Plan 2007:

“A suburban area where the existing character and form of buildings is maintained. The area’s large open spaces will be protected. There will be successful local centres providing a range of shops and services at Herne Hill, Lordship Lane and Dulwich Village. New development will not make parking and traffic congestion in the area worse.”

B.6.6 Significant parts of Dulwich are designated as open space or conservation areas and there are no major planned regeneration projects. Consequently it is envisaged that the majority of development will be small-scale infill.

B.6.7 Residential development is governed by policies that include density zoning – the majority is suburban (200 – 350 habitable rooms per hectare, usually houses with gardens), with a northern strip being zoned as urban (200 – 700 habitable rooms per hectare). The zoning policy will be important in safeguarding the existing character of the area, particularly the relationship of open space to built development.
B.6.8 For retail development, new developments should contribute to improving the public realm including creating vibrant areas for people to congregate and interact, associating them with public crossings and environmental improvements.

B.6.9 Conservation Area designations apply to several of the substantial green spaces within the area. This designation affords protection to the character and appearance of the areas, including the trees. Conservation Area Appraisals have been produced for the designations within Dulwich and provide an additional level of policy interpretation, highlighting the most important aspects of the environment and the contribution that they make to the overall character and appearance of the Conservation Areas. In addition, protection is afforded from designation as metropolitan open land, borough open land and other open space designations, presenting a strong presumption against development (policies 3.25 – 3.27 of the Southwark Plan 2007). In accordance with these designations, the SPD states the following in respect of new development proposals within conservation areas:

- “On playing fields, development might be appropriate to upgrade or improve buildings on site or provide new facilities to ensure the viability of the site in exceptional circumstances;

- New development should contribute to the existing open character of the area by enhancing links between the existing open spaces creating further opportunities for footpaths and cycle ways as well as providing important wildlife corridors that will increase local biodiversity.

- Development will need to consider the impacts on ecology on the surrounding area especially on sites close to areas with protected species and should encourage and protect high levels of biodiversity.”

B.6.10 Southwark is part of the ‘Green Chains’ network. Originally developed in 1977 to provide approximately 300 protected green spaces across the London boroughs of Bexley, Bromley, Greenwich and Lewisham, Southwark joined the partnership in 2008. Together, the green chain open spaces form a 20 mile green ‘swathe’ around the south east of London. The objectives for the green chain open spaces are:

- “to improve and encourage the provision of suitable recreational facilities with an emphasis on those serving a wide range of south east London and/or requiring open land.

- to safeguard the open land from built development and maintain its structural contribution in providing a visual break in the built up area of London.

- to conserve, enhance and raise public awareness of the visual amenity and ecological aspects of the landscape.

- to improve public access to and through the area.

- to promote an overall identity for the area in order to increase public awareness of available recreational facilities.

- to encourage the collaboration and co-operation of the various public and private agencies, owners, organisations, clubs, etc. in the area to achieve the above objectives.

B.6.11 The SPD indicates that Dulwich is considering designated the following green spaces as green chains in the Core Strategy, to form part of the south east London Green Chain Walk:

- Camberwell Old Cemetery;

- Dawson Heights;

- Dulwich Park;

- Belair Park;

- Dulwich Picture Gallery;
• Cox's Walk;
• Dulwich and Sydenham Hill Golf Club;
• Sydenham Hill and Dulwich Woods;
• Dulwich Wood; and
• Dulwich Upper Wood.

B.6.12 There are proposals for the refurbishment of the Herne Hill Velodrome Site. Options are under development, but should include refurbishment of the outdoor BMX track and velodrome track as a complement to a health and/or leisure facility at the site. No other development projects with notable open space elements are proposed within the SPD.

B.6.13 The SPD envisages that planning obligations will form a key delivery mechanism. Planning negotiations are to be focused on the top five priorities for the Dulwich area. None of these priorities directly relate to the provision of open space; however, there is emphasis on delivering traffic and transport improvements, reducing crime and improving community safety.

Conservation Area Appraisals

B.6.14 There are Conservation Area appraisals (CAA) for the following areas in Dulwich:

• Dulwich Wood Conservation Area – designated to preserve the open, natural aspects of the land, to protect woodland and single tree specimens, to prevent intrusive development along the ridge line and northern scarp of Sydenham Hill and to control backland and infill development to ensure generally that no diminution occurs in the semi-rural character of the area. The area is also designated as an ‘Important Metropolitan Open Space’.

• Dulwich Village Conservation Area – originally designated in September 1968 and subsequently extended, the area comprises 5 sub-areas - Sub Area 1: Dulwich College; Sub Area 2: Dulwich Picture Gallery, College Road & Gallery Road; Sub Area 3: The Old Village of Dulwich; Sub Area 4: Court Lane, Calton Avenue, Woodwarde Road and Alleyn’s School; and Sub Area 5: The Velodrome, Griffins Sports Field and North Dulwich Station.

• The Gardens Conservation Area – planned entirely as a residential development and completed in a relatively short space of time, The Gardens is an example of 19th century speculative building growth. Its development was undertaken in phases, relating to the land parcels occupied by the former market gardens. A green square forms the heart of the conservation area, enclosed between 1870 and 1880 – the tree planting around the perimeter of these gardens is cited as making a positive contribution to the character of the area.

• The Sunray Estate Conservation Area – this conservation area is situated on the southern side of Denmark Hill, at the base of which sits the Sunray Gardens. Notable elements are cited as the slopes of the Hill, which are lined with mature Platanus x hispanica trees and, at the base of the area, the Sunray Gardens Park.

B.6.15 Development preferences, design controls and strategies for open spaces within these conservation areas are provided. Key qualities are summarised here:

• In Dulwich Village, the quality of the open spaces is described, suggesting that they unfolding as one travels through the area. In this respect, considerable value is placed on protecting the private open spaces – principally substantial and well-established rear gardens – in addition to the public open spaces. The leafy character is valued and presented as desirable to preserve, particularly where there is formal planting (e.g. in the grounds of Dulwich College) and landscaped grounds to buildings of significant historical architectural merit.

• The Gardens Conservation Area is primarily a housing estate focused on a central public garden. Trees are noted as being of importance in defining boundaries and softening the
transition between open spaces and buildings and some scope for new street trees is referenced in the CAA.

- Within the Sunray Gardens CAA, the small park that survives within the grounds of the now demolished Casino House, is described as lending a great deal to the character of the conservation area, particularly on account of the maturity of the trees within it. In addition, a connection is made between the open spaces within the estate and the garden suburb movement of Ebeneezer Howard, resulting in elongated, landscaped strips of open space and substantial verges.
Appendix C
Residents’ Survey Results
C.1 Residents’ Survey Results

C.1.1 This section presents the findings of the residents’ survey at a sub-area level.

C.2 Canada Water and Rotherhithe

Open space users and non-users

C.2.1 The findings of the residents’ survey reveal 10% of respondents never visited an open space within the borough. This figure is the same when controlling for gender. An examination of age cohorts’ show that a larger proportion of those age 65-79 (20%) and 80+ (50%) do not visit open spaces within the borough when compared with other age groupings. This may be an indication of reduced mobility amongst older age cohorts coupled with safety fears.

C.2.2 The geographical breakdown indicates that 7% of those from the Canada Water and Rotherhithe sub-area have not made use of open space, which is below the borough average of 10%. Only the Dulwich sub-area has a lower proportion of non-use (at 2%).

C.2.3 Of the larger publicly owned and managed open spaces Burgess Park and Southwark Park have the largest proportion of visitors (23% and 24% respectively) followed by Dulwich Park receiving 14% of all visitors. Within the Canada Water sub-area, Southwark Park is by far the most well used space (90% of all respondents have visited the park), followed by Russia Dock Woodland.

Comparison of different open space types

C.2.4 The most popular types of open space relating to the number of visits are Metropolitan Parks and large open spaces with 69% of all visitations. Smaller local parks are also popular (40%), as well as Thames Path/riverside walks (40%) and children’s play areas with 27%. Metropolitan Parks were also the most popular form of open space in Canada Water and Rotherhithe (76%), largely due to the popularity of Southwark Park.

C.2.5 In comparing patterns of use between the genders a number of variations come to the fore. There is an increased tendency for men to use outdoor sports facilities (23%) against 17% of women, a difference which is reversed when looking at children’s play areas, predominately used by women (37%) and only 17% of men. There are no other significant gender variations with similar usage patterns for all other open space types.

C.2.6 Differing usage patterns are also evident for different age cohorts. 30% of people aged 16-24 visit outdoor sports facilities, significantly more than other age groups, while a larger percentage of people in the age groupings 25 – 34 and 35 – 49 visit children’s play areas. These differences highlight the different requirements and priorities of different age cohorts, younger men are more inclined to use sporting facilities while slightly older women are more inclined to use play facilities. Theses findings, while not unexpected, illustrate the need to ensure public green space can cater to the differing priorities and responsibilities of all users.

C.2.7 In considering the frequency of use by type of space, areas with a clearly definable recreational role attract more regular visitation. Of those who use allotments, 42% visit at least once a week while 37% of those who use outdoor sports facilities and 65% of visitors to children’s play areas also visit at least once a week. No one interviewed in the Canada Water and Rotherhithe area was recorded as using allotments, which probably reflects the lack of provision in the sub area.

Reasons for use

C.2.8 The most common reason for visiting large open parks and open spaces are Walking (47%), fresh air (38%), children’s play (32%), and exercise (26%). For smaller parks and open spaces the most
common reasons are children’s play (36%) and walking (37%) while users of the Thames Path do so for walking (78%), fresh air (40%) and exercise (24%).

C.2.9 There are differences between age cohorts in looking at why respondents visit large open spaces. A larger percentage of 16 – 24 year olds visit large open spaces to meet friends (24%) against 17% of 25 – 34 year olds and 16% of those aged 35-49. Due to the fact younger people are more likely to visit an open space for social reasons it is reasonable to assume appropriate youth facilities are provided at some of these spaces. Canada Water recorded the highest level of total respondents who visit parks to meet friends, at 21%, compared to just 12% in Bermondsey.

Time spent

C.2.10 The amount of time spent varies according to the open space type with respondents generally stating they spend longer at larger types of spaces which generally have a greater range of functions than smaller spaces. At larger open spaces only 10% spend less than 30 minutes while 42% of users spend 1-2 hours. This compares with small open spaces where 25% of users spend less than 30 minutes and only 30% stay for 1-2 hours.

C.2.11 A higher proportion of those from the Canada Water sub-area spend more than 30 minutes at large open spaces (86%). This could be due to the dominance of large open spaces in the North this sub-area, such as Southwark Park.

C.2.12 Those who visit spaces with a specific recreational role tend to stay longer. Visitors to outdoor sports facilities tend to stay for 1-2 hours (30%) and 2-4 hours (7%) while visitors to allotments spend the longest length of time with 13% spending 2-4 hours and a further 13% staying for more than 4 hours. Conversely respondents who visit amenity areas spend the least amount of time with 54% spending less than 30 minutes.

Travel mode

C.2.13 Residents were asked to name their usual mode of travel to open space. The vast majority of respondents visit open spaces by foot (71% in the borough as a whole, rising to 81% in the Canada Water sub-area). Smaller local parks have even higher proportions who travel by foot to reach them (90% in the borough and 89% in the sub-area).

C.2.14 In terms of car usage, a higher percentage of visitors to cemeteries use the car than any other space (48%). The types of open space with the lowest incidence of car usage are smaller local parks (4%), children’s play area (4%) and amenity areas (3%).

C.2.15 The survey shows that the use of public transport to visit open space is generally low, with figures for the train particularly low. Respondents who use the bus do so primarily to visit large open spaces, cemeteries and the Thames Path.

Travel time

C.2.16 Respondents were asked how long they spend travelling to different types of open spaces. When the results for open spaces are analysed, it is apparent that open space use is fairly localised. For most open space categories a large proportion of respondents spend less than 10 minutes travelling. The most localised open space types being amenity areas, children’s play areas and small local parks. Open space categories respondents were most prepared to spend 16-30 minutes travelling to include outdoor sports facilities, larger open space, Thames path and cemeteries.

Quality of spaces

C.2.17 Respondents were asked to rate the quality of open spaces; across all open spaces in the borough. The majority of respondents rated all categories of open space as being good or very good, however some categories performed better than others indicating perceptions vary
according to the type of open space. Those categories rated as being the highest quality sites are allotments (92%), large open spaces (86%), the Thames path (88%), natural green space (80.3%) and children’s play (81%). Fewer respondents rated amenity areas as good or very good (59%). Categories with a higher proportion of poor or very poor ratings include amenity areas (11%), smaller local park (5%), outdoor sports facilities (5%) and children’s play (6%). There were no major differences between sub-areas.

Satisfaction and quality of life

C.2.18 Respondents to the survey were generally satisfied with the existing level of open space provision. Taking into consideration age and gender breakdowns there were no considerable differences in the response across the borough. However, respondents in the Canada Water sub-area recorded some of the highest levels of satisfaction with open space (87%, compared to 71% in Elephant & Castle, with only respondents in Dulwich registering higher satisfaction levels – at 90%).

C.2.19 In terms of the contribution open space plays in respondent’s quality of life, again there was some variation between the sub-areas across the borough. 87% of respondents feel open space contributes a little or a lot to quality of life in the Canada Water sub area, against 78% in Bermondsey.

C.2.20 Those in the 16-24 age cohort (76%) feel open spaces contribute a little or a lot to quality of life, a lower percentage than the other age cohorts (91% of 50 to 64 year olds feel that open spaces contribute to quality of life). In addition to this a greater proportion (18%) of 16-24 year olds felt open spaces neither contribute or under perform, compared to other age cohorts.

Non use and improvements of open space

C.2.21 Non users of open spaces were asked their reasons for non use. Time constraints (28%), nothing particular (19%), boring or uninteresting facilities (13%) and poor health (17%) were the most common responses. Very few respondents suggested that quality-related reasons dissuaded them, such as litter or dogs.

C.2.22 Patterns of existing use do not necessarily highlight all needs for open space. Residents were therefore asked what improvements could be made to encourage greater use of open space. Cleaner environments (less litter, graffiti, dog mess, etc) (21%), park rangers/wardens (14%) and more different attractions (9%) were all cited as priorities in the Canada Water sub area. However, 40% of all respondents in the sub area stated that nothing would encourage them to use spaces more frequently, suggesting that investment in new facilities for some would reap little by way of increased usage.

C.3 Bankside, Borough and London Bridge

Open space users and non users

C.3.1 There are no large open spaces located in the Bankside, Borough and London Bridge sub-area. Respondents in this sub-area need to travel further to access large open spaces and parks. Of those sub-area respondents that visit large open spaces (43%), Southwark Park receives 42% of this proportion, while Burgess Park receives only 16%.

C.3.2 Some 13% of the sub-area residents do not use any type of open space, which is more than the borough average of 10%.

Comparison of different open space types

C.3.3 Bankside, Borough and London Bridge are located on the South Bank of the River Thames. The Thames Path is a popular open space to visit for 54% of the sub-area respondents, followed by smaller local parks (51%) and Metropolitan Parks (43%).
C.3.4 Open spaces that provide opportunities for recreational activity tend to attract more regular visitation. Of those respondents that use children’s play area, 69% visit at least once a week, while 58% of those that visit smaller local parks and 33% of those that use allotments also visit at least once a week.

C.3.5 Of the respondents that visit large parks and open spaces, only 25% of these visit at least once a week. Large parks and open spaces are located outside of the sub-area boundary, which may discourage sub-area respondents from visiting on a more regular basis.

Reasons for use

C.3.6 The most common reasons for visiting large open parks and opens spaces are for children’s play (46%), walking the dog (42%) and fresh air (38%). For visiting smaller local parks the most common reasons are walking (48%) and fresh air (48%), while users of the Thames Path primarily visit for the purpose of walking (79%), en route/short cut to their destination (45%) and fresh air (30%).

Time spent

C.3.7 A high proportion of respondents from the Bankside, Borough and London Bridge area tend to spend more than 30 minutes at large parks and open spaces (78%). Visitors to outdoor sports facilities stay between 1-2 hours (63%), while 51% of visitors to the Thames Path stay between 1 and 4 hours.

C.3.8 Visitors to smaller local parks stay for under an hour (66%), while this is even less for amenity areas, where 56% of respondents stay for less than 30 minutes.

Travel mode

C.3.9 A moderate number of visitors to large parks and open spaces access these by foot (67%), while smaller local parks have even higher proportions with 94% of visitors arriving by foot.

C.3.10 In terms of car usage, half of visitors to cemeteries use a car to access this type of open space. In contrast, respondents accessing children’s play areas or amenity areas do not use a car at all to access these types of open spaces.

C.3.11 The use of public transport to access open space is generally low. Respondents that travel by bus use them to visit large open spaces, allotments and cemeteries.

Travel time

C.3.12 The most localised areas are amenity areas, smaller local parks and children’s play areas. The majority of residents are also able to access outdoor sport facilities in less than 10 minutes (75%) and the Thames Path in less than 15 minutes (76%).

C.3.13 The majority of residents that visit larger open spaces are to reach them within 20 minutes (78%), while residents visiting cemeteries have a greater travelling time of between 21 to 45 minutes (88%).

Quality of spaces

C.3.14 Those categories rated as being good or very good quality sites are children’s play areas (94%), Thames Path (94%) and large parks and open spaces (89%). Allotments and cemeteries also both achieved a 100% rating as being good or very good.

C.3.15 Categories with a higher proportion of poor or very poor ratings include outdoor sports facilities (25%) and children’s play areas (6%).
Satisfaction and quality of life

C.3.16 Respondents in the Bankside, Borough and London Bridge sub-area recorded relatively high levels of satisfaction with open space (80%), which is the same proportion as Camberwell and only less than the sub-areas of Dulwich, Canada Water and Walworth.

C.3.17 In terms of the contribution open space plays in respondent’s quality of life, 82% of respondents feel open space contributes a little or a lot to quality of life in the Bankside, Borough and London Bridge sub-area.

Non use and improvements of open space

C.3.18 Non users of open spaces were asked their reasons for non use. Time constraints (33%), too far away (20%), boring or uninteresting facilities (20%) and poor health (20%) were the most common responses.

C.3.19 Residents asked what improvements could be made to encourage greater use of open space. Cleaner environments (less litter, graffiti, dog mess, etc) (23%), more/improved sports facilities (13%), more event/activities (11%) and more/improved benches/litter bins (11%) were all cited as priorities in the Bankside, Borough and London Bridge sub-area. However, 43% of all respondents in the sub-area stated that nothing would encourage them to use spaces more frequently, suggesting that investment in new facilities for some would reap little by way of increased usage.

C.4 Bermondsey

Open space users and non users

C.4.1 The most popular larger publically owned and managed open spaces visited by sub-area respondents are Southwark Park and Burgess Park, which receive 60% and 20% of visitations from respondents in the Bermondsey area, respectively.

C.4.2 Some 11% of the sub-area residents do not use any type of open space, which is slightly more than the borough average of 10%.

Comparison of different open space types

C.4.3 Metropolitan Parks receive a high proportion of visitors from the Bermondsey sub-area (74%). The proportion of sub-area residents visiting the Thames Path and smaller local parks is 47% and 43%, respectively.

C.4.4 Open spaces that perform a recreational role attract more regular visitation. Of those that use children’s play area, 71% visit at least once a week, while 75% of those that use allotments visit at least once a week. Conversely, 40% of those that visit outdoor sports facilities only visit at least once a week.

C.4.5 The large open spaces are visited by their users on a regular basis, with 51% of respondents visiting at least once week. Similarly, 56% of visitors that use a local park also visit at least once a week.

Reasons for use

C.4.6 The most common reason for visiting large open parks and opens spaces are for walking (48%), fresh air (45%) and children’s play (35%). For visiting smaller local parks, the most common reasons are children’s play (44%) and fresh air (30%), while Thames Path visitors go primarily for walking (77%) and fresh air (40%).
Time spent

C.4.7 A high proportion of respondents from the Bermondsey sub-area tend to spend more than 1 hour at large parks and open spaces (68%). Visitors to outdoor sports facilities tend to stay for 1-2 hours (63%).

C.4.8 Respondents who visit amenity areas spend the least amount of time, with 53% staying for less than 30 minutes.

Travel mode

C.4.9 The majority of visitors to large parks and open spaces access these by foot (73%), while smaller local parks have a greater proportion of visitors with 86% arriving by foot.

C.4.10 In terms of car usage, a higher percentage of visitors to cemeteries use a car (69%). In contrast, respondents accessing nearby spaces, such as smaller local parks (2%), amenity spaces (6%) and children’s play area (7%) have a low proportion of respondents using a car to access these types of open spaces.

C.4.11 The use of public transport to access open space is generally low, with respondents that use buses as their primary mode of transport using them to visit cemeteries and allotments.

Travel time

C.4.12 The most localised areas (with short journey times of less than 5 minutes) are amenity areas, smaller local parks and children’s play areas. The majority of residents that visit larger parks and open spaces are able to reach them within 10 minutes (66%).

C.4.13 The majority of residents that use outdoor sport facilities have a travel time of less than 15 minutes (69%), while 66% of users of the Thames Path have access in less than 15 minutes. In comparison, 69% of respondents visiting cemeteries have a much longer travelling time of between 11 to 30 minutes.

Quality of spaces

C.4.14 Those categories rated as being good or very good quality sites are natural greenspace areas (90%), large parks and open spaces (86%) and the Thames Path (83%). Allotments achieved a 100% good or very good quality site rating.

C.4.15 Categories with a higher proportion of poor or very poor ratings include smaller local parks (12%) and amenity areas (18%).

Satisfaction and quality of life

C.4.16 Respondents in the Bermondsey sub-area recorded high levels of satisfaction with open space (78%), although in the borough this is the third lowest score, with Peckham and Rye and Elephant and Castle achieving lower scores.

C.4.17 In terms of the contribution open space plays in respondent’s quality of life, 78% of respondents feel open space contributes a little or a lot to quality of life in the Bermondsey sub-area, which is only 1% more than the lowest score achieved in the Walworth and Aylesbury sub-area.

Non use and improvements of open space

C.4.18 Non users of open spaces were asked their reasons for non use. Disability (24%), time constraints (19%) and poor health (19%) were the most common responses.

C.4.19 Residents asked what improvements could be made to encourage greater use of open space. Cleaner environments (less litter, graffiti, dog mess, etc) (23%), more/improved sports facilities
(17%), more/improved sports facilities (14%) and more park rangers/wardens (11%) were all cited as priorities in the Bermondsey sub-area. However, 43% of all respondents in the sub-area stated that nothing would encourage them to use spaces more frequently, suggesting that investment in new facilities for some would reap little by way of increased usage.

C.5 Camberwell

Open space users and non users

C.5.1 Burgess Park is the most popular large open space for visitors in the Camberwell sub-area (30%). Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common, which is the second most popular large park, achieves a much lower proportion of visitors from the Camberwell sub-area with only 22% of visitations.

C.5.2 Some 11% of the sub-area residents do not use any type of open space, which is slightly more than the borough average of 10%.

Comparison of different open space types

C.5.3 Metropolitan Parks are the most popular type of open space for the sub-area residents to visit (67%), which is followed by smaller local parks (50%) and the Thames Path (32%).

C.5.4 Open spaces that perform a recreational role attract more regular visitation. Of those that use children’s play area, 64% visit at least once a week. The large parks and open spaces are visited by their users on a regular basis, with 55% of respondents visiting at least once week.

C.5.5 Half of respondents that use amenity areas visit them at least once a week, while 52% of visitors that use a local park visit it at least once a week.

Reasons for use

C.5.6 The most common reasons for visiting large open parks and opens spaces are for walking (46%), fresh air (40%) and children’s play (31%). For visiting smaller local parks the most common reasons are fresh air (45%) and walking (41%), while users of the Thames Path do so for walking (79%) and fresh air (33%).

Time spent

C.5.7 A high proportion of respondents from the Camberwell sub-area tend to spend more than 1 hour at large open spaces (66%). Visitors to outdoor sports facilities tend to stay between 1 to 4 hours (69%).

C.5.8 Respondents who visit amenity areas spend the least amount of time, with 65% staying for less than 30 minutes.

Travel mode

C.5.9 The majority of visitors to large open spaces access these by foot (68%), while smaller local parks have even higher proportions with 90% of visitors arriving by foot.

C.5.10 In terms of car usage, a higher percentage of visitors to cemeteries use the car than any other space (60%). In contrast, respondents accessing smaller local parks (2%) have a low proportion of respondents using a car to access these open spaces.

C.5.11 The use of public transport to access open space is generally low, with respondents that do use the bus primarily using it to visit the Thames Path, cemeteries and outdoor sports facilities.
Travel time

C.5.12 The most localised areas (with short journey times of less than 5 minutes) are amenity areas, children’s play areas and allotments. A moderate proportion of residents that visit larger open spaces are to reach them within 10 minutes (62%), similarly 60% of respondents that visit cemeteries are able to access them within 10 minutes. The majority of residents that use smaller local parks also have a travel time of less than 10 minutes (77%).

C.5.13 Visitors to the Thames Path have a longer travelling time of between 11 to 30 minutes (74%), similarly 72% of visitors to outdoor sports facilities have a travel time of between 11 to 30 minutes.

Quality of spaces

C.5.14 Those categories rated as being good or very good quality sites are children’s play areas (93%), outdoor sports facilities (91%) and large parks and open spaces (89%).

C.5.15 Categories with a higher proportion of poor or very poor ratings include amenity areas (13%), and cemeteries (10%).

Satisfaction and quality of life

C.5.16 Respondents in the Camberwell sub-area recorded high levels of satisfaction with open space (80%), which is the same as Bankside and only lower than Canada Water and Dulwich.

C.5.17 In terms of the contribution open space plays in respondent’s quality of life, 83% of respondents feel open space contributes a little or a lot to quality of life in the Camberwell sub-area, which is only lower than Canada Water and Dulwich.

Non use and improvements of open space

C.5.18 Non users of open spaces were asked their reasons for non use. Poor health (29%) and time constraints (21%) were the most common responses.

C.5.19 Residents asked what improvements could be made to encourage greater use of open space. Cleaner environments (less litter, graffiti, dog mess, etc) (14%), more park rangers/wardens (13%), more/improved sports facilities (12%) and improved safety (12%) were all cited as priorities in the Camberwell sub-area. However, 45% of all respondents in the sub-area stated that nothing would encourage them to use spaces more frequently, suggesting that investment in new facilities for some would reap little by way of increased usage.

C.6 Elephant & Castle

Open space users and non users

C.6.1 The most popular larger parks and open spaces used by respondents are Burgess Park (25%), followed by Geraldine Mary Harmsworth Park (14%).

C.6.2 The proportion of sub-area residents that do not use any type of open space is 15%, which is more than the borough average of 10% and higher than any other sub-area.

Comparison of different open space types

C.6.3 Metropolitan Parks and smaller local parks both attract 59% of sub-area respondent, this is followed by large open space/gardens (24%) and children’s play areas (24%).

C.6.4 Open spaces that perform a recreational role attract more regular visitation. Of those that use children’s play area, 70% visit at least once a week.
Although amenity areas generally have less recreational activities available there are a high proportion of users that visit at least once a week (75%).

There are no large open parks and spaces located in Elephant and Castle, as such residents need to travel to other sub-areas to access these open spaces. Of the respondents that visit large parks and open spaces, only 38% visit at least once a week.

### Reasons for use

The most common reason for visiting large open parks and open spaces are for children’s play (46%), walking (42%) and fresh air (38%). For visiting smaller local parks, 38% of respondents visit for the purpose of walking, while a further 38% visit for children’s play.

### Time spent

Of the respondents that visit large parks and open spaces, 63% tend to spend more than 1 hour at large parks and open spaces. Visitors to outdoor sports facilities tend to stay for between 30 minutes and 2 hours (72%), while 69% of those that visit the Thames Path spend between 30 minutes and 2 hours.

Although a high proportion of respondents that use amenity areas visit on a regular basis of once a week (75%), half of these respondents tend to stay for less than 30 minutes.

### Travel mode

The majority of visitors to large open spaces access these by foot (71%), while smaller local parks have even higher proportions with 100% of visitors arriving by foot.

The use of cars to access open spaces is low within this sub-area. Cemeteries have the highest proportion of visitors arriving by car (40%). In contrast, the more localised amenity areas and children’s play areas are all accessed by respondents without using cars.

Buses are not generally the main use of transport to access open spaces in the sub-area. The largest proportions of bus users in the Elephant and Castle sub-area are those respondents that are visiting natural greenspaces (40%) or cemeteries (40%).

### Travel time

The most localised areas (with short journey times of less than 5 minutes) are amenity areas and children’s play areas.

The majority of residents that visit large parks and open spaces are to reach them within 10 minutes (71%), while 90% of residents that use children’s play areas are able to access these within 10 minutes. Similarly those 71% of those respondents that visit outdoor sports facilities are able to reach them within 10 minutes.

Respondents that visit cemeteries have a longer journey time of between 31 to 45 minutes (80%).

### Quality of spaces

Those categories rated as being good or very good quality sites are the Thames Path (94%), Metropolitan Parks (83%) and cemeteries (80%).

Categories with a higher proportion of poor or very poor ratings include outdoor sports facilities (28%), children’s play areas (10%), and smaller local parks (8%).

### Satisfaction and quality of life

Respondents in the Elephant and Castle sub-area have the recorded the lowest levels of satisfaction with open space in the borough (71%).
In terms of the contribution open space plays in respondent’s quality of life, 78% of respondents feel open space contributes a little or a lot to quality of life in the Elephant and Castle sub-area, which is the same as Bermondsey and only higher than Walworth (77%).

Non use and improvements of open space

Non users of open spaces were asked their reasons for non use. Time constraints (45%) and safety fears/undesirable condition (18%).

Residents asked what improvements could be made to encourage greater use of open space. Cleaner environments (less litter, graffiti, dog mess, etc) (17%), more park rangers/wardens (15%), improved safety (10%) and more/different activities (10%) were all cited as priorities in the Elephant and Castle sub-area. However, 34% of all respondents in the sub-area stated that nothing would encourage them to use spaces more frequently; this suggests that improving the cleanliness and safety aspects may contribute to increasing the proportion of people that use open spaces in Elephant and Castle.

C.7 Walworth

Open space users and non users

The most popular larger publically owned and managed open spaces used by respondents are Burgess Park followed by Kennington Park, that receive 48% and 37% of visitations from respondents in the Walworth area, respectively.

Some 19% of the sub-area residents do not use any type of open space, which is much higher than the borough average of 10%.

Comparison of different open space types

Metropolitan Parks are the most popular type of open space for the sub-area residents to visit (68%), which is followed the Thames Path (29%) and smaller local parks (26%).

Open spaces that perform a recreational role attract more regular visitation. Of those that use children’s play area 90% visit at least once a week, while all of the allotment users visit at least once per week. Conversely of those that visit outdoor sports facilities only 36% visit at least once a week.

The large open spaces are visited by their uses on a regular basis, with 55% of respondents visiting at least once week. Similarly 80% of visitors that use a local park visit it at least once a week.

Reasons for use

The most common reason for visiting large parks and opens spaces are for fresh air (50%) and walking (45%). For visiting smaller local parks 100% of respondents visit for the primary purpose of children’s play.

Time spent

A high proportion of respondents from the Walworth sub-area tend to spend more than 1 hour at large parks and open spaces (57%). Visitors to outdoor sports facilities tend to stay for 1-2 hours (55%).

Respondents who visit amenity areas spend the least amount of time, with 67% staying for less than 30 minutes.
Travel mode

C.7.9 The majority of visitors to large open spaces access these by foot (85%), while smaller local parks have even higher proportions with 95% of visitors arriving by foot.

C.7.10 Of the respondents that visit cemeteries, only 33% travel there by car in comparison to 67% that travel there by bus. Children's play areas, outdoor sports facilities and amenity spaces are all accessed by respondents without using cars, while large parks and open spaces have a low level of car usage (4%).

C.7.11 The use of public transport to access open space is generally low, with respondents that do travel by bus primarily using it to visit cemeteries and the Thames Path.

Travel time

C.7.12 The most localised areas (with short journey times of less than 5 minutes) are amenity areas, smaller local parks and children's play areas. The majority of residents that visit large parks and open spaces are to reach them within 10 minutes (70%). The majority of residents that use outdoor sport facilities have a travel time of less than 15 minutes (91%).

C.7.13 Respondents that use the Thames Path have a longer journey time of between 11 to 30 minutes (73%). Cemeteries also have a longer travelling time of between 21 to 30 minutes (69%).

Quality of spaces

C.7.14 Those categories rated as being good or very good quality sites are outdoor sports facilities (91%), smaller local parks (80%) and Metropolitan Parks (72%). Allotments and natural green space areas achieved a 100% good or very good quality site rating.

C.7.15 Categories with a higher proportion of poor or very poor ratings include children's play areas, and amenity areas (17%).

Satisfaction and quality of life

C.7.16 Respondents in the Walworth sub-area recorded high levels of satisfaction with open space (82%), with only Dulwich and Canada Water sub-areas achieving higher scores.

C.7.17 In terms of the contribution open space plays in respondent's quality of life, 77% of respondents feel open space contributes a little or a lot to quality of life in the Walworth sub-area, which is the lowest score in the borough.

Non use and improvements of open space

C.7.18 Non users of open spaces were asked their reasons for non use. Time constraints (29%) and disability (19%) were the most common responses.

C.7.19 Residents asked what improvements could be made to encourage greater use of open space. Cleaner environments (less litter, graffiti, dog mess, etc) (18%), more park rangers/wardens (18%), more/improved sports facilities (13%) and improved safety (13%) were all cited as priorities in the Walworth sub-area. However, 45% of all respondents in the sub-area stated that nothing would encourage them to use spaces more frequently, suggesting that investment in new facilities for some would reap little by way of increased usage.
C.8 Peckham and Nunhead

Open space users and non users

C.8.1 The most popular large parks and open spaces are Burgess Park and Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common, which each receive 36% of visitations from sub-area respondents that use this type of open space.

C.8.2 Only 8% of the sub-area residents do not use any type of open space, which is less than the borough average of 10%.

Comparison of different open space types

C.8.3 Metropolitan Parks are the most popular type of open space for the sub-area residents to visit (68%), which is followed by smaller local parks (47%) and children’s play area (35%).

C.8.4 Open spaces that perform a recreational role attract more regular visitation. Of those that use children’s play area 67% visit at least once a week, while 50% of those that visit outdoor sports facilities visit at least once a week.

C.8.5 The large open spaces are visited by their users on a regular basis, with 50% of respondents visiting at least once a week. Similarly 56% of visitors that use a local park visit it at least once a week. Of those that use amenity areas, 65% visit at least once a week.

Reasons for use

C.8.6 The most common reason for visiting large open parks and opens spaces are for walking (41%), children’s play (32%) and fresh air (31%). For visiting smaller local parks 55% of respondents visit for children’s play, while a further 32% go for the purpose of walking.

Time spent

C.8.7 A high proportion of respondents from the Peckham and the Nunhead sub-area tend to spend more than 1 hour at large open spaces (64%). Visitors to outdoor sports facilities tend to stay for 1-2 hours (50%).

C.8.8 Respondents who visit amenity areas spend the least amount of time, with 65% staying for less than 30 minutes.

Travel mode

C.8.9 The majority of visitors to large open spaces access these by foot (64%), while smaller local parks have even higher proportions with 92% of visitors arriving by foot.

C.8.10 Cemeteries have the highest proportion of respondents that arrive by car (30%), though this is not the most popular mode of transport to visit this type of space, which is walking with 40%.

C.8.11 Allotments, amenity areas, are all accessed by respondents without using cars, while smaller local parks have a low level of car usage (3%).

C.8.12 Buses are not generally the main use of transport to access open spaces in the sub-area. Of the respondents visiting the Thames Path, 36% use the bus, while 31% of respondents visiting outdoor sport facilities use buses.

Travel time

C.8.13 The most localised areas (with short journey times of less than 5 minutes) are amenity areas, smaller local parks and children’s play areas. The majority of residents that visit larger open
spaces are to reach them within 10 minutes (53%), while 60% of residents that use cemeteries are able to access these within 10 minutes.

C.8.14 Respondents that visit outdoor sport facilities have a longer journey time of 16 to 30 minutes (59%). While the majority of those that use the Thames Path have a journey time of between 11 to 30 minutes (74%)

Quality of spaces

C.8.15 Those categories rated as being good or very good quality sites are Thames Path (89%), Metropolitan Parks (88%), outdoor sports facilities (78%) and children’s play area (78%).

C.8.16 Categories with a higher proportion of poor or very poor ratings include amenity areas (18%), cemeteries (10%) and smaller local parks (7%).

Satisfaction and quality of life

C.8.17 Respondents in the Peckham and Nunhead sub-area recorded the second lowest levels of satisfaction with open space (76%), with only Elephant and Castle scoring lower with 71%.

C.8.18 In terms of the contribution open space plays in respondent’s quality of life, 79% of respondents feel open space contributes a little or a lot to quality of life in the Peckham and Nunhead sub-area, which is lower than the sub-areas of Bankside, Camberwell, Canada Water and Dulwich.

Non use and improvements of open space

C.8.19 Non users of open spaces were asked their reasons for non use. Time constraints (32%), not enough to do (16%) and poor/maintenance condition (13%) were the most common responses.

C.8.20 Residents asked what improvements could be made to encourage greater use of open space. Cleaner environments (less litter, graffiti, dog mess, etc) (23%), improved safety (14%), more/improved sports facilities (13%) and more/different attractions (13%) were all cited as priorities in the Peckham and Nunhead sub-area. However, 34% of all respondents in the sub-area stated that nothing would encourage them to use spaces more frequently; this suggests that improving maintenance may contribute to increasing the proportion of people that use open spaces in Peckham and Nunhead.

C.9 Dulwich

Open space users and non users

C.9.1 The most popular larger publically owned and managed open spaces used by respondents accessing large parks and open spaces are Dulwich Park (55%), followed by Peckham Rye Park and Peckham Rye Common (20%).

C.9.2 Only 2% of the sub-area residents do not use any type of open space, which is less than the borough average of 10% and lower than any other sub-area.

Comparison of different open space types

C.9.3 Metropolitan Parks are the most popular type of open space for the sub-area residents to visit (79%), which is followed by the Thames Path (39%) and smaller local parks (36%).

C.9.4 Open spaces that perform a recreational role attract more regular visitation. Of those that use children’s play area 55% visit at least once a week. The large parks and open spaces that are visited by their users on a regular basis, with 55% of respondents visiting at least once week. Conversely, the amenity areas are also visited at least once a week by their users (60%).
Reasons for use

C.9.5 The most common reason for visiting large parks and opens spaces are for walking (50%), fresh air (37%) and children’s play (28%). For visiting smaller local parks, 33% of respondents visit for the purpose of walking, while a further 22% go for exercise.

Time spent

C.9.6 Over half of respondents from the Dulwich sub-area tend to spend more than 1 hour at large open spaces (58%). Visitors to outdoor sports facilities tend to stay for between 30 minutes and 2 hours (58%), while 64% of those that visit natural space areas spend between 30 minutes and 2 hours.

C.9.7 Respondents who visit amenity areas spend the least amount of time, with 67% staying for less than 30 minutes.

Travel mode

C.9.8 The majority of visitors to large open spaces access these by foot (70%), while smaller local parks have even higher proportions with 81% of visitors arriving by foot.

C.9.9 The highest proportion of car use to access an open space is with visiting cemeteries with 43% of respondents using this mode of transport.

C.9.10 Amenity areas and children’s play areas are all accessed by respondents without using cars.

C.9.11 Buses are not generally the main use of transport to access open spaces in the sub-area. The largest proportions of bus users in the Dulwich sub-area are those respondents that are visiting the Thames Path (18%).

Travel time

C.9.12 The most localised areas (with short journey times of less than 5 minutes) are amenity areas and large parks and open spaces, with 60% and 43% of users reaching these open spaces in less than 5 minutes, respectively.

C.9.13 The majority of residents that visit large parks and open spaces are to reach them within 10 minutes (70%), while 74% of residents that use children’s play areas are able to access these within 10 minutes. Similarly those 54% of those respondents that visit outdoor sports facilities are able to reach them within 10 minutes.

C.9.14 Over half of respondents that use the Thames Path have a longer journey time of between 21 to 45 minutes (56%).

Quality of spaces

C.9.15 Those categories rated as being good or very good quality sites are natural greenspace areas (89%), Metropolitan Parks (88%), outdoor sports facilities (84%) and the Thames Path (82%).

C.9.16 Categories with a higher proportion of poor or very poor ratings include allotments (20%), and cemeteries (4%).

Satisfaction and quality of life

C.9.17 Respondents in the Dulwich sub-area have the recorded the highest levels of satisfaction with open space in the borough (91%).

C.9.18 In terms of the contribution open space plays in respondent’s quality of life, 94% of respondents feel open space contributes a little or a lot to quality of life in the Dulwich sub-area, which is a higher score than any other sub-area.
Non use and improvements of open space

C.9.19  Non users of open spaces were asked their reasons for non use. Time constraints (57%) and poor health (29%) were the most common responses.

C.9.20  Residents asked what improvements could be made to encourage greater use of open space. Cleaner environments (less litter, graffiti, dog mess, etc) (18%), more park rangers/wardens (10%), more events/activities (10%) and more/different activities (10%) were all cited as priorities in the Dulwich sub-area. However, 50% of all respondents in the sub-area stated that nothing would encourage them to use spaces more frequently, suggesting that investment in new facilities for some would reap little by way of increased usage.
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### E.1 Schedule of Sites Assessed

#### Table E.1 – Schedule of Open Space Sites Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Name of Space</th>
<th>Sub-Area</th>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS1</td>
<td>Christchurch Gardens</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS2</td>
<td>Paris Gardens</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - private</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS3</td>
<td>Cathedral Precinct</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS4</td>
<td>Potter’s Field Park</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS5</td>
<td>Surrey Water</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS6</td>
<td>Surrey Docks Sports Ground (Pitch 1)</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - private</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS7</td>
<td>Surrey Docks Sports Ground (Pitches 2&amp;3)</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - education</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS8</td>
<td>Lavender Pond</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS9</td>
<td>Pearson Park</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS10</td>
<td>Nelson Square Gardens</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS11</td>
<td>Grotto Podiums</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - private</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS12</td>
<td>Grotto Open space</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS13</td>
<td>All Hallows Churchyard</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS14</td>
<td>Mint Street Park</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS15</td>
<td>Redcross Gardens</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS16</td>
<td>Little Dorrit Park</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS17</td>
<td>Marlborough Playground</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS18</td>
<td>St George's Churchyard and Gardens</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS19</td>
<td>Guy Street Park</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS20</td>
<td>Leathermarket Gardens</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS21</td>
<td>Snowsfield Nature Garden</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS22</td>
<td>Bermondsey Playground</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Name of Space</td>
<td>Sub-Area</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Size (ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS23</td>
<td>St John’s Churchyard</td>
<td>London Bridge</td>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS24</td>
<td>Dr Salter’s Playground</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Provision for young people and teenagers</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS25</td>
<td>Cherry Gardens</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Linear Open Space</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS26</td>
<td>Angel Public House</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Civic Spaces</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS27</td>
<td>King Edward III Manor House</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS28</td>
<td>King’s Stairs Gardens</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS29</td>
<td>Hope Sufferance Wharf</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Civic Spaces</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS30</td>
<td>St Mary’s Churchyard, Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS31</td>
<td>St Mary’s Churchyard Gardens</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS32</td>
<td>Knot Garden</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Civic Spaces</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS33</td>
<td>Brunel Pump House</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Civic Spaces</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS34</td>
<td>Deal Porter’s Walk</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Linear Open Space</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS35</td>
<td>Albion Channel</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Civic Spaces</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS36</td>
<td>Stave Hill</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS37</td>
<td>Stave Hill Ecological Park</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS38</td>
<td>Russia Dock Woodlands</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>District Park</td>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS39</td>
<td>Holy Trinity Churchyard</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS40</td>
<td>Durand’s Wharf</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS41</td>
<td>Surrey Docks Farm</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS42</td>
<td>Newington Gardens</td>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS43</td>
<td>Trinity Church Square</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS44</td>
<td>Dickens Square</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS45</td>
<td>Merrick Square</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS46</td>
<td>Tabard Gardens</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Local Park</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS47</td>
<td>Hankey Place Gardens</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS48</td>
<td>Long Lane Park</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS49</td>
<td>St Mary Magdalen Churchyard</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS50</td>
<td>Bermondsey Square</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Amenity space</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Name of Space</td>
<td>Sub-Area</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Size (ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS51</td>
<td>Beormond Environ Open Space.</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS52</td>
<td>St James’ Churchyard</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS53</td>
<td>Southwark Park</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Metropolitan Park</td>
<td>26.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS54</td>
<td>King George’s Field Park</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS55</td>
<td>Canada Water</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS56</td>
<td>Geraldine Mary Harmsworth Park</td>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>Local Park</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS57</td>
<td>West Square Garden</td>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS58</td>
<td>Falmouth Road Community Garden</td>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS59</td>
<td>David Copperfield Gardens</td>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>Linear Open Space</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS60</td>
<td>Swanmead</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS61</td>
<td>Bermondsey Spa Park</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS62</td>
<td>Lucey Way/Alexis Street</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS63</td>
<td>Aspinden Road Nature Garden</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS64</td>
<td>Greenland Dock</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS65</td>
<td>South Dock</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS66</td>
<td>Lamlash Street Allotments</td>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS67</td>
<td>St Mary’s Churchyard, Newington</td>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS68</td>
<td>Victory Community Park</td>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS69</td>
<td>Paragon Gardens</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS70</td>
<td>Salisbury Row Park</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS71</td>
<td>St Anne’s Churchyard</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS72</td>
<td>St James’ Road Allotments</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS73</td>
<td>Shuttleworth Park</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS74</td>
<td>Galleywell Road Nature Garden</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS75</td>
<td>Pullens Gardens</td>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS76</td>
<td>Nursery Row Park</td>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS77</td>
<td>Surrey Square Park</td>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS78</td>
<td>Paterson Park (Western part)</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS79</td>
<td>The Stables</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS80</td>
<td>South Bermondsey Railway Embankments</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS81</td>
<td>Walworth Garden Farm</td>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Name of Space</td>
<td>Sub-Area</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Size (ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS82</td>
<td>Surrey Gardens</td>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS83</td>
<td>Sutherland Square</td>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS84</td>
<td>Pelier Park</td>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS85</td>
<td>Faraday Gardens</td>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS86</td>
<td>St Peter's Churchyard</td>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS87</td>
<td>Evelina Lowe Nature Garden</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS88</td>
<td>Bramcote Play Area</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Provision for young people and teenagers</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS89</td>
<td>Varcoe Road Nature Garden</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS90</td>
<td>Forsyth Gardens</td>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS91</td>
<td>Burgess Park</td>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>District Park</td>
<td>47.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS92</td>
<td>Kennington Park</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS93</td>
<td>Bethwin Road Open Space</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS94</td>
<td>Leyton Square</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS95</td>
<td>Bird-in-Bush Park</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS96</td>
<td>Caroline Gardens</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Amenity space</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS97</td>
<td>Benhill Road Nature Garden</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS98</td>
<td>Surrey Canal Walk</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Linear Open Space</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS99</td>
<td>Brimmington Park</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS100</td>
<td>Camberwell Green</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS101</td>
<td>Brunswick Park</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Local Park</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS102</td>
<td>Sumner Park</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS103</td>
<td>Goldsmith Road Nature Garden</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS104</td>
<td>St Giles' Churchyard</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS105</td>
<td>Lucas Gardens</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS106</td>
<td>Bellenden Road Tree Nursery</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS107</td>
<td>Cossall Park</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS108</td>
<td>Nunhead Railway Embankments</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS109</td>
<td>St Mary Frobisher Gardens</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS110</td>
<td>Grove Park and East Dulwich Railway cuttings and embankments</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>10.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS111</td>
<td>Warwick Gardens</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS112</td>
<td>Highshore Open Space</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS113</td>
<td>Holly Grove Shrubbery</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Linear Open Space</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS114</td>
<td>Lettsom Gardens</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS115</td>
<td>McDermott Grove Nature</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Name of Space</td>
<td>Sub-Area</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Size (ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS116</td>
<td>Consort Park</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS117</td>
<td>Dr Harold Moody Park</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS118</td>
<td>Nunhead Green</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS119</td>
<td>Dog Kennel Hill Open Space and Adventure Playground</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS120</td>
<td>St. Francis’ Park</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS121</td>
<td>London Wildlife Trust Centre for Wildlife Gardening.</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS122</td>
<td>Goose Green Common</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS123</td>
<td>Goose Green Playground</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS124</td>
<td>Peckham Rye Park and Common and Piermont Green</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Metropolitan Park</td>
<td>42.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS125</td>
<td>Nunhead Reservoir</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS126</td>
<td>Nunhead Cemetery</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>20.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS127</td>
<td>Ivydale Road Playing Field</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - education</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS128</td>
<td>Greendale Playing Field</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS129</td>
<td>Greendale Artificial Playing Pitch</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - private</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS130</td>
<td>Dulwich Hamlet</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - private</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS131</td>
<td>The Gardens Square</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Amenity space</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS132</td>
<td>Water Works</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS133</td>
<td>Nunhead Allotments</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS134</td>
<td>Nairne Grove Nature Garden</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS135</td>
<td>James Allens Girls School Playing Fields</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - education</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS136</td>
<td>Charter School</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - education</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS137</td>
<td>Waverley School</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - education</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS138</td>
<td>Sunray Gardens</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS139</td>
<td>James Allens Girls Schools Sports Club</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - education</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS140</td>
<td>Alleyn School Playing Field (North of Townley Road)</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - education</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS141</td>
<td>Friern Road Allotments</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS142</td>
<td>Homestall Road Playing Field</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - private</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS143</td>
<td>Aquarius Golf Course</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - private</td>
<td>13.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS144</td>
<td>Brenchley Gardens</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Name of Space</td>
<td>Sub-Area</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Size (ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS145</td>
<td>Camberwell New Cemetery and Grounds</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>17.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS146</td>
<td>Herne Hill Cycle Stadium and Sports Ground</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - private</td>
<td>8.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS147</td>
<td>Alleyn School Playing Pitch (Carlton Avenue)</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - education</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS148</td>
<td>Plough Lane Pond</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS149</td>
<td>Camberwell Old Cemetery</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>11.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS150</td>
<td>One Tree Hill</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS151</td>
<td>Honor Oak Allotments</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS152</td>
<td>Honor Oak Sports Ground</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Local Park</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS153</td>
<td>Burbage Road Playing Fields</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - private</td>
<td>6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS154</td>
<td>Dulwich Library Garden</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Greenspaces within grounds of institution</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS155</td>
<td>Dawson’s Hill/Dawson Heights</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS156</td>
<td>Sydenham Hill Railway Cuttings</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS157</td>
<td>Dulwich College Playing Fields and Sports Grounds (Turney Road and West Gallery Road)</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - education</td>
<td>14.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS158</td>
<td>Dulwich Picture Gallery Grounds</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Greenspaces within grounds of institution</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS159</td>
<td>Dulwich Park</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Metropolitan Park</td>
<td>30.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS160</td>
<td>Belair Park</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Local Park</td>
<td>10.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS161</td>
<td>Dulwich College Playing Fields and Sports Ground (East Gallery Road)</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - education</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS162</td>
<td>Southwark Sports Ground</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - private</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS163</td>
<td>Barclay Way</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Amenity space</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS164</td>
<td>Mill Pond</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Greenspaces within grounds of institution</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS165</td>
<td>Pynners Close Playing Field</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - private</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS166</td>
<td>Old Alleynian’s Sports Ground</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - education</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS168</td>
<td>Dulwich Common Allotments and Tennis Club</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - private</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS169</td>
<td>Dulwich Common Sports Ground and Cricket Club</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - private</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS170</td>
<td>St Peter’s Churchyard (Lordship Lane)</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Name of Space</td>
<td>Sub-Area</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Size (ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS171</td>
<td>Dulwich College</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - education</td>
<td>17.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS172</td>
<td>Dulwich College Sports Ground (North Grange Road)</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - education</td>
<td>8.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS173</td>
<td>Dulwich and Sydenham Hill Golf Club</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - private</td>
<td>33.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS174</td>
<td>Cox’s Walk</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Linear Open Space</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS175</td>
<td>Cox’s walk Allotments</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS176</td>
<td>Mary Datchelor Playing Field</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - education</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS177</td>
<td>College Sports Ground (South Grange Road)</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - education</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS178</td>
<td>Grange Road Allotments (South)</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS179</td>
<td>The Fort Camping Ground</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Provision for young people and teenagers</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS180</td>
<td>Grange Road Allotments (North)</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS181</td>
<td>Sydenham Hill and Dulwich Woods</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>28.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS182</td>
<td>Kingswood House</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Greenspaces within grounds of institution</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS183</td>
<td>Countisbury House Lawns (Dulwich)</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Amenity space</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS184</td>
<td>Long Meadow</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Amenity space</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS185</td>
<td>Carlton Place Copse/Hitherwood</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS186</td>
<td>Gipsy Hill Railway Cutting</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS187</td>
<td>Dulwich Upper Wood</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS188</td>
<td>College Road</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Central Venture Park</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Provision for young people and teenagers</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>Calypso Gardens</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>Caspian Street Allotments</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>Grove Park Allotments</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>Dunston Roads Allotments</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Bonar Road Allotments</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Aylesbury Road Allotments</td>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Fielding Street Allotments</td>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Alsucot Road Allotments</td>
<td>Bermondsey &amp; Old Kent Road</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW1</td>
<td>Lorrimore Square Gardens</td>
<td>Aylesbury &amp; Walworth</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB1</td>
<td>Montague Close Open Space</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Name of Space</td>
<td>Sub-Area</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Size (ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB2</td>
<td>Crossbones Graveyard</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB3</td>
<td>Tate Garden</td>
<td>Bankside, Borough and London Bridge</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW1</td>
<td>St Pauls Sports Ground</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - education</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW2</td>
<td>Former Nursery</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW3</td>
<td>Cumberland Wharf</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW4</td>
<td>Surrey Docks Adventure Playground</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Provision for young people and teenagers</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW5</td>
<td>Neptune Street Park</td>
<td>Canada Water and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1</td>
<td>Carter Place</td>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2</td>
<td>Diversity Garden</td>
<td>Elephant and Castle</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN1</td>
<td>Jowett Street Park</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN2</td>
<td>Lyndhurst Square</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Amenity space</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN3</td>
<td>Hatcham Gardens</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Pocket Park</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN4</td>
<td>Brayards Green</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Amenity space</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN5</td>
<td>Buchan Hall Sports Pitch</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities - private</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN6</td>
<td>Kirkwood Road Nature Garden</td>
<td>Peckham &amp; Nunhead</td>
<td>Small Local Park</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>The Spinney</td>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>Natural or semi-natural greenspaces</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# F.1 Quality and Value Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Value Score (%)</th>
<th>Quality Score (%)</th>
<th>Relationship between Quality and Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS1</td>
<td>Christchurch Gardens</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS2</td>
<td>Paris Gardens</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS3</td>
<td>Cathedral Precinct</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS4</td>
<td>Potter’s Field Park</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS5</td>
<td>Surrey Water</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS6</td>
<td>Surrey Docks Sports Ground (Pitch 1)</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS7</td>
<td>Surrey Docks Sports Ground (Pitches 2&amp;3)</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS8</td>
<td>Lavender Pond</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS9</td>
<td>Pearson Park</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS10</td>
<td>Nelson Square Gardens</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS11</td>
<td>Grotto Podiums</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS12</td>
<td>Grotto Open Space</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS13</td>
<td>All Hallows Churchyard</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS14</td>
<td>Mint Street Park</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS15</td>
<td>Redcross Gardens</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS16</td>
<td>Little Dorrit Park</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS17</td>
<td>Marlborough Playground</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS18</td>
<td>St George’s Churchyard and Gardens</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS19</td>
<td>Guy Street Park</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS20</td>
<td>Leathermarket Gardens</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS21</td>
<td>Snowsfield Nature Garden</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS22</td>
<td>Bermondsey Playground</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Value Score (%)</td>
<td>Quality Score (%)</td>
<td>Relationship between Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS23</td>
<td>St John’s Churchyard</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS24</td>
<td>Dr Salter’s Playground</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS25</td>
<td>Cherry Gardens</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS26</td>
<td>Angel Public House</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS27</td>
<td>King Edward III Manor House</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS28</td>
<td>King’s Stairs Gardens</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS29</td>
<td>Hope Sufferance Wharf</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS30</td>
<td>St Mary’s Churchyard, Rotherhithe</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS31</td>
<td>St Mary’s Churchyard Gardens</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS32</td>
<td>Knot Garden</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS33</td>
<td>Brunel Pump House</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS34</td>
<td>Deal Porter’s Walk</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS35</td>
<td>Albion Channel</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS36</td>
<td>Stave Hill</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS37</td>
<td>Stave Hill Ecological Park</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS38</td>
<td>Russia Dock Woodlands</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS39</td>
<td>Holy Trinity Churchyard</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS40</td>
<td>Durand’s Wharf</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS41</td>
<td>Surrey Docks Farm</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS42</td>
<td>Newington Gardens</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS43</td>
<td>Trinity Church Square</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS44</td>
<td>Dickens Square</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS45</td>
<td>Merrick Square</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS46</td>
<td>Tabard Gardens</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS47</td>
<td>Hankey Place Gardens</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Value Score (%)</td>
<td>Quality Score (%)</td>
<td>Relationship between Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS48</td>
<td>Long Lane Park</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS49</td>
<td>St Mary Magdalen Churchyard</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS50</td>
<td>Bermondsey Square</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS51</td>
<td>Beormond Environ Open Space.</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS52</td>
<td>St James’ Churchyard</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS53</td>
<td>Southwark Park</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS54</td>
<td>King George’s Field Park</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS55</td>
<td>Canada Water</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS56</td>
<td>Geraldine Mary Harmsworth Park</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS57</td>
<td>West Square Garden</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS58</td>
<td>Falmouth Road Community Garden</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS59</td>
<td>David Copperfield Gardens</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS60</td>
<td>Swanmead</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS61</td>
<td>Bermondsey Spa Park</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS62</td>
<td>Lucey Way/Alexis Street</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS63</td>
<td>Aspinden Road Nature Garden</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS64</td>
<td>Greenland Dock</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS65</td>
<td>South Dock</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS66</td>
<td>Lamlash Street Allotments</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS67</td>
<td>St Mary’s Churchyard, Newington</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS68</td>
<td>Victory Community Park</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS69</td>
<td>Paragon Gardens</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS70</td>
<td>Salisbury Row Park</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS71</td>
<td>St Anne’s Churchyard</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Value Score (%)</td>
<td>Quality Score (%)</td>
<td>Relationship between Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS72</td>
<td>St James' Road Allotments</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS73</td>
<td>Shuttleworth Park</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS74</td>
<td>Galleywell Road Nature Garden</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS75</td>
<td>Pullens Gardens</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS76</td>
<td>Nursery Row Park</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS77</td>
<td>Surrey Square Park</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS78</td>
<td>Paterson Park (Western part)</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS79</td>
<td>The Stables</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS80</td>
<td>South Bermondsey Railway Embankments</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS81</td>
<td>Walworth Garden Farm</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS82</td>
<td>Surrey Gardens</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS83</td>
<td>Sutherland Square</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS84</td>
<td>Pelier Park</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS85</td>
<td>Faraday Gardens</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS86</td>
<td>St Peter's Churchyard</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS87</td>
<td>Evelina Lowe Nature Garden</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS88</td>
<td>Bramcote Play Area</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS89</td>
<td>Varcoe Road Nature Garden</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS90</td>
<td>Forsyth Gardens</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS91</td>
<td>Burgess Park</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS92</td>
<td>Kennington Park</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS93</td>
<td>Bethwin Road Open Space</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS94</td>
<td>Leyton Square</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS95</td>
<td>Bird-in-Bush Park</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS96</td>
<td>Caroline Gardens</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Value Score (%)</td>
<td>Quality Score (%)</td>
<td>Relationship between Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS97</td>
<td>Benhill Road Nature Garden</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS98</td>
<td>Surrey Canal Walk</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS99</td>
<td>Brimmington Park</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS100</td>
<td>Camberwell Green</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS101</td>
<td>Brunswick Park</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS102</td>
<td>Sumner Park</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS103</td>
<td>Goldsmith Road Nature Garden</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS104</td>
<td>St Giles’ Churchyard</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS105</td>
<td>Lucas Gardens</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS106</td>
<td>Bellenden Road Tree Nursery</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS107</td>
<td>Cossal Park</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS108</td>
<td>Nunhead Railway Embankments</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS109</td>
<td>St Mary Frobisher Gardens</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS110</td>
<td>Grove Park and East Dulwich Railway cuttings and embankments</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS111</td>
<td>Warwick Gardens</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS112</td>
<td>Highshore Open Space</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS113</td>
<td>Holly Grove Shrubbery</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS114</td>
<td>Lettsom Gardens</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS115</td>
<td>McDermott Grove Nature Garden</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS116</td>
<td>Consort Park</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS117</td>
<td>Dr Harold Moody Park</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS118</td>
<td>Nunhead Green</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS119</td>
<td>Dog Kennel Hill Open Space and Adventure Playground</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS120</td>
<td>St. Francis’ Park</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Value Score (%)</td>
<td>Quality Score (%)</td>
<td>Relationship between Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS121</td>
<td>London Wildlife Trust Centre for Wildlife Gardening.</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS122</td>
<td>Goose Green Common</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS123</td>
<td>Goose Green Playground</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS124</td>
<td>Peckham Rye Park and Common and Piermont Green</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS125</td>
<td>Nunhead Reservoir</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS126</td>
<td>Nunhead Cemetery</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS127</td>
<td>Ivydale Road Playing Field</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS128</td>
<td>Greendale Playing Field</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS129</td>
<td>Greendale Artificial Playing Pitch</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS130</td>
<td>Dulwich Hamlet</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS131</td>
<td>The Gardens Square</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS132</td>
<td>Water Works</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS133</td>
<td>Nunhead Allotments</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS134</td>
<td>Nairne Grove Nature Garden</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS135</td>
<td>James Allens Girls School Playing Fields</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS136</td>
<td>Charter School</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS137</td>
<td>Waverley School</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS138</td>
<td>Sunray Gardens</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS139</td>
<td>James Allens Girls Schools Sports Club</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS140</td>
<td>Alleyn School Playing Field (North of Townley Road)</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS141</td>
<td>Friern Road Allotments</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS142</td>
<td>Homestall Road Playing Field</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS143</td>
<td>Aquarius Golf Course</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS144</td>
<td>Brenchley Gardens</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Value Score (%)</td>
<td>Quality Score (%)</td>
<td>Relationship between Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS145</td>
<td>Camberwell New Cemetery and Grounds</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS146</td>
<td>Herne Hill Cycle Stadium and Sports Ground</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS147</td>
<td>Alleyn School Playing Pitch (Carlton Avenue)</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS149</td>
<td>Camberwell Old Cemetery</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS150</td>
<td>One Tree Hill</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS151</td>
<td>Honor Oak Allotments</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS152</td>
<td>Honor Oak Sports Ground</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS153</td>
<td>Burbage Road Playing Fields</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS154</td>
<td>Dulwich Library Garden</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS155</td>
<td>Dawson’s Hill/Dawson Heights</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS156</td>
<td>Sydenham Hill Railway Cuttings</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS157</td>
<td>Dulwich College Playing Fields and Sports Grounds (Turney Road and West Gallery Road)</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS158</td>
<td>Dulwich Picture Gallery Grounds</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS159</td>
<td>Dulwich Park</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS160</td>
<td>Belair Park</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS161</td>
<td>Dulwich College Playing Fields and Sports Ground (East Gallery Road)</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS162</td>
<td>Southwark Sports Ground</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS163</td>
<td>Barclay Way</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS164</td>
<td>Mill Pond</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS165</td>
<td>Pynners Close Playing Field</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS166</td>
<td>Old Alleynian’s Sports Ground</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS167</td>
<td>Honor Oak and Tulse Hill Playing Fields / Sports Grounds</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS168</td>
<td>Dulwich Common Allotments and Tennis Club</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS169</td>
<td>Dulwich Common Sports</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Value Score (%)</td>
<td>Quality Score (%)</td>
<td>Relationship between Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS170</td>
<td>St Peter’s Churchyard (Lordship Lane)</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS171</td>
<td>Dulwich College</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS172</td>
<td>Dulwich College Sports Ground (North Grange Road)</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS173</td>
<td>Dulwich and Sydenham Hill Golf Club</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS174</td>
<td>Cox’s Walk</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS175</td>
<td>Cox’s walk Allotments</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS176</td>
<td>Mary Datchelor Playing Field</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS177</td>
<td>College Sports Ground (South Grange Road)</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS178</td>
<td>Grange Road Allotments (South)</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS179</td>
<td>The Fort Camping Ground</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS180</td>
<td>Grange Road Allotments (North)</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS181</td>
<td>Sydenham Hill and Dulwich Woods</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS183</td>
<td>Countisbury House Lawns (Dulwich)</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>Above Average Value, Below Average Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS184</td>
<td>Long Meadow</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS185</td>
<td>Carlton Place Copse/Hitherwood</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS186</td>
<td>Gipsy Hill Railway Cutting</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS187</td>
<td>Dulwich Upper Wood</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS188</td>
<td>College Road</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Central Venture Park</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>Calypso Gardens</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>Caspian Street Allotments</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>Grove Park Allotments</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>Dunston Road Allotments</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Bonar Road Allotments</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Value Score (%)</td>
<td>Quality Score (%)</td>
<td>Relationship between Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Aylesbury Road Allotments</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Fielding Street Allotments</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Alscot Road Allotments</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB1</td>
<td>Montague Close Open Space</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW1</td>
<td>St Pauls Sports Ground</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW2</td>
<td>Former Nursery</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW3</td>
<td>Cumberland Wharf</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>Above Average Quality, Below Average Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW4</td>
<td>Surrey Docks Adventure Playground</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW5</td>
<td>Neptune Street Park</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN1</td>
<td>Jowett Street Park</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN2</td>
<td>Lyndhurst Square</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN3</td>
<td>Montague Square</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN4</td>
<td>Brayards Green</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN5</td>
<td>Buchan Hall Sports Pitch</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN6</td>
<td>Kirkwood Road Nature Garden</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>Below Average Quality and Value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contact us

Planning policy team, Chief Executive’s Department, Southwark Council, P.O. Box 64529, London SE1P 5LX.

Any enquiries relating to this document can be directed to planning policy team, Southwark Council. Email planningpolicy@southwark.gov.uk, Tel 020 7525 5471

This document can be viewed at www.southwark.gov.uk

If you require this document in large print, braille or audiotape please contact us on 020 7525 5548.