

Butterfingers Cup

For those London Boroughs that just can't keep hold of their social housing



Between 2004 and 2018, fifteen London councils lost more social housing (homes for social or 'affordable' rent) than was built in their boroughs. That is to say they made a negative net contribution to the capital's social housing stock. Which are the worst offenders?

Welcome to the league table that no low income resident wants their borough to be on...

THE LEAGUE TABLE 2004-2018

Position	Borough	Homes built	Loss as a percentage of borough's total stock in 2004
1st	Southwark	- 2,987	- 5.1%
2nd	Camden	-1,872	- 5.1%
3rd	Lambeth	-1,588	- 3.2%
4th	Islington	-1,187	- 2.8%
5th	Hackney	-937	- 2.0%
6th	Barking & Dagenham	-788	- 3.3%
7th	Lewisham	-776	- 2.0%

Position	Borough	Homes built	Loss as a percentage of borough's total stock in 2004
8th	Kensington & Chelsea	-702	- 3.4%
9th	Haringey	-520	- 1.9%
10th	Greenwich	-516	- 1.4%
11th	Hammersmith & Fulham	-477	- 1.8%
12th	Wandsworth	-289	-1.0%
13th	Newham	-278	-0.9%
14th	Redbridge	-118	- 1.2%
15th	City of London	-96	-12.6%

These figures are for council and housing association homes combined for the years 2004-18. Our calculations were made using the Government's Live Tables on Dwelling Stock. We used 2004 as a benchmark as this was the year of the first London Plan.

Thanks to estate demolitions and the Right to Buy, London in 2018 had just 0.6% more social housing (homes for social or 'affordable' rent) than it did in 2004.

As a consequence, 13% of social renters in London are overcrowded (compared to 5% nationally) and in the fifteen months to June 2018, 2,500 homeless households were moved out of London completely.

How have the boroughs fared since 2018? We'll be announcing the feckless winners of the 2019 Butterfingers Cup at our Annual Conference this autumn.