



REVIEW OF MAYORAL PLANNING DECISIONS

REPORT BY THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTMINSTER DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND TRANSPORT

1. Introduction

The purpose of this research consultancy was to undertake a review of the Mayor's decisions and advice on strategic planning applications between May 2008 and the publication of the revised London Plan in July 2011. This was undertaken through a review of documentation relating to a sample of strategic planning applications considered by the Mayor over this three year period. This report provides an update on a report on a sample of planning decisions by the previous Mayor published by the London Assembly Planning and Spatial Development Committee in 2007.

The criteria for cases referable to the Mayor by the local planning authority and the Mayor's powers in relation to such applications is set out in section 5 of GOL circular 1/2008 *Strategic Planning in London*, which is a revision of GOL circular 1/2001 to incorporate the changes to the Mayor's planning powers as set out in the Greater London Authority Act 2007.

2. Research Methodology

The population for the sample was all cases considered by the Mayor as stage 2 cases between May 2008 and July 2011. This analysis therefore relates only to cases referred to the Mayor under his strategic planning powers, where the Mayor had made comments on the application under the stage 1 consultation procedure. In order to obtain a sample of over 40 cases, every eighth case stage 2 report to the Mayor in date order was taken. In cases where the archive file was not available within the project timescale, case documentation held electronically was analysed. The total in the sample was 45 cases. The GLA then obtained case files from archive for the consultant's inspection. Inspection of files commenced on 21st November 2012 and was completed on 22nd December 2012, taking in total some 13 days, with inspection of a file normally taking 1 to 1.5 hours. Within the timetable available for the project, it was not possible to undertake detailed scrutiny of all supporting documents (though a record was kept of all substantive documentation on each case file) though supporting reports, for example financial viability appraisals, were scrutinised where these appeared to be critical to the Mayor's decision.

3. Overview

Any planning decision is a subjective assessment of the relative importance of a range

of different factors applying in relation to an extensive range of published policies. The 2008 London Plan had 197 policies. In addition a planning application also has to have regard to national planning policies, as set out in Planning Policy Guidance (PPGs) and Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) and to policies adopted by the Local Planning Authority in terms of Core Strategies and other Local Development Documents such as Site Allocations and Area Planning Frameworks. Applications need also to have regard to Supplementary Planning Guidance published at both mayoral and Local Planning Authority Level. In addition the Mayor has sponsored a number of Planning Frameworks for Opportunity Areas - those areas identified in the London Plan as having significant capacity for new development. Some documents may have been published as consultative drafts rather than as adopted final documents. These however may still be a material consideration for planning decisions. For example the Mayor published in October 2009, his initial draft for a replacement London Plan, and reports to the Mayor after this date refer to new policies referred to in this document. Similarly, the Mayor published in 2010 his proposals for a levy to support Crossrail, and while this proposal relied on the Localism Act, not enacted until December 2011, after the end of the project case study period, the proposals were nevertheless referred to in some reports.

Of the 45 cases analysed, 33 cases (73%) had a substantial housing component. While most of these schemes included other land uses, for the purposes of this report, they are treated as housing led projects. A significant number of London Plan policies apply only to schemes with housing components. These schemes can be subject to a more detailed analysis in terms of compliance of the housing components against a range of specific targets ; Residential density ; affordable housing proportions; the balance between social rented and intermediate housing, bedroom size mix and external playspace provision. This detailed information is provided in annex 1.

The 33 cases with a significant residential component were as follows:

Scheme	Borough	Date of Stage 2 report
Caspian Works	Tower Hamlets	May 2008
Ransome's Wharf	Wandsworth	June 2008
Crossharbour	Tower Hamlets	August 2008
Stockwell St	Greenwich	September 2008
RAF Bentley Priory	Harrow	October 2008
Hartfield Road Car Park	Merton	December 2008
Ram Brewery	Wandsworth	January 2009
Arundel Great Court	Westminster	March 2009
Rathbone Market	Newham	April 2009
Former Goods Yard, Queens Ride, Barnes	Richmond	April 2009
City Pride and Island Point	Tower Hamlets	May 2009
18-42 Wharf Road	Hackney	June 2009
Mardyke Estate*	Havering	July 2009
Holland Estate*	Tower Hamlets	July 2009
Britannia Music Site	Redbridge	November 2009
Former Commonwealth Institute	Kensington and Chelsea	December 2009

Southall Gas Works	Ealing	December 2009
142-170 Streatham Hill	Lambeth	December 2009
Eric and Treby Estates*	Tower Hamlets	February 2010
206-214 High St, Stratford	Newham	March 2010
Land at Kew Bridge	Hounslow	March 2010
Land at Billet works	Waltham Forest	May 2010
Former NATS HQ site	Hillingdon	June 2010
Fresh Wharf	Barking and Dagenham	September 2010
Randolph and Pembroke House	Croydon	October 2010
Innovation Centre	Tower Hamlets	December 2010
Battersea Power Station	Wandsworth	December 2010
Bermondsey Spa site C5	Southwark	January 2011
Silvertown Quays	Newham	January 2011
Zenith House	Barnet	February 2011
One Tower Bridge	Southwark	March 2011
82-84 Piccadilly	Westminster	May 2011
Inglis Barracks	Barnet	June 2011

* These 3 schemes were estate regeneration schemes involving demolition of existing residential units

The 12 other cases analysed included the following key land uses:

Crossness	Bexley	Sewage treatment works	October 2008
Thames Wharf	Newham	Waste transfer station	November 2008
18/21 Barlow Way	Havering	Clinical waste treatment facility	March 2009
Hertsmere House, Columbus Tower	Tower Hamlets	Offices, hotel and serviced apartments	August 2009
St Leonards Hospital	Hackney	Mental health unit	February 2010
3 Dearsley Road	Enfield	Retail (conversion from night club)	March 2010
Chiswick Roundabout	Hounslow	Office with advertising screens	April 2010
Dormers Wells High School	Ealing	School	August 2010
Woodlands, 80 Wood Lane	Hammersmit and Fulham	Student accommodation	November 2010
Athlone House	Camden	Large single residential dwelling	November 2010
Langdon School	Newham	School extension	December 2010
Surbiton Hospital Site	Kingston	Healthcare facility with primary school	March 2011

Given the wide range of uses involved in these schemes, different London Plan policies

apply to different cases and a comparative analysis of policy compliance is problematic. This report will nevertheless refer to key policy compliance issues applying to individual cases.

An analysis of planning obligations proposed under section 106 agreements was undertaken for all cases – housing led and other schemes. However it should be noted that as s106 was primarily a matter for the local planning authority, reports to the Mayor did not necessarily include full information in all cases.

4. Distribution of sample cases between boroughs

Borough	Housing led case analysed	Other case analysed	Total in sample
<i>Inner London</i>	16	4	20
Camden		1	1
City of London			0
Hackney	1	1	2
Hammersmith and Fulham		1	1
Islington			0
Kensington and Chelsea	1		1
Lambeth	1		1
Lewisham			0
Southwark	2		2
Tower Hamlets	6	1	7
Wandsworth	3		3
Westminster	2		2
<i>Outer London</i>	17	8	25
Barking and Dagenham	1		1
Barnet	2		2
Bexley		1	1
Croydon	1		1
Ealing	1	1	2
Enfield		1	1
Greenwich	1		1
Haringey			0
Harrow	1		1
Havering	1	1	2
Hillingdon	1		1
Hounslow	1	1	2
Kingston		1	1
Merton	1		1
Newham	3	2	5
Redbridge	1		1

Richmond	1		1
Sutton			0
Waltham Forest	1		1
	33	12	45

6. Policy Compliance:

6.1 Residential led schemes

For the purpose of assessing whether policy application changed over time, the 33 sample cases have been categorised into three time periods as follows:

May 2008 to April 2009 10 schemes
 May 2009 to April 2010 11 schemes
 May 2010 to June 2011 12 schemes

The scheme schedules in the appendices are in date order of consideration of Stage 2 report by the Mayor or Deputy Mayor.

i) Land Use/ Protection of Existing Use

The Mayor was generally flexible on land use. This reflected the fact that land use designations are primarily a matter for the Local Planning Authority. Land use changes were generally considered to be strategic matters in only three situations: a) development on protected open space – Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land; b) loss of protected employment land – Strategic Industrial Locations (as defined in London Plan) and development, and c) Developments impacted negatively on protected wharves.

In terms of the housing led schemes, the only scheme proposing development on protected open space was the scheme on the former goods yard at Queen's Ride, Barnes. In this case a small housing development was supported as an enabling development to fund the return of part of the site to Metropolitan Open Land status. The assessment of the scheme focused on the minimum level of development which would achieve this objective.

Issues relating to the development of Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land for non residential uses are considered separately below.

A number of housing schemes involved development on sites which had previously been in employment use. Many of these sites had been allocated by boroughs for development of residential led mixed use projects, and this approach was generally supported by the Mayor as consistent with overall strategic objectives and necessary to achieve the Mayor's annual housing target of 30,500 net annual additions to housing supply. In only two cases in the sample was the loss of employment land considered as a strategic issue: 18-42 Wharf Road, Hackney, were the loss of 885 sq m employment

land was considered acceptable in the context in which Hackney was categorised in the London Plan as a borough in which the managed release of employment land to housing was considered to be acceptable, and on the basis of an assessment that the new development would lead to a net increase of 318 jobs. The second case was Land at Billett Works, Waltham Forrest, where loss of employment land was also considered acceptable even though 154 persons had been previously employed on site and the job generation from new mixed use development was not assessed. Most reports on housing led mixed use developments or housing developments on former industrial sites did not include an assessment of net job loss or creation arising from redevelopment. In some cases the site was vacant and the employment generating use had not been operational for some years. In one case, that of Caspian works in Tower Hamlets, where a light industrial site was to be redeveloped as residential, with offices, shops and a restaurant, an employment assessment demonstrated that redevelopment would have positive employment impacts, with jobs increasing from 22 to 35.

As land use zoning is primarily a matter for the local planning authority, the Mayor only considers issues of land use change where change of land use is a strategic matter in terms of the statutory referral criteria. This normally relates to development on the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land, which is generally resisted by the Mayor. The Mayor has demonstrated more flexibility in relation to the use of employment land, whether vacant or operational, for residential development.

ii) Residential Density

One of the core policies in the London Plan is that the residential density of new development should conform with the principles of sustainable residential quality and the appropriate density range as set out in the London Plan density matrix. These ranges reflect a) the public transport access level (PTAL) of the site, b) the relationship of a site to a town centre (international, metropolitan, major, district or local) as set out in the London Plan town centre hierarchy, and c) the existing neighbourhood character in terms of the existing build form of development (categorised as central, urban and suburban).

The majority of the cases in the sample were approved at densities over the top of the appropriate density range. In seven cases density information was not recorded in the stage 1 or stage 2 reports. This included the three largest schemes – the Southall Gas Works scheme, Silvertown Quays and Battersea Power Station. In the first case, density was not considered until the final report on the basis of which the Mayor himself granted planning consent for the scheme. In the case of Silvertown Quays, the application related to an extension of the pre-existing planning consent. The other cases for which there was no assessment of density in the stage 1 or stage 2 reports were: Stockwell Street, Crossharbour, RAF Bentley Priory, Randolph and Pembroke House and 82-84 Piccadilly.

There was some inconsistency in the recording of residential density information. Information could be recorded in terms of dwellings per hectare or in terms of habitable rooms per hectare or both. The density matrix in the 2008 London Plan focuses in habitable rooms per hectare, with for each cell, 3 different dwellings per hectare ranges depending on the housing mix selected in terms of average habitable rooms per

dwelling. A scheme with a disproportionate number of small units could nevertheless exceed the dwellings per hectare range while still being within the habitable rooms per hectare range. There were also problems with residential density calculations for some mixed use sites, with some calculations relating to residential site areas (based on floorspace proportions for mixed use buildings as suggested in GLA guidance) while in other cases, for example the Ram Brewery site, the calculation relates to the overall site area, which has the effect of depressing the assessed residential density. Some applications related to more than one site, with different density ranges applying to different sites.

Despite these caveats, the following table summarises the density assessments

Period	Under density range	Within density range	Over density range	Density not recorded	Total sites
2008-9	1	4	2	3	10
2009-10	1	4	6	1	11
2010-11	0	4	7	4	15
All schemes	2	12	15	8	37
Proportions	5%	32%	41%	22%	100%
Proportions excluding not recorded	7%	41%	52%	(-)	(100%)

It should be noted that these findings are within the context that the London Plan Key Policy Indicator 2 states that 95% of planning consents should be within the appropriate London Plan range, while the two latest London Plan annual monitoring reports give the following data in relation to density policy compliance for all residential planning consents in London: The proportions in each category in the sampled cases are roughly consistent with those for all planning consents in the annual monitoring reports.

	Under density range	Within density range	Over density range	All schemes
2008-9	4%	33%	64%	100%
2009-10	6%	39%	56%	100%

The limited sample of cases analysed does imply that there remains an issue as to the degree of Mayor support for schemes which are overdevelopment in terms of the published London Plan.

In some of the reports, some explanation was given for why density over the top of the appropriate range was considered acceptable.

For example, in the case of 206-214 High Street, Stratford, a scheme with a density of 1,031 dwellings per hectare and 2701 habitable rooms per hectare (compared to appropriate London Plan ranges of 215-450 dph and 625-1100 hrph), the draft stage 1

report was amended before submission to the Mayor from the case officer's summary that *'This high density represents an overdevelopment of the site'* to *'This high density could be acceptable subject to the scheme being able to provide adequate amenity space and a good mix of unit sizes and high quality design'*.

This example provides a useful statement of the planning decisions unit approach to high density schemes – that the density matrix is a guide and that good design can overcome the deficiencies often seen as accompanying schemes of this kind. Interestingly in the case of this hyperdense development proposal, the scheme did not comply with Mayoral policy on other aspects – achieving only 12% on site affordable units (16 shared ownership units), with no social rent on site, only 9% 3 bedroom plus units on site with the 210 sq metres children's playspace requirement (assuming only 21 children in the 131 flats) being met through a roof garden, was supported as the scheme was to make a £3.1m contribution to new affordable homes on the adjacent Carpenters estate, though the report to the mayor did not quantify how many and what kind of homes this contribution would support and consequently not in accordance with London Plan policy 3A.10 and the guidance in the 2005 Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance.

To take another example – the City Pride scheme in Tower Hamlets near Canary Wharf, a scheme with a density of 4,172 hrh compared with the applicable London Plan range of 650-1100, was considered acceptable as 'not out of context' – This scheme had only 4% affordable units within it (18 shared ownership units), with only 220 sq m children's playspace to meet the requirement for 510 sq m (assuming 51 children within this 62 storey tower). This scheme was supported on the basis that some 166 affordable units, of which 118 were to be social rented, was to be provided in a lower density development on a site elsewhere on the Isle of Dogs at Island Point.

In the case of the Innovation Centre scheme, also on the Isle of Dogs but north of Canary Wharf, the density of 2,542 hrph compared with the London Plan 650-1100 range. The report to the Mayor stated that the 'Proposed density is however justified in this instance as the site is relatively small and most of its ground floor area is developed over, this combined with its height produces a relatively high density. The scheme is not out of context with the surrounding development and the site's location on the Isle of Dogs' This is despite fact that the adjacent buildings were actually low or medium rise. This scheme included 25% affordable housing in the 11 storey block rather than the 43 storey tower. With 22% of the total dwellings being 3 bedrooms or more - the required 1130 sq m children's playspace being provided on the 11th floor podium.

To take a rather different case, the Mayor supported the Rathbone Market redevelopment scheme in Newham, which involved the replacement of an 11 storey block by a development including a 23 storey tower. This scheme was twice the top of the appropriate density range - 418 dwellings per hectare compared with the London Plan range of 45-260 and 1660 habitable rooms per hectare compared with the LP 200-700 range. The scheme did not include any 3 bedroom or larger flats, with only 25% affordable homes (of which 70% were to be shared ownership rather than social rent). The Mayor however accepted the scheme as necessary to kickstart the regeneration of the area, including the replacement of the market

To take two less extreme cases : The 18-42 Wharf Road scheme on a site in Hackney

with a PTAL of 4 and a density of 1142 habitable rooms per hectare was supported as ‘not out of context’. The Zenith House scheme in Barnet, with a density of 816 habitable rooms per hectare on a site with a PTAL ranging from 2-4, was supported as meeting other policy objectives, though it had 44% affordable homes, most of which were to be social rented, only 13% of flats had 3 or more bedrooms and children’s playspace provision was well below the 1260 sq m requirement assessed. These two schemes also point to the difficulty of the wideness of the London Plan density ranges, with the same ranges applying to sites with PTAL levels of 4, 5 and 6. Arguably schemes with a PTAL of 4 should be at the lower end of the range, sites with a PTAL of 5 in the middle, and only sites with a PTAL of 6 at the top of the range.

There were only two cases in the sample where residential density was below the appropriate density range. The special circumstances of the Former Goods Yard development in Barnes were discussed above. The other case was the Former Commonwealth Institute site in Kensington and Chelsea. Where the density proposed was 210 habitable rooms per hectare on a site with a PTAL of 5 to 6, and with a London Plan density range of 650 to 1100. The residential development in this case was an enabling development to support the new design museum on this former cultural institution site and involved a change of land use. The funding package assumed the development of 72 high value market homes with a high proportion (65%) being 3 bedrooms or more. The below norm density was regarded as appropriate for the site. The single unit development at Athlone House is considered separately - a single unit mansion development on a Green Belt site in Hampstead, Camden – though curiously the report to the Mayor on that scheme does not give PTAL, site area or density calculation.

To conclude, the evidence demonstrates that the density policy in the London Plan has not been applied on a consistent basis, and that in a number of cases the assessment of density was either omitted or unsatisfactory. There is a need for a consistent approach to applying the policy, with a standardised reporting format and clear criteria for the justification in exceptional cases of density at or below the applicable range. There is a case for disaggregating the ranges so each PTAL level has its own much narrower range of for giving further guidance on the appropriate application of the density policy through a revised Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance.

ii) Affordable Housing

The adopted 2008 London Plan target was that 50% of net additions to housing stock should be affordable housing, within which the ratio of social rent to intermediate housing should be 70:30. On his election the new Mayor confirmed his intention to remove the 50% target and to amend the 70:30 ratio to 60:40. This new approach however did not become a material consideration in planning decisions until the draft replacement London Plan which included these new policies was published in October 2009. The new policy only superseded the previous policy with the adoption of the new London Plan in July 2011. Planning reports to the Mayor after October 2009 however referred to the new emerging policies.

The detailed affordable outputs for individual housing led schemes in the sample are

given in an appendix. There are some technical difficulties in analysing the available information. Firstly, some reports calculate affordable housing proportionate outputs in units, while others give figures in bedspaces. Some reports have both calculations, but the use of units is most common. This is despite GLA guidance in the Housing SPG advising that given differential unit mixes between tenures, bedspaces is generally the most appropriate calculation. Some of the planning applications considered, generally the larger schemes, had affordable housing proportions as percentages rather than specific unit or bedspace numbers, as scheme design was at a relatively early stage. In a few cases, for example the Fresh Wharf scheme, a planning decision was accompanied by an agreement that proportions of affordable housing could be varied as a scheme developed, reflecting changing funding and viability contexts. This is discussed further below in relation to the use of viability assessments. Some schemes also involved off site provision of affordable housing, either in terms of an identified site with units quantified, or in terms of a fixed or variable financial contribution through a section 106 agreement. An assessment of affordable housing outputs can only have regard to off site outputs where a site has been identified and the outputs quantified. Three schemes in the sample were estate regeneration schemes, involving the demolition of social rented homes, and consequently an analysis of net additions to stock, needs to reflect this.

Taking into account these caveats, the affordable housing output of the case study sample schemes was as follows, with calculations in units.

Gross affordable housing outputs

	Affordable Housing %	% including off site provision
2008/9	20%	22%
2009/10	26%	26%
2010/11	22%	22%
Average	22.5%	23%

Net affordable housing outputs

2008/9	20%	22%
2009/10	19%	19%
2010/11	22%	22%
Average	20.5%	21%

These figures compare with the proportions given in the latest two annual monitoring reports, also given as proportion of total net units of:

2008/9 37%
2009/10 37%

The onset of the property market recession and reductions in the availability of public funding led to some scheme re-assessment, though fewer cases within the sample than might have been expected. In the cases of the Ram Brewery site, 206-241 High

Street, Stratford, and Land at Kew Bridge, lower affordable housing proportions were accepted, following financial appraisal, on the basis of non availability of grant. However the new Mayor nevertheless in other cases pursued his predecessor's policy of seeking to achieve the maximum reasonable proportion of affordable housing, and in some cases achieved an increase in the affordable housing output – examples being the Britannia Music Site, where the proposed affordable output was increased from 0 units to 98 units, the Southall Gas Works scheme where the affordable proportion was increased from 20% to 30% of habitable rooms, and the Arundel Great Court scheme where the off site provision was increased from 14 to 43 units. In the case of 206-214 High Street Stratford, although a lower on site provision was accepted, the contribution to off site provision was increased from £2.1m to £3.1m.

Information was also collected on the balance between social rent and intermediate housing relative to the 2008 policy ratio of 70:30 and the proposed revision to 60:40. Four schemes had no affordable housing on site: RAF Bentley Priory, Arundel Great Court, the Former Goods Yard, Barnes and the Former Commonwealth Institute. In three other cases, the disaggregation between social rented homes and intermediate homes was not specified in Mayoral reports - Crossharbour, Ram Brewery and Fresh Wharf.

Information was available for the 28 sites (26 applications).

The range was very wide, with 3 sites having 100: 0 ratios (ie: no intermediate units) – Eric and Treby, Randolph and Pembroke off site component, and One Tower Bridge (City Corporation site) with 2 sites having 0:100 ratios (ie: no social rented units) – City Pride and Randolph and Pride on site provision.

	Social rent: Intermediate ratio
2008/9	52:48
2009/10	56:48
2010/11	65:35
Average	58:42

If the three projects involving replacement of social rented housing are excluded from the analysis, the ratio changes to 54:46.

This compares with the data for all London planning approvals in the most recent London Plan Annual Monitoring Reports

	Social rent: Intermediate ratio
2008/9	49:51
2009/10	49:51
Average	49:51

This case study therefore shows a higher social rent proportion for the sample of

Mayoral cases than for the aggregate of all London schemes. There is also no evidence of a shift from social rented homes to intermediate homes since the Mayor published his revised London Plan target in October 2009 – in fact that there an indication of a slight shift back to social rented provision. This may reflect the increased funding for social rented housing from the Government's kickstart programme at the end of 2008. The comparable ratio in the last year of Ken Livingstone's mayoralty, 2007/8 was 55 social rent: 45 intermediate.

It should also be noted that some applications sought to concentrate social rent and intermediate homes on different parts of the site or different sites. This was explicit in the City Pride/Island Point, Randolph and Pembroke and One Tower Bridge applications. This was generally acceptable to the Mayor, though in the case of the Island Point scheme an assessment was undertaken of the impact of a concentration of social rented family homes on the neighbourhood.

On the basis of the sample of cases in this study, it would appear that the proportionate output for schemes considered by the Mayor is significantly lower than the proportionate output from all London planning consents as recorded through the London Development Database and reported in the London Plan Annual Monitoring Reports. There is however no evidence from this study that the proportion has fallen further since the new targets were put forward formally in the draft replacement London Plan in October 2009. There is however evidence that the Mayor was more flexible in terms of accepting reductions in affordable housing proportions in the light of changing economic factors including the property market reception and the reduced availability of Housing Corporation/ Homes and Communities Agency grant

There is nevertheless a need for a more consistent approach to the reporting of proposed scheme affordable housing outputs, with analysis to be undertaken by habitable rooms as well as by units as recommended in the Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance. All cases where under-provision relative to London Plan targets is proposed should be subject to full financial appraisals as required by the policy in the London Plan relating to the need to demonstrate the delivery of the maximum reasonable affordable housing. Deviation from the London Plan guide ratio of 60:40 social rent: intermediate (The 2011 London Plan policy replacing the 70:30 ratio in the 2008 London Plan) should require a clear justification in terms of the criteria set out in the Housing SPG. Proposals to concentrate the provision of affordable housing off site need to demonstrate that this is consistent with London Plan policies on the development of mixed and balanced communities and does not increase social polarisation.

iii) Bedroom size mix

The 2008 London Plan sought to ensure an appropriate mix of new homes in terms of bedroom size. The 2005 Housing SPG included guidance on the proportion of homes which should be 3 bedrooms or larger. This included guidance that 30% of all new homes should be 4 or more bedrooms, with the proportion for social rented homes being 42% and the proportionate of intermediate housing being 34%.

This guidance was based on the 2005 Housing Requirements Study and was not updated once the 2009 Housing Market Assessment became available, which demonstrated a significantly greater need for family sized intermediate homes.

The London Housing Strategy target was that 42% of social rented homes should have 3 or more bedrooms, with the target for intermediate homes being 16%.

Information on bedroom size mix in the case study reports is not consistently presented. For some schemes detailed unit bedroom size mix by tenure is presented. In other cases overall figures. In others, proportions of 3 Bedroom+ units – either for all tenures, or specifically for social rent or intermediate homes. For some cases, no data on bedroom size mix was included, with no policy compliance assessment being undertaken. Available data is given in the appendix.

The data can be summarised as follows:

	% homes 3 bedrooms or larger
2008/9	30%
2009/10	27%
2010/11	27%
Average	28%

The sample cases therefore show a slight fall in the proportion of 3 bedroom or larger homes over time. It should however be noted that where tenure specific figures were given, p 3B+ proportions for social rented homes were significantly higher than for intermediate or market homes. For suburban schemes, these could be high – for example for the former NATS HQ site in Hillingdon, all social rented homes were to be 3 or more bedrooms. For the Inglis barracks site in Barnet, the proportion was 50%, while for the Southall Gas Works scheme in Ealing the proportion was 41%. Silvertown Quays in Newham was to deliver 40%. The Caspian Works scheme in Tower Hamlets was to have 48% of social rented units as 3 bedrooms. For the Eric and Treby estate regeneration scheme in Tower Hamlets the proportion was 70%, relating to the high proportion of families within the existing estate. For higher density schemes which included social rented homes, the proportion was generally lower - 34% on the Bermondsey Spa site, 28% at Billet works, 23% at 142-170 Streatham Hill. The highest density schemes generally included little or no social rented homes. As mentioned earlier while the Rathbone market scheme included 25% affordable homes, all these flats were 1 or 2 bedrooms.

GLA planning officers often raised the issue of inadequate provision of 3 bedroom homes at the stage 1 consultation stage, and in some cases proportions were increased in response to Mayoral comments – for example in the case of Caspian Works (proportion of 3 bedroom social rented units increased from 34 to 48%) and the case of Crossharbour (3 bedroom proportion increased from 10% to 24%). In other cases, for example, Rathbone Market, 206-214 High Street, Stratford and City Pride, the Mayor accepted the sites and/or built form made the site inappropriate for family housing, with in the latter 2 cases, family housing to be provided off site.

To conclude, while the Mayor did not seek to strictly apply the guidance on bedroom size mix set out in the Housing SPG in all cases, the general thrust of the Mayor's intervention was to seek an increase in the provision of social rented homes with 3 or more bedrooms. However, in some cases, the Mayor relied on the view of the local planning authority and effectively withdrew objections to the proposed housing mix if the borough was satisfied the mix was appropriate. The mayor was generally relaxed as to the mix of market provision, on the basis that developers were in a better position to judge what was marketable. There was an understandable reluctance to impose requirements which weakened scheme viability, especially in a recessionary period.

iv) Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair provision/ inclusive design

In the majority of cases, applicants were required to demonstrate compliance with the 100% lifetime homes and 10% wheelchair homes requirements. Non compliance was often raised as an issue in stage 1 reports, and generally if not demonstrated by the stage 2 report, the Mayor would request the local planning authority to impose a planning condition to ensure compliance.

Policies on lifetime homes and wheelchair provision were generally applied in a consistent manner.

v) External playspace

The 2008 London Plan introduced a new requirement for 10 sq m external playspace per child. Applicants generally used the GLA's child yield/occupation model to estimate the number of children likely to live in a development, though there were cases where an applicant or a local planning authority queried the GLA model and where the GLA accepted different estimates. This issue was often raised in stage 1 reports, with the applicant required to demonstrate compliance. In a few cases however, the issue does not appear to have been considered adequately – for example assessments are missing in the case of Crossharbour and Randolph and Pembroke House. For some of the larger schemes, design proposals were only at an outline stage, so the quantification of number of children likely to live within a development or the location and size of specific play areas may not have been finalised.

From the cases examined, the Mayor's team had considerable success in getting increases in play provision - examples being Caspian Works, Island Point, the Former Commonwealth Institute, 142—170 Streatham Hill and Eric and Treby Estates. However in a number of other cases, the policy requirements were not demonstrably met in time for the stage 2 report. For the larger schemes with some information available on overall amenity space, such as RAF Bentley Priory, Southall Gas Works, the former NATS HQ site, Silvertown Quays and Inglis barracks, the Mayor accepted that child play space requirements could be met within this overall capacity. In cases where it was not possible to demonstrate compliance, applicants agreed to make a s106 contribution to upgrading existing parks in lieu of the on site deficit, though this does not appear to have always been an entirely satisfactory outcome. In other cases, the local planning authority was requested to impose a planning condition to ensure compliance. In the case of some high rise developments, for example the Ram

Brewery scheme, 206-214 High Street, Stratford and the Innovation Centre, child playspace provision was to be made through use of roof space.

While the Mayor sought to ensure that the new external playspace standards introduced in the 2008 London Plan were met, and in a number of cases achieved an improvement in the level of playspace provision, only in about a third of cases however does on site provision meeting the targets appear to have been achieved by the time of the stage 2 reports, which raises concerns as to the deliverability of the policy, especially in relation to high density schemes, even where the number of child occupants may be initially relatively low. The methodology also fails to recognise that more limited housing options may lead to higher levels of child occupation, including within market units, in the longer term. There are also issues as to the form of provision, with the use of roof playspace being regarded as acceptable in the case of some high density schemes.

vi) Space Standards

The Mayor proposed space standards design standards in the Mayor's Housing Design Guide initially published for consultation in July 2009. The proposal for standards was also included in the draft replacement London Plan published in October 2009. Following this draft, the Mayor did have regard to residential space standards in submitted schemes, though this is not referred to in all reports on housing led schemes prepared after this date.

With the formal adoption of minimum space standards in the 2011 London Plan, it is important that policy compliance is assessed on a consistent basis and space standards achieved monitored through the London Plan annual monitoring reports.

vii) Design policies

Mayoral reports generally included comments on the design of scheme proposals. These covered a very wide range. Issues were generally raised in stage 1 reports, and generally tough not always resolved before the stage 2 report was submitted to the Mayor. Some concerns related to overall scheme layout and pedestrian connectivity. There were concerns in some cases that flats were single aspect, that balconies were too small, and as mentioned above, internal space standards was raised in a few cases. There were cases where concern was expressed that family units did not have direct access to communal open space – in others concerns as to inadequate security for residential entrances. In other schemes, suggestions were made on relocation of scheme components such as bin and cycle stores or energy and cooling plant.

Mayoral reports also included some supportive comments – for example Southall Gas Works was regarded as having 'one of the most humane and well thought out masterplans'. Comments on some other cases were less complimentary – the design of Stockwell Street scheme in Greenwich was acceptable 'if far from exemplary'. In the case of the Mardyke estate redevelopment in Rainham "Further development of the design quality guide to move beyond generalities and to demonstrate a commitment to the highest quality design, incorporating variation, visual richness, layering and to ensure an avoidance of generic housing design should be pursued"

Comments in reports to the Mayor covered a wide range of design issues. The publication of the Mayor's Housing Design Guide should facilitate a greater consistency on the assessment of cases against specific design guidance. While there remains an element of subjectivity in relation to design assessment, the focus of reports should be on objective criteria.

vii) Strategic Views

The impact of developments on strategic views was considered in a number of cases.

In a number of high rise schemes, the towers did not fall within any strategic viewing corridors, for example the Ram Brewery site in Wandsworth, the Britannia Works site in Ilford, Redbridge, Rathbone Market in Newham, and Zenith House in Barnet. In the case of Stockwell Street in Greenwich, the impact on the neighbouring World Heritage site was discounted despite objections from the World Heritage Site executive. L B Greenwich's objection that the One Tower Bridge development, including the proposed campanile, would impact of the view of St Paul's cathedral from Blackheath was also discounted. In the cases of Southall Gas Works and Silvertown Quays, there was no consideration in reports of strategic view impacts. The Battersea Power Station redevelopment was not considered as having impact on protected views.

The treatment of the Isle of Dogs schemes appears inconsistent. The issue of strategic views is not considered in the report on City Pride – a 62 storey tower. The Innovation Centre is recognised as being within the Greenwich/ St Paul's viewing corridor but is regarded as acceptable as part of the Canary Wharf cluster, though no images are shown in either the 2010 reports or in the reports on file for the previous application in 2008. It is recognised that the Crossharbour development would be visible in the view from Greenwich Park to the Greenwich world heritage site, but the proposal was regarded as having a high quality of design and therefore as acceptable.

It should also be noted that the Hertsmere House/ Columbus tower scheme, which though including a hotel and serviced apartments is not considered as a residential scheme, impacted on the panoramic views from Greenwich Park, Primrose Hill and the river prospect from Waterloo Bridge. The Mayor however considered that as the 46 storey tower was close to the Canary Wharf high rise cluster, that the impact was relatively minor and therefore acceptable.

The analysis of sample cases demonstrated a degree of inconsistency on the application of policies on strategic views to individual applications. In some cases full assessments were not included in Mayoral reports. Decisions on acceptability of developments which impacted on viewing corridors appear to have been determined at least partly by subjective views on design quality.

viii) Transport

All the sample cases involved a transport assessment by the TfL planning team. In most cases deficiencies in transport provision were identified in stage 1 reports. This often related to the fact that applicants were seeking a development density over the top of the range supported by the relevant Public Transport Access Level (PTAL). The key areas

raised in transport comments included:

- a) Overprovision of car parking spaces relative to London Plan standards. TfL in some cases encouraged a reduction in provision below the published standards, recognising that while this could sometimes be achieved through negotiation this could not be compelled.
- b) Increase in cycle parking. In most cases this was achieved.
- c) Contribution sought to bus provision – both bus capacity and improvements to bus stops.
- d) Contributions sought to improvements to rail and underground stations
- e) Contributions sought to improve cycling and pedestrian access and facilities
- f) Installation of charging points for electric vehicles.

In some later cases, the Mayor sought contributions to Crossrail. However such contributions were only pursued after the publication of draft amendment to the London Plan and draft Crossrail SPG were published.

In many cases, stage 1 comments on transport issues related to lack of information, for example in relation to trip generation figures, travel plans and construction and servicing plans. In most cases applicants provided the required information in advance of the stage 2 report.

Some policy requirements were considered to be met through s106 contributions. In other cases the Mayor requested the local planning authority to impose a planning condition to secure compliance. Transport contributions could be significant. (These are considered below in the section on Planning Obligations),

ix) Social Infrastructure

Social infrastructure implications of schemes were rarely considered in planning reports to the mayor. This was the case even with schemes involving significant increased population. Policy 3A.7 in the 2008 London Plan – the requirement for area planning frameworks for major new residential schemes, applied to sites of 5 or more hectares or capable of providing with 500 or more homes. The supporting text for this policy includes the statement that “in considering development proposals for large residential sites boroughs should assess the need for community and ancillary services such as local health facilities, schools, leisure facilities, public open space, children’s playspace and social care”. Boroughs were also required to assess the potential impacts of new developments on the surrounding areas.

The few references to social infrastructure within sample case reports were to schemes which included provision of social infrastructure such as a school or health facility, within the development. The only scheme in the sample where social infrastructure demands were raised as an issue was the City Pride/Island Point scheme where concerns were raised as to whether there was sufficient social infrastructure within the neighbourhood for a high proportion of family sized social rent households within the scheme, which was in effect an off site provision to meet the planning policy requirements relating to the high rise market scheme at City Pride.

While as discussed above, significant transport contributions were negotiated for

schemes with a density above the range in the density matrix, there was no standard process for the assessment of social infrastructure requirements leading to a negotiation of contributions to social infrastructure. The matter of section 106 negotiations for social infrastructure was left to boroughs, and there is no record in the sample cases of the Mayor expressing the view on whether the borough was or was not prioritising community facilities. This was perhaps in recognition that any further funding for social infrastructure would reduce the funding available for transport improvements. It could however be argued that given the explicit London plan policy referred to above, the failure to apply this policy systematically in relation to the larger schemes is a significant deficiency.

x) Climate change and energy efficiency.

Each case was subject to a detailed assessment of energy efficiency and climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies in relation to the policies set out in the 2008 London Plan. GLA officers consistently pushed for further reductions in carbon emissions and for more efficient and environmentally positive heating systems – often asking the applicants to consider combined heat and power systems (CHP) including linking up to existing systems, biomass boilers and photovoltaics. In many cases specialist reports were required and subjected to detailed scrutiny. The Mayoral team also pursued best practice in relation to water efficiency, rainwater harvesting, sustainable drainage, flood mitigation and green roofs. The GLA team also pursued an increased level of Code for Sustainable Homes rating. Developers were pushed to guarantee delivery of minimum 20% C2O savings targets. Where policy compliance was not guaranteed, the local planning authority was requested to impose a planning condition.

Assessment of climate change and energy efficiency aspects of applications was both thorough and consistent.

xi) Other policy compliance issues

In a few cases, **heritage** issues were raised – for example as a positive factor in the museum proposals at Bentley Priory (Battle of Britain Museum), the Former Commonwealth Institute (the relocated Design Museum), and the One Tower Bridge development (use of flexible space for a cultural use not as yet determined). The provision of a new museum was also put forward as a justification for the loss of the Commonwealth Institute listed building.

Biodiversity issues were raised in a few cases – the idea of lighting the canal at the Wharf Road development was dropped as it might disturb the bats. A bat impact mitigation strategy was required for the Bentley priory scheme. An updated biodiversity assessment was required for the Kew Bridge site. Ecological proposals needed to be implemented for the Mardyke development. Ecological issues relating to the Crossness Sewage site are considered below together with environmental impacts of other non-residential schemes.

The issues of **air quality** and **noise** were raised in a number of cases, with mitigation measures required.

In the cases of Southall Gas Works, Battersea Power Station and the Ram Brewery development, the presence of **hazardous installations** – gas cylinders, was a relevant factor. In the case of Battersea Power Station, the Mayor considered that the positive aspects of the redevelopment scheme outweighed the risks. The location of the gas cylinder was not considered to be a key issue in consideration of the Ram Brewery scheme, though it was to prove to be the key factor in the scheme call in and overall rejection of the scheme, leading to both a delay and a major redesign, with one of the two towers dropped from the proposal.

The Battersea Power station redevelopment required measures to remove any negative impact on the **Safeguarded Wharf**.

xii) Responses to public objections to development schemes.

Mayoral reports often referred to objections raised by consultees. Some case files included full sets of responses to the local planning authority's consultation. In most cases, objections were regarded as a local matter and not raising any new strategic issues. There is little evidence in the case studies that the Mayor was swayed by any public view on a specific scheme, even if objections came from an organisation such as CABE (The Commission on Architecture and the Built Environment).

xiii) Use of section 106 agreements

The overall s106 contributions recorded in reports are set out in the table below. It should be recognised that s106 agreements were the responsibility of the Local Planning authority (except in the case of the Southall Gas Works scheme, where the Mayor took over the application) and the information recorded in reports to the Mayor not represent the final agreement. Detailed breakdown of contributions is given in the annex. No information on s106 contributions was given in reports for the following five schemes: Crossharbour; Arundel Great Court, Former Goods Yard, Barnes; Former Commonwealth Institute; Eric and Treby estates.

Summary of s106 contributions: Residential Schemes

Scheme	Transport contributions	Off site affordable housing	Other	Total	£ per residential unit*
Caspian Works	£36,386			£36,386	£256
Ransome's Wharf	£40,000			£40,000	£284
Stockwell St	£320,000			£320,000	£2,480
RAF Bentley Priory	£200,000	£1.0m	£3.6m	£4.8m	£46,600
Hartfield Road Car Park	£500,000		£72,250	£572,250	£5,202
Ram Brewery	£39.83m		£1.086m	£40.916m	£49,356
Rathbone Market	£550,000			£550,000	£844
City Pride and Island Point	£353,000			£353,000	£570
18-42 Wharf	£270,000			£270,000	£826

Road					
Mardyke Estate*	£90,000			£90,000	£162
Holland Estate*			£1,322,000	£1,322,000	£6,325
Britannia Music Site	£750,000			£750,000	£2,259
Southall Gas Works	£11.15m		£19.899m*	£31.049m	£8,280
142-170 Streatham Hill	£160,000			£160,000	£560
206-214 High St, Stratford		£3.1m		£3.1m	£23,664
Land at Kew Bridge	Not specified	Up to £3.6m	£12,000	£3.612m	£22,024
Land at Billet works	£750,000		£1.779m	£2.529m	£4,502
Former NATS HQ site	£479,000		£5.517m**	£5.996m	£7,757
Fresh Wharf	£600,000		£5.1m	£5.7m	£6,000
Randolph and Pembroke House	£731,000			£731,000	£850
Innovation Centre	£20,000			£20,000	£75
Battersea Power Station	£211.467m		£1.8m	£213.267m	£55,308
Bermondsey Spa site C5	£256,250			£256,250	£1,250
Silvertown Quays	£2.827m			£2,827m	£5,734
Zenith House	£457,700		£50,000	£507,700	£1,643
One Tower Bridge	£128,000	£10.51m	£460,580	£11.098m	£27,814
82-84 Piccadilly			£72,000	£72,000	£2,000
Inglis Barracks	£3.575m	Profit share agreement		£3.575m	£1,644

Notes:

* + provision of health facility, junior school and nursery (not costed)

** + provision pf community facility (not costed)

It should be noted that some of these schemes include significant non-residential components.

The total s106 contributions recorded for these schemes was £334.619m, categorised as follows:

Contributions to transport provision	£275.539m
Contributions to affordable housing	£18.31m
Contributions to other infrastructure	£40.770m

This gives a proportionate split of:

Transport 82%

Affordable housing 6%
 Other infrastructure 12%

In this context it should be noted that the London Plan gives highest priority to Transport and Affordable Housing in the negotiation of planning applications.

The case study sample shows a wide variation on s106 contributions either in terms of total amount or contributions to residential information. Part of this variation may be reflected by the fact that information in some Mayoral reports may be incomplete, either because information has not been supplied to the GLA, or because it is not considered to be relevant to the recommendation to the Mayor or because details of s106 contributions not being finalised at the time of the stage 2 report. The available information does however demonstrate the extent to which public transport provision takes the dominant share of s106 contributions, with relatively little funding going into social infrastructure such as health, education and leisure facilities, and into off site affordable housing provision. There is however a need for greater consistency in the reporting of planning obligations so that a more robust comparative analysis can be undertaken in the future.

xiv) Use of planning conditions

Planning conditions were generally a matter for the Local Planning Authority. However, where at Stage 2 the Mayor remained to be satisfied that a scheme was fully policy compliant, compliance could be secured by the LPA agreeing to attach a planning condition to the planning consent.

Planning conditions were most widely used to secure transport components, for example transport plans, and for energy saving and climate change mitigation and adaptation measures. Conditions were also used to secure compliance with lifetime homes and wheelchair homes standards and external playspace provision in schemes, some involving outline planning consent, where scheme design was not at a sufficiently advanced stage to demonstrate policy compliance.

Non residential components of residential led schemes: Policy compliance

A summary of comments raised in Mayoral stage 1 and stage 2 reports on the non residential components of these schemes is set out in annex 3.

Several of the residential led schemes included significant non residential components – for example the schemes at Southall Gas Works, Battersea Power Station and Silvertown Quays. Details of the scheme components are given in the scheme schedules in annex 2.

The Mayor generally did not raise concerns as to the proposed mix of uses in individual schemes. Schemes including retail and commercial provision were generally supported, for example the Ram Brewery retail component was supported as enabling Wandsworth to fulfil its role in the town centre hierarchy.

For large new developments involving significant retail provision, such as the Southall Gas Works and Battersea Power Station schemes, there was a recognition that there was a potential for a negative impact on neighbouring centres. The Mayor was assured that there would be no negative impact on neighbouring retail centres such as Clapham Junction. The new retail centre at Southall Gas Works was welcomed as complementing rather than competing with the existing Southall town centre.

Battersea Power station was seen as delivering a major strategic addition to London's modern office stock and strengthening London's global competitiveness.

While the Mayor also supported hotel provision to meet the identified deficit, the Mayor did not object to the proposal for a hotel on the Hartfield Road Wimbledon site being dropped.

6.2 Non Residential Schemes

The twelve schemes analysed covered a wide variety of land uses. They also varied widely in scale – from the conversion of a nightclub to non food retail (3 Deardsley Road, Enfield) to a 63 storey building providing offices, hotel, serviced apartments and retail space (Hertsmere House/Columbus Tower, Tower Hamlets).

Three of the twelve schemes could be considered to be contentious:

The Athlone House scheme in Camden involved the demolition of a large residential property and replacement by a larger single residential property. The site was on Metropolitan Open Land. The Mayor supported Camden's rejection of the application as inappropriate development within MOL, harm to the conservation area, lack of provision of affordable housing and lack of agreement to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 3. This was despite the previous Mayor's decision not to object a similar development proposal in 2005.

The Hertsmere House proposal was contentious as L B Tower Hamlets refused consent on the basis of negative impact on the adjacent conservation area and listed buildings and unacceptable loss of daylight and sunlight to nearby residential dwellings. The Mayor took over the application and granted consent. The application was very similar to a 2004 application which Tower Hamlets had granted with the support of the previous Mayor. The Mayor could therefore demonstrate consistency. The Mayor considered that benefits of the scheme including a £4m contribution to Crossrail outweighed the negative impact on local residents. As the serviced apartments were not treated as residential units, there was no density assessment, no application of affordable housing requirements and no assessment of impacts on neighbourhood infrastructure, other than transport impacts. An earlier requirement for a contribution to providing a primary health care centre was dropped.

The Chiswick Roundabout office scheme incorporated 5 large media screens, visible from and in fact intentionally aligned with the Chiswick flyover. The Mayoral report was enthusiastic about the scheme design and in fact disregarded the safety concerns, which was one of the grounds for refusal of the application by the L B Hounslow. The report to the Mayor instead focused on climate change mitigation measures. The

Mayor considered taking over the application from the borough to grant consent but accepted that there were no strategic grounds to do so.

For the other nine cases, the Mayor's main concerns related to whether the proposed land use was acceptable, whether there were transport impacts which needed mitigated through s106 contributions, and whether the new policies on energy efficiency and climate change mitigation were met.

Change of land use an issue in three cases – all relating to protection of open space. In the case of the Crossness Sewage Works, where part of the site was within MOL, mitigation measures were satisfactory so a proposed contribution to MOL enhancement was not pursued. The overall health benefits of sewage treatment were considered to justify loss of MOL. In the case of Langdon Comprehensive School, a site within MOL, the redevelopment involved a reduction in floorspace. In the case of Dormers Wells High School, while the proposal involved the development of school playing fields, the scheme actually generated a net increase in recreational open space.

In two cases (in addition to Hertsmere House), the developments were considered to have a transport impact requiring s106 contributions. It is to be noted that this was required for Langdon School and the St Leonards mental health unit, but not required for the utilities or commercial schemes. In the case of the student housing scheme at Woodlands, a significant contribution was sought to infrastructure improvements within the area.

In all cases, compliance in terms of energy renewal and climate change mitigation was sought and secured.

Schemes were also assessed in terms of contribution to other policies – student accommodation as supporting policy on higher education provision, and office and retail provision as meeting demand.

Design was raised as an issue in the case of the Chiswick Roundabout office scheme which incorporated five large media screens, visible from and in fact intentionally aligned with the Chiswick flyover. The Mayoral report was enthusiastic about the scheme design and in fact disregarded the safety concerns, which was one of the grounds for refusal of the application by the L B Hounslow.

Given the range of cases in the small sample of non-residential cases, with a range of land uses to which different London Plan policies apply it is not possible to draw specific conclusions, other than to note that issues of impact on Green Belt/ MOL and transport impact were significant matters in a number of cases.

6.3 Process Issues:

a) Use of Financial appraisals

The use of financial appraisals does not appear to be consistent. In some ten housing led schemes in the sample, there is no reference to financial appraisals. While two of these schemes (Rathbone Market and Mardyke estate) were estate regeneration

schemes to which the 50% affordable housing requirement does not strictly apply, there is no explanation of why in the other 8 cases where the new build proposals did not comply with policy requirements in terms of the 5-% target and the ratio between social rented and intermediate provision, a financial appraisal was not required to demonstrate that the scheme was achieving the maximum reasonable proportion of affordable housing as required by London Plan policy 3A.10.

In some cases, appraisals are referred to in reports, but appraisals were not in the case files. This raises the issue of whether or not financial appraisals were assessed by GLA officers or whether the officers relied on the judgement of the Local Planning Authority. Only in three cases is there a file record of an independent assessment commissioned by the GLA or by a borough.

Given the increasingly critical role of viability assessments in informing a judgement as to whether or not maximum reasonable affordable housing output is being achieved as well as informing a judgement as to whether or not planning obligations and/or Community Infrastructure Levy charges have the consequence of making a scheme not viable, there is a case for having a more systematic system of financial appraisals, required and used on a consistent basis, with a process of independent assessment of applicant submissions.

b) Evidence Base

i) Housing Need

While at stage 1 Mayoral reports queried the lack of larger family sized homes, the Mayor was generally supportive to a borough's view of what form of housing was appropriate for a site rather than requiring specific evidence that the overall need in a borough or neighbourhood supported the mix proposed by the applicant. This meant that in practice the Mayor did not challenge either the local authority or applicant perspective and did not seek to impose the specific bedroom size mix as set out in the November 2005 Housing SPG as derived from the 2004 Housing Requirements Study. Moreover the Mayor did not generally refer to the 2009 Strategic Housing Market Assessment in relation to the proposed housing mix of individual schemes, though as referred to above, there were two cases in the sample where as a result of Mayoral stage 1 comments, there were marginal increases in the proportion of family homes to be provided.

There must be some concern as to the purpose of undertaking substantive research on housing need and demand if the outcome of the research is not used to inform the application of the Mayor's planning powers.

ii) Employment loss and employment generation

There does not appear to have been a systematic approach to requiring evidence of employment loss or generation in relation to sites being transferred from employment uses to residential uses. This is significant since the majority of sites proposed for residential development had previously been in employment generating uses. In some cases, sites appear to have been vacant or some time, but reports generally did not state either the length of vacancy or what efforts had been made to bring sites back

into employment use. This to an extent reflects the fact that many sites had already been re-designated by the local planning authority as available for residential development or residential led mixed se development and that consequently a new assessment of potential employment loss or generation was not required.

Given the overall Mayoral approach is that any change of use should be supported by a demonstration that employment capacity was protected and ideally enhanced through an intensification of development, it would have been helpful if quantifications had been sought in more cases than the two recorded .

c) Use of policy references outside 2008 London Plan

There were few references to policies outside the 2008 Plan. The 2008 Plan had itself incorporated many of the policies from earlier Mayoral strategies, for example those dealing with energy efficiency and climate change. Mayoral reports normally referred to the status of any borough plan, whether saved policies from a pre 2004 Unitary Development Plan or draft or adopted Local Development Framework Core strategy. Reports also generally referred to the status of any borough Area Plan or Mayoral Opportunity Area Framework. The draft Replacement London Plan was referred to in reports considered after October 2009, with the Crossrail proposals also referred to in some later reports.

Reports were clear as to the status of policy documentation and there is no evidence of the Mayor seeking to impose policies which did not have the appropriate statutory basis.

d) Role of pre-application meetings with planning decisions unit officers

Pre-application meetings were held in 8 cases. These were referred to in stage 1 reports, with formal documentation of meetings held on case files. The meetings appear to have been productive in terms of informing applicants of requirements for supporting documentation and identifying issues of potential policy non compliance. It would appear that applicants generally took on board advice provided and that the progress of the application through the decision making stages was made easier. Clearly the pre-application meeting did not resolve all issues as otherwise a stage 1 decision would have left an application for the local planning authority to determine without a stage 2 assessment being required. Moreover as the sample related only to cases which involved a stage 2 report, it is not known whether cases with pre-application meetings were more or less likely to generate a conclusive positive decision at stage 1.

e) Pre-application presentations to Mayor

This s only recorded in one case – the case of One Tower Bridge, where the previous application had only been determined after Public Inquiry and where the Mayor had an interest given the location of the development adjacent to City Hall. Although this study related to cases reaching the Stage 2 process, it should be also noted that the Mayor was directly involved in two cases in the sample as he determined to take over the applications and grant consent.

f) Changes in priorities between 2008 and 2011

There is little evidence from the cases sampled of significant changes in Mayoral priorities in terms of applying policy to referred development applications. Despite some deficiencies identified in assessment of some cases, there was no identifiable pattern of specific policies either being given greater prominence in reports or being dis-applied. While reports drafted after October 2009 refer to policies in the Draft Replacement London Plan, there is no evidence of any dis-application of 2008 London Plan policies. The most critical newly emerging policy impacting on consideration of individual planning applications was the proposed policy for minimum internal housing space standards and this is reflected in some though not all of the post October 2009 reports.

7. Conclusions

The main text of this report includes conclusions in bold type in relation to each factor assessed.

There are a number of significant points which can be drawn from this study of sample cases.

The process of scheme appraisal appears to reflect continuity with that of the previous Mayoral regime.

Assessment of policy compliance in relation to environmental aspects (especially energy efficiency and climate change mitigation) and transport impacts was consistently comprehensive, reflecting the fact that these assessments were carried out by specialist teams using standard checklists and report formats.

There was also consistency in assessment of lifetime homes and wheelchair homes provision, and a generally consistent assessment of requirements for and provision of external playspace for children.

Assessment of scheme compliance with some other policies relating to housing, notably those relating to residential density, affordable housing and housing mix, has been less consistent. The lack of a consistent reporting format and data presentation, demonstrated in the schedules in the annex to this report, has limited the ability to undertake a directly comparable analysis of the sample cases. The treatment of residential density has been especially problematic, with data given in dwellings or habitable rooms, sometimes based on gross site area, sometimes based on net residential area. There is also some inconsistency in reference to London Plan density policy ranges. In a few cases there is no evidence in reports that any density assessment has been undertaken.

There appears to be some inconsistency in the consideration of impact of schemes on strategic views, with the issue not given full consideration in some cases. The Mayor supported schemes which were within viewing corridors where design was considered acceptable.

27th January 2012

8. Recommendations

1. There needs to be greater standardisation of data presentation in reports. This is especially problematic in relation to data on housing schemes, where scheme proposals can be checked against specific policy targets and guidance set out in the London Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance. This applies to a) residential density; b) affordable housing proportions; c) mix of dwellings in terms of number of bedrooms.
2. There is a need for greater consistency in the application of the density policy to individual applications and much clearer justification for support for schemes both above and below the appropriate density range. There is a case for disaggregation of density range by individual PTAL level, rather than the current groupings. A PTAL of 4 should not be accepted as a valid basis for a scheme being supported at the top of the 4-6 density range. Moreover TfL should be required to demonstrate that where transport contributions are made, this will generate transport improvements which will raise the PTAL level to the required level to support the anticipated increase in population and trips.
3. Policies set out the London Plan in relation to social infrastructure provision need to be applied. For developments of 500 or more homes, policy 3.7 (replacing 3A.7 in the 2008 London Plan) should be applied consistently with a TfL infrastructure assessment included in the report to the Mayor. The recognition of the need for guidance on the application of this policy in the draft Housing SPG is to be welcomed.
4. Financial appraisals should be undertaken for all residential schemes not complying with London Plan targets. There should be a consistent format for reporting the outcome of financial appraisals, while avoiding the inclusion of commercially confidential data in published Mayoral reports. The planning decisions team needs to maintain a database of submitted appraisals to act as a dataset for comparable analysis, to inform judgements on the validity of information supplied on costs and values and to inform the annual updating of toolkit benchmarks and assumptions.
5. There is a need for greater consistency in reporting of section 106 contributions. While it is recognised that for outline applications, full section 106 contributions may not be available, there is a strong case for reporting obligations in a common format, disaggregating contributions into categories – for example transport, off site affordable housing and other infrastructure. This latter category could be further disaggregated between education, healthy, open spaces, leisure, community facilities and other provision. This would enable a record to be kept of contributions from comparable schemes and to monitor outputs relative to the priorities for use of planning obligations set out in the London Plan.
6. Where schemes involve loss of employment land or change of use from employment generating uses, the Mayoral report should include an assessment of job losses or gains relating to each land use classification.

7. Reports on schemes within viewing corridors should be subject to a full assessment with images included in the Mayoral reports.

8. The approach to considering the impact of hazardous installations on residential developments needs to be clarified.

27th January 2012

Annex 1

Detailed data on 33 sampled schemes with significant housing component

1. Residential Density

Scheme	PTAL	Units per hectare	Habrooms per hectare	LP range (u/ha)	LP range (hr/ha)	u/ha	hr/ha
Caspian Works	2-4	302	894	110-340	325-875	within	over
Ransome's Wharf	3	324	1077	65-240	300-650	over	over
Crossharbour	5	No details					
Stockwell St	5	No details					
RAF Bentley Priory	0 to 1	No details					
Hartfield Road Car Park	6	275	750	275-750	650-1100	within	within
Ram Brewery	5	227 (gross)	631(gross)	140-405	650-1100	within	below
Arundel Great Court	6	273	889	140-405	650-1100	within	within
Rathbone Market	6	418	1660	45-260	200-700	over	over
Former Goods Yard, Queens Ride, Barnes	3	13	44	40-80	150-250	below	below
City Pride and Island Point	6 4	Not stated	4172 545		650-1100 450-700		over within
18-42 Wharf Road	4	Not stated	1142		650-1100		over
Mardyke Estate*	2	113	Not stated	35-95			over
Holland Estate*	6	Not stated	725 (from 529)		650-1100		within
Britannia Music Site	6	503	Not stated	215-405		over	
Former Commonwealth Institute	5-6	Not stated	210		650-1100		below
Southall Gas	0-3	No					

Works		details but 103 dph gross					
142-170 Streatham Hill	6	Not stated	832		650-1100		within
Eric and Treby Estates*	6	161 (from 131)	414 (from 325)	65-240	300-650	within	within
206-214 High St, Stratford	6	1031	2701	215-450	650-1100	over	over
Land at Kew Bridge	3	209	669	45-170	200-450	over	over
Land at Billet works	2	Not stated	570		200-450		over
Former NATS HQ site	1	61	205	40-65	150-200	within	just over
Fresh Wharf	0-1	215	Not stated	50-95		over	
Randolph and Pembroke House	6	No details					
Innovation Centre	4	Not stated	2542		650-1100		over
Battersea Power Station	2 to 4	Not stated					
Bermondsey Spa site C5	3	Not stated	700		300-600		over
Silvertown Quays	Not stated	No details					
Zenith House	2-4	Not stated	816		200-450		over
One Tower Bridge	6	Not stated	Main site 1260 Second site 930		650-1100		over within
82-84 Piccadilly	6	No details					
Inglis Barracks	1-3	3 zones: 40 65 144		35-95		within within over	

2. Affordable Housing Output

Scheme	AH units/ Total units	% affordable
Caspian works	47/142	33% (units) 37% (hab rooms)
Ransomes Wharf	53/151	34% (units) 35% (hab rooms)

Crossharbour		27% (units) 36% (hab rooms)
Stockwell Street	45/129	35% (units)
RAF Bentley Priory	0/103	0%
Hartfield Road Car Park	35/110	32% (units) 28% (hab rooms)
Ram Brewery	0/829	0% (+ 11% off site)
Arundel Great Court	0/151	43 units off site - 24%
Rathbone Market*	165/652	25% (units)
Former Goods Yard, Queens Ride, Barnes	0/14	0%
City Pride and Island Point	City Pride 18/ 430 Island Point 166/189 Overall 184/619	4% 88% 30%
18-42 Wharf Road	95/327	29% (units) 34% (hab rooms)
Mardyke Estate*	395/555	70%
Holland Estate*	91/209	39% (units) 46% (hab rooms) Net of demolitions: 31% (units) 39% (hab rooms)
Britannia Music Site	98/332	31% (original proposal was 0%)
Former Commonwealth Institute	0/72	0%
Southall Gas Works	915/3750	24% (units) 30% (habrooms) original proposal was 20% hab rooms
142-170 Streatham Hill	45/286	18% (units) 20% (habrooms)
Eric and Treby estates*	50/179	28% (units)
206-214 High St, Stratford	16/131	12% (units) + £3.1m off site contribution
Land at Kew Bridge	21/164	13% (units) + off site contribution up to £3.6m
Land at Billet works	188/562	33% (units)
Former NATS HQ site	59/773	8% (units) 11% (habrooms)
Fresh Wharf	95 to 330/950	Between 10% and 35%
Randolph and Pembroke House	On site 36/754 Including off site 140/859	On site 5% Total 16%
Innovation Centre	75/265	25% (units)
Battersea Power Station	517/3856	15% (units)
Bermondsey Spa site C5	68/205	33% (units)
Silvertown Quays	1330/4930	27% (units)
Zenith House	135/309	44% (units)
One Tower Bridge	Main site 0/ 356 Second site 43/43 Overall 43/ 399	0% (units) 100% (units) 11% (units)
82-84 Piccadilly	11/36	31% (units)
Inglis Barracks	325/2174	15% (units)

* Estate regeneration schemes

Cases where affordable housing proportion increased between stage1 and stage2

reports:

Arundel Great Court (off site provision)
 Britannia Music Site. From 0 to 98 units
 Southall Gas Works. From 20% to 30% of hab rooms

Cases where affordable housing proportion decreased between stage1 and stage 2 reports:

Ram Brewery
 206-241 High St, Stratford. Reduced from 45 units to 16 units
 Land at Kew Bridge. Reduced from 44 units (26%) to 21 (13%) due to non availability of Housing Corporation grant

3. Balance between social rent and intermediate housing

Scheme	Social rented units	Intermediate units	Ratio
Caspian Works	35	12	74:26
Ransomes Wharf	27	24	51:49
Crossharbour	Not specified	Not specified	
Stockwell Street	14	31	31:69
RAF Bentley Priory	0	0	N/A
Hartfield Road Car Park	26	9	74:26
Ram Brewery	Not specified	Not specified	
Arundel Great Court	0 on site	0 on site	
Rathbone Market *	49	116	30:70
Former Goods Yard, Queens Ride, Barnes	0	0	N/A
City Pride	0	18	0:100
Island Point	118	48	71:29
	Overall: 118	66	64:36
18-42 Wharf Road	53	42	56:44
Mardyke Estate	334	57	85:15
Holland Estate	68	13	84:16
Britannia Music Site	59	39	60:40
Former Commonwealth Institute	0	0	N/A
Southall Gas Works	50%	50%	50:50
142-170 Streatham Hill	30	15	67:33
Eric and Treby estates	50	0	100:0
206-214 High St, Stratford	0	16	0:100
Land at Kew Bridge	50%	50%	50:50
Land at Billet works	121	67	64:36
Former NATS HQ site	40	19	68:34
Fresh Wharf	Not specified	Not specified	N/A
Randolph and Pembroke	On site 0	36	0:100

House	Off site 104 Overall 104	0 36	100:0 74:26
Innovation Centre	56	19	75:25
Battersea Power Station			60:40
Bermondsey Spa site C5	44	24	65:35
Silvertown Quays			60:40
Zenith House	97	38	72:28
One Tower Bridge	43	0	100:0
82-84 Piccadilly	6	5	55:45
Inglis Barracks			60:40

* Figures for phase 1 only

Cases where social rent proportion increased between stage1 and stage 2 reports

Ransomes Wharf
Britannia Music Site

Cases where social rent proportion decreased between stage 1 and stage 2 reports

3. Bedroom size mix

Scheme	Studios	1 Beds	2 Beds	3 Beds	4+ Beds	3B+
Caspian Works				48% social rented units		48% social rented units
Ransomes Wharf				7%		7%
Crossharbour				103 (24%)		24%
Stockwell Street				17%		17%
RAF Bentley Priory				70 (86%)		86%
Hartfield Road Car Park	4	22	84	0		0
Ram Brewery		353	336	131 (16%)	9 (2%)	18%
Arundel Great Court	Not specified in report					Not specified
Rathbone Market		50%	50%	0%		0%
Former Goods Yard, Queens		4 (29%)		10 (71%)		71%

Ride, Barnes						
City Pride and Island Point	57	231	231	72	44 4Bs 18 5Bs	22%
18-42 Wharf Road	3	133	88	68	35	41%
Mardyke Estate		198	258	90	16	19%
Holland Estate						27% (41% of AH)
Britannia Music Site		75	238	73		9%
Former Commonwealth Institute						65%
Southall Gas Works						SR 41% Int 30% Market: not stated
142-170 Streatham Hill	13	75	121	31	3	SR 23% Int 0% Market 24% Total 14%
Eric and Treby estates	19	61	52	38	0	SR 70% Total 21%
206-214 High St, Stratford		57	76	8	6	9%
Land at Kew Bridge		14	99	51		AH 38% Market 30% Total 31%
Land at Billet works		219	242	67	58	SR 28% Int 16% Market 3% Total 21%
Former NATS HQ site	12	152	338	204	68	SR 100% Int 100% Total 35%
Fresh Wharf		25-40%	39-45%	18-26%	3-4%	21-30%
Randolph and						37%

Pembroke House						
Innovation Centre	34	88	82	53	8	22%
Battersea Power Station	12%	16%	44%	18%	8%	SR 40% Int 20% Total 26%
Bermondsey Spa site C5	9	51	107	26	12	SR 34% Int 8% Market 15% Total 23%
Silvertown Quays						SR 40% Int 5% Market 20%
Zenith House		109	160	29	11	13%
One Tower Bridge						21% (main site)
82-84 Piccadilly		4	4	22	5	42%
Inglis Barracks		641	966	290	277	SR 50% Int 16% Total 26%

Cases where 3B+ increased between Stage 1 and Stage 2:

Caspian Works Increase from 34% to 48% of social rented units
Crossharbour Increase from 10% to 24% units, with reduction in studios

Density

Scheme	PTAL	Units per hectare	Habrooms per hectare	LP range (u/ha)	LP range (hr/ha)	u/ha	hr/ha
Caspian Works	2-4	302	894	110-340	325-875	within	over
Ransome's Wharf	3	324	1077	65-240	300-650	over	over
Crossharbour	5	No details					
Stockwell St	5	No details					
RAF Bentley	0 to 1	No					

Priory		details					
Hartfield Road Car Park	6	275	750	275-750	650-1100	within	within
Ram Brewery	5	227 (gross)	631(gross)	140-405	650-1100	within	below
Arundel Great Court	6	273	889	140-405	650-1100	within	within
Rathbone Market	6	418	1660	45-260	200-700	over	over
Former Goods Yard, Queens Ride, Barnes	3	13	44	40-80	150-250	below	below
City Pride and Island Point	6 4	Not stated	4172 545		650-1100 450-700		over within
18-42 Wharf Road	4	Not stated	1142		650-1100		over
Mardyke Estate*	2	113	Not stated	35-95			over
Holland Estate*	6	Not stated	725 (from 529)		650-1100		within
Britannia Music Site	6	503	Not stated	215-405		over	
Former Commonwealth Institute	5-6	Not stated	210		650-1100		below
Southall Gas Works	0-3	No details but 103 dph gross					
142-170 Streatham Hill	6	Not stated	832		650-1100		within
Eric and Treby Estates*	6	161 (from 131)	414 (from 325)	65-240	300-650	within	within
206-214 High St, Stratford	6	1031	2701	215-450	650-1100	over	over
Land at Kew Bridge	3	209	669	45-170	200-450	over	over
Land at Billet works	2	Not stated	570		200-450		over
Former NATS HQ site	1	61	205	40-65	150-200	within	just over
Fresh Wharf	0-1	215	Not stated	50-95		over	
Randolph and Pembroke House	6	No details					
Innovation	4	Not	2542		650-1100		over

Centre		stated					
Battersea Power Station	2 to 4	Not stated					
Bermondsey Spa site C5	3	Not stated	700		300-600		over
Silvertown Quays	Not stated	No details					
Zenith House	2-4	Not stated	816		200-450		over
One Tower Bridge	6	Not stated	Main site 1260 Second site 930		650-1100		over within
82-84 Piccadilly	6	No details					
Inglis Barracks	1-3	3 zones: 40 65 144		35-95			within within over

* Estate regeneration schemes

4. Use of financial appraisal to assess justification of affordable housing output

a) Cases where report referred to appraisal, but where no appraisal on file

Ransomes Wharf
Crossharbour
Hartfield Road Car Park
18-42 Wharf Road
Land at Kew Bridge
82-84 Piccadilly

b) Appraisal submitted by developer on file

Caspian Wharf
RAF Bentley Priory
City Pride/Island Point
Holland Estate
Southall Gas Works
142-170 Streatham Hill (summary only)
Eric and Treby Estates
Land at Billet Works
Former NATS Headquarters
Fresh Wharf
Randolph and Pembroke Houses
Battersea Power Station (cash flow appraisal)
Silvertown Quays

Zenith House
One Tower Bridge

c) Independent appraisal carried out for GLA or for local planning authority

City Pride/Island Point
Southall Gas Works
Land at Kew Bridge
Former NATS Headquarters

d) Appraisal relating to earlier application

Innovation Centre

e) No reference to appraisal

Stockwell Street
Ram Brewery
Arundel Great Court
Rathbone Market
Former Goods Yard, Queens Road, Barnes
Mardyke Estate
Brittania Music Site
Former Commonwealth Institute
206-214 High Street, Stratford
Bermondsey Spa

5. Childrens Playspace

Scheme	Required	Proposed
Caspian Works	2,670 sq m	1,830 sq m increased to 1,880 sq m
Ransomes Wharf	400 sq m	None
Crossharbour	No assessment	
Stockwell Street	490 sq m	None
RAF Bentley Priory	770 sq m	375 sq m (+ 17,000 sq m lawn)
Hartfield Road Car Park	2190 sq m	1375 sq m (+ S106 contribution of £72,250 in lieu of deficit)
Ram Brewery	1040 sq m	502 sq m – deficit to met through roofspace and financial contribution
Arundel Great Court	340 sq m	200 sq m
Rathbone Market	590 sq m	satisfactory

Former Goods Yard, Queens Ride, Barnes	50 sq m	satisfactory
City Pride and Island Point	City Pride 510 sq m Island Point 2140 sq m	220 sq m 2179 sq m (increased from 1623 sq m)
18-42 Wharf Road	1142 sq m	1086 sq m
Mardyke Estate	3465 sq m	700 sq m
Holland Estate	1380 sq m	1608 s m
Britannia Music Site	500 sq m	130 sq m
Former Commonwealth Institute	120 sq m	120 sq m
Southall Gas Works	Not assessed as dwelling mix not finalised	2.5 hectares
142-170 Streatham Hill	600 sq m	651 sq m (increased from 80 sq m)
Eric and Treby estates	1000 sq m	960 sq m (increased from 120 sq m)
206-214 High St, Stratford	210 sq m	213 sq m roof garden
Land at Kew Bridge	558 sq m	To be confirmed by conditions;£12,000 contribution to parks
Land at Billet works	2970 sq m	7853 sq m
Former NATS HQ site	3250 sq m	Not specified but overall amenity space totals 41817 sq m
Fresh Wharf	Not specified in report	'Exceeds requirement'
Randolph and Pembroke House	Not specified in report	
Innovation Centre	1130 sq m	1109 sqm on 11 th floor podium
Battersea Power Station	10,000 sq m	'More than sufficient' Design details to be finalised
Bermondsey Spa site C5	840 sq m	330 sq m + ?
Silvertown Quays	12823 sq m	Open space 22,252 sq m (children's playspace not specified)
Zenith House	1260 sq m	126 sq m + 274 sq m ?
One Tower Bridge	0 Sq m	£460,580 contribution to park
82-84 Piccadilly	Not specified	0 sq m - £72,000 to off site provision
Inglis Barracks	7,980 sq m	3 hectares of open space (children's playspace not specified)

Cases where child playspace provision increased between stage 1 and 2

Caspian Works
 Island Point
 Former Commonwealth Institute
 142-170 Streatham Hill
 Eric and Treby Estates

6. Assessment of transport impacts: Car parking provision

Scheme	Spaces proposed
Caspian Works	31 reduced to 20
RAF Bentley Priory	Much higher than target
Hartfield Road Car Park	20 spaces over target
Arundel Court	Too high
Rathbone Market	159 – 0.5 spaces per res unit – too high
City Pride and Island Point	Satisfactory
18-52 Wharf Road	Reduction sought
Holland Estate	Car-free
Eric and Treby Estates	Reduction as part of estate regeneration project
Land at Kew Bridge	Reduced from 160 to 155
Former NATS HQ site	Reduced from 1122 to 1084
Innovation Centre	40 spaces satisfactory
	Residential reduced from 2364 to 1928 (from 0.6 places per resi unit to 0.5)

Annex 2

Process Information on all schemes

1. Section 106 contributions to transport provision

Housing led schemes

Caspian Works	£20,000 to Docklands Arrival Information System £16,386 to bus services
Ransomes Wharf	£40,000 to junction improvement
Stockwell Street	£220,000
RAF Bentley Priory	£200,000 highway works
Hartfield Car Park	£500,000 to bus garage
Ram Brewery	£38m towards highway improvements (Wandsworth gyratory) £1m towards Wandsworth Town station £350,000 to local bus services £250,000 towards improved access between town centre and River Thames £10,000 for a river bus £70,000 for Controlled Parking Zone £150,000 towards junction improvements
Rathbone Market	£270,000 bus capacity £280,000 subway
City Pride/ Island Point	City Pride: £20,000 for bus stops £200,000 for increased bus Island Point: £20,000 for bus stops £113,000 for increased
14-42 Wharf Road	£270,000 (including £135,000 to bus network, £35,000 for bus stop improvements, £70,000 for walking and cycling improvements and £30,000 for street design framework)
Mardyke estate	£60,000 Controlled Parking Zone £30,000 bus stops
Britannia Music Site	£750,000 gyratory works
Southall Gas Works	£6.6m for buses; £4.3m to mitigate other transport impacts. £50,000 signage for town centre

	<p>£100,000 for Southall town centre car parking</p> <p>£100,000 for controlled parking zones</p>
142-170 Streatham Hill	TfL requested £160,000 contribution to Streatham Hill station (rather than bus improvements). £30,000 for bus stop improvements not secured
Land at Kew Bridge	Contributions to Kew Bridge rail station, bus stands, cycle club, travel plan. Amount not specified in reports.
Land at Billet Works	£750,000 bus services
Former NATS Headquarters	<p>£420,000 towards TfL bus services.</p> <p>£34,000 towards bus-stop improvements.</p> <p>£25,000 towards a parking management study</p>
Fresh Wharf	£600,000 to bus and transport infrastructure
Randolph and Pembroke House	<p>£331,000 contribution towards sustainable transport (cycle, bus pedestrian and tram improvements), including £100,000 towards accessibility improvements at five bus stops</p> <p>£200,000 contribution towards capacity enhancements at East Croydon station</p> <p>£200,000 contribution towards capacity enhancements at West Croydon station</p>
Innovation Centre	£20,000 to Docklands Arrival Information System
Battersea Power Station	<p>£203m to Northern Line Extension</p> <p>£6.8m to other public transport improvements</p> <p>£1.4m to TfL for bus service improvements</p> <p>£267,000 to TfL for cycle hire</p>
Bermondsey Spa	£256,250 to cycle and pedestrian
Silvertown Quays	<p>Crossrail contribution of £627,040.</p> <p>Contribution to bus services increased from £1.5m in original s106 to £2.2m.</p>
Zenith House	<p>£135,000 for bus network enhancements,</p> <p>£100,000 for step free access at Colindale</p>

	underground station, £20,000 for bus stop upgrades, £100,000 for junction improvements, £10,000 for CPZ review and implementation. £92,700 for Oyster card, car club and cycle vouchers.
One Tower Bridge	£103,000 to Crossrail £25,000 to compensate for environmental impact of cars.
Inglis Barracks	£2.9m to Mill Hill East station. Bus network (£625,000) and bus stop upgrades (£50,000)

Housing led schemes with no information on s106 contributions to transport:

Crossharbour
Arundel Great Court
Former Goods Yard, Queens Ride, Barnes
Holland Estate
Former Commonwealth Institute
Eric and Reby Estares
206-214 High Street, Stratford
82-8 Piccadilly

Other Schemes:

18/21 Barlow Way	Contribution to bus stop improvement not pursued
Hertsmere House, Columbus Tower	DLR £3,581,553 Cycleway extension £433,252
St Leonards Hospital	£16,000 for bus stop £2,500 for travel plan monitoring
Langdon School	£70,000 to increase bus capacity

No transport contributions were recorded for the following schemes:

Crossness Sewage Treatment Works
Thames Wharf
3 Deadsley Road
Chiswick Roundabout
Woodlands, 80 Wood Lane

Athlone House
 Surbiton Hospital Site

2. Section 106 contributions for purposes other than transport

Housing led schemes

RAF Bentley Priory	<p>£3.2m for museum £200,000 education £200,000 community facilities (ecology and health) £1m to off site affordable housing (reduced from £2.079m)</p>
Hartfield Road Car Park	£72,250 to park
Ram Brewery	<p>£200,000 towards public realm £261,000 towards public safety and security £250,000 for enhancements to River Wandle £100,000 for Home Zone scheme £275,000 for local employment agreement</p>
Holland Estate	£785,000 for community centre. £1,322,000 in total.
Southall Gas Works	<p>Provision of 2,550 sq m health facility Provision of 3,450 sq m junior school and nursery £5,131,456 contribution to secondary school provision £1,000,000 for local parks and open space £100,000 for allotments £262,000 for provision and maintenance of trees £750,000 for burial space £1,500,000 contribution to a swimming pool £678,000 to employment and training provision £360,000 to shop mobility scheme £596,000 public realm improvements £ 689,000 for low emissions strategy £50,000 for council contaminated land officer post 200 sq m facility (value of £350,000) for community police station £2,752,520 for Minet Country Park £821,000 for secondary and post 16 education in Hillingdon £20,000 for strategic master plan for wider</p>

	area £4,000,000 for land remediation £660,000 improved access along canal
206-214 High Street, Stratford	£3.1m for off site affordable housing /regeneration of Carpenters estate (original offer was £2.1m)
Land at Kew Bridge	£12,000 contribution to parks Up to £3.6m for off site affordable housing subject to financial appraisal review.
Land at Billet works	£1,779m unspecified in reports (assuming 750,000 of £2.529m total is ringfenced for bus services)
Former NATS Headquarters	£3,998,412 towards educational facilities. £337,574 towards local healthcare facilities in lieu of on-site provision. £392,220 towards indoor/outdoor sports and recreational facilities £34,000 towards library facilities. £250,000 to improve the public realm at Mulberry Parade. £200,000 or works in kind to the Grand Union Canal, with the agreement of British Waterways. Provision of a community facility on site of not less than 204 sq.m.
Fresh Wharf	Planning obligations within LTGDC fixed rate tariff (discounted from £28,000 per resi unit to £6,000 per unit)
Battersea Power Station	£1.8m to community and local employment purposes
Zenith House	£50,000 for public realm
One Tower Bridge	£10.51m for off site affordable housing £460,580 to adjacent park
82-84 Piccadilly	£72,000 to playspace
Inglis Barracks	Profit share agreement could generate funds for off site affordable housing

Housing led schemes with no information on s106 contributions for purposes other than transport:

Caspian Works
 Ransomes Wharf
 Crossharbour
 Stockwell Street
 Arudel Great Court
 Rathbone Market
 Former Goods Yard, Queen's Ride, Barnes
 City Pride/Island Point
 18-42 Wharf Road
 Mardyke Estate
 Britannia Music Site
 Former Commonwealth Institute
 142-170 Streatham Hill
 Randolph and Pembroke House
 Innovation Centre
 Bermondsey Spa
 Silvertown Quays

Other Schemes

Crossness Sewage Treatment Works	Contribution to MOL enhancement not pursued as as biodiversity mitigation measures considered to be sufficient
Hertsmere House, Columbus Tower	Off site affordable housing £1,155,340 Employment and training £332,756 (Primary health care facility £375,000 attached to 2004 consent not pursued)
Woodlands, 80 Wood Lane	£1m for infrastructure improvements £120,000 for development infrastructure funding study

No s106 contributions were recorded for the following schemes:

Thames Wharf
 18/21 Barlow Way
 St Leonards Hospital
 3 Deardsley Road
 Chiswick Roundabout
 Dormers Well High School
 Athlone House
 Langdon School
 Surbiton Hospital Site

3. Form of Planning Application

Extension of existing outline planning consent

Silvertown Quays

Amendment to existing consent (with key components of amendment)

Crossharbour: Loss of all office space; increase in residential units (54), hotel rooms (6) and additional retail space, health club and open space.

Late referral (combined stage 1 and stage 2)

Ransome's Wharf
Athlone House

Outline applications

Mardyke Estate
Southall Gas Works
St Leonards Hospital
Former NATS Headquarters site
Fresh Wharf
Battersea Power Station
Inglis Barracks

Hybrid applications

Southall Gas Works
Rathbone Market
Inglis Barracks

Full detailed applications

All other schemes

4. Pre-application meetings and Mayoral Presentations

Pre-application meeting:

Rathbone Market (2 meetings)
City Pride/Island Point
18-42 Wharf Road
Mardyke Estate
Holland Estate
Former NATS Headquarters
Innovation Centre
Woodlands (3 meetings)
Battersea Power Station (2 meetings)

Bermondsey Spa
 Zenith House (2 meetings)
 One Tower Bridge
 82-84 Piccadilly
 Surbiton Hospital Site

Presentation to Mayor/ Deputy Mayor:

Ram Brewery
 Woodlands
 Battersea Power Station
 One Tower Bridge

Mayoral Visit (relating to Mayor taking over application) :

Southall Gas Works
 Columbus Tower

5. Mayoral Decisions

Stage 2 decisions

a) Leave to Local Planning Authority to determine

All schemes other than those listed below

b) Mayor directed refusal

Athlone House (L B Camden had already decided to refuse application)

c) Mayor took over application

Southall Gas Works
 Columbus Tower

6. Cases for which files not retrieved from archive, so are excluded from analysis:

Jan 2009	Wallis House, Great West Road, Hounslow
May 2009	19/20 Fenchurch Street, City of London
May 2009	50-57 High Holborn, Camden
Aug 2009	South Marsh, Hackney
Sep 2009	Moor Hall Farm, Havering
Oct 2009	Harold Hill Learning Village, Havering
Nov 2009	General Lying-in Hospital, Lambeth

July 2010 Mildmay Mission Hospital
Sep 2010 Temple House, 221-225 Station Road, Harrow

7. Cases for which files not retrieved from archive, but substantive supporting documentation was available:

Oct 2008 RAF Bentley Priory, Stanmore, Harrow
May 2009 City Pride and Island Point, Tower Hamlets
Dec 2010 Battersea Power Station, Wandsworth
Jan 2011 Bermondsey Spa Site C5, Southwark
Jan 2011 Silvertown Quays, Newham
Feb 2011 Zenith House, Barnet
Jun 2011 Inglis Barracks, Barnet

Annex 3**Residential led schemes: Comments on matters other than housing policies*****Urban Design Issues*****Piccadilly**

Relocate plant space from roof to basement to mitigate impact in a conservation area.

Streatham Hill

Layout and configuration requires changes. Family housing should have direct access to communal area

Wharf Road

Security of residential entrances

Stratford High St

Significant concerns on scheme design massing and access to balconies.

Bermondsey

Concerns re north-south links through the site, the viability of commercial space with respect to public realm, and the choice of materials.

Battersea Power Station

Generally compliant, but further detail required

Bentley Priory

Concerns outstanding re pedestrian connectivity but not grounds for refusal

Britannia

Density twice the appropriate range in London Plan . However design including high rise component, generally supported. Landscaping/ public realm improvements required.

Caspian

Relocation of bin store and cycle store welcomed, together with other minor revisions.

City Pride

Design for both sites welcomed

Commonwealth Institute

Mayor supported reduction in building height and reduction in floorspace

Crossharbour

Design supported as tower blends in with Canary wharf cluster.

Some concern at that the inter-relationship between development and the dock water not set out.

Former NATS HQ

Minor amendments suggested. Design code for development acceptable.

Fresh Wharf

Broad support - detailed design to be subject to applications for detailed consent.

Hartfield

Acceptable but disappointment as to 'standard design'

Inglis

Compliant. Condition to be attached re site wide design code

Innovation Centre

Concern re single aspect orientation of most flats

Land at Billet works

Good design overall – minor changes sought

Land at Kew Bridge

Generally welcomed but concern with high proportion of single aspect dwellings

Mardyke

“Further development of the design quality guide to move beyond generalities and to demonstrate a commitment to the highest quality design, incorporating variation, visual richness, layering and to ensure an avoidance of generic housing design should be pursued.”

One Tower Bridge

Minor changes to design required. Overall design acceptable (CABE objections to design especially Campanile)

Ram Brewery

Design generally supported. Concern that some balconies too small, and that some single aspect dwellings are sensitive to noise from main roads. Some concern with design of tower blocks.

Randolph and Pembroke

Acceptable (no major changes since 2007 scheme)

Ransomes Wharf

Design including new public square acceptable

Rathbone Market

Policy compliant

Silvertown Quays

Compliance with new housing design standards secured

Southall Gas Works

Policy compliant – ‘one of the most humane and well thought out masterplans’. Concern re eastern access (change of level) resolved.

St Leonards

Broadly compliant. Further images requested
Access consultant should be involved in detailed design.

Stockwell Street

Concern that many flats lack internal space and that balconies are too small.
Proposals acceptable ‘ if far from exemplary’ Some design changes made in response to representations from CABE.

Zenith House

Concerns re materials, wind levels, cycle access and design of retail unit
Welcomed as improvement on consented scheme. Revisions to ensure compliance but additional work on wind mitigation required.

Strategic Views

Piccadilly

Views checked and acceptable

Bermondsey

Site within Parliament Hill- St Paul's cathedral viewing corridor but height well below negative impact threshold

Battersea Power Station

Height of buildings range from 45m to 60m though number of stories not specified. , assumed to be 15-20. No concerns as to any negative impact on protected views or on setting of Battersea Power Station.

Britannia

No protected views. Height is 3 storeys above Ilford Area Action Plan guideline but acceptable.

City Pride

Not considered in reports (City Pride development is a 62 storey tower)

Crossharbour

Development visible in view from Greenwich Park to Greenwich world heritage site, but acceptable given high quality of design.

Innovation Centre

Site within Greenwich/ St Paul's viewing corridor. Acceptable as part of Canary Wharf cluster. However no images shown in report (or in 2008 reports on previous application).

One Tower Bridge

L B Greenwich objected to impact on view of St Paul's from Blackheath. Objection discounted.

Ram Brewery

Site does not fall within any strategic views.

Rathbone Market

Not applicable (scheme involves a 23 storey tower)

Silvertown Quays

No new issues

Southall Gas Works

Not considered

Stockwell Street

Not raised in report.

Zenith House

N/A (Scheme includes 16 storey tower)

Climate Change/ energy

Streatham Hill

Sustainability report provided. However further information required re biomass boiler. Detailed modelling required. Further information required on mitigating overheati

Piccadilly

Further information required on CO2 savings. CHP should be considered

Wharf Road

Space requirements for energy centre need specified, with further information on type of system. Details of rainwater harvesting system.

Bermondsey

Estimate of carbon emissions required

Stratford High St

Need for sustainable drainage provision. Need for sustainability statement and further information on heating systems

Barnes

Further information provided on on-site renewables

Battersea Power Station

Insufficient information on energy strategy
Flood risk assessment satisfactory

Bentley

Strategy broadly in line with LP requirements but feasibility of CHP needs to be considered

Britannia

Alternative options for climate change mitigation discussed, though no specialist reports on file.

Caspian

Conditions applied to achieve 10% renewable energy and optimisation of CHP
Applicant committed to 16% reduction in carbon emissions

City Pride

Alternative energy strategy required for City Pride. Link to Barkentine heating system should be

considered. Further details for energy systems at Island Point required.

Commonwealth

Concerns on biomass boiler not pursued following submission of further documentation

Crossharbour

Further details required on energy proposals. Detailed assessment included in Stage 1 report. Water efficiency measures should be secured by condition.

Eric and Tenby

Renewal energy: Refurbishment of district heating system proposed + photovoltaic panels.
Climate change mitigation: Acceptable (though lack of green roofs disappointing)

Former NATS

Energy centre with CHP and district heating network to be provided.

Fresh Wharf

Proposal for rainwater collection required. Concerns re use of river transport for waste and construction materials.

Further information required re renewable energy

Hartfield

Photovoltaic panels requested.
Water conservation strategy required.

Inglis

Revised energy strategy with biomass boiler to be replaced by gas fired CHP

Innovation Centre

Energy strategy insufficiently robust.

Land at Billett Works

Generally satisfactory though some flooding, biodiversity and noise issues need to be addressed.

Land at Kew Bridge

Further information required on flood risk assessment and management of water run-off.
Further information required on energy provision and renewables. Modelling for commercial elements supplied as requested

Mardyke

Energy proposals acceptable.

Query as to why applicant states that rainwater harvesting not viable

One Tower Bridge

Further details on heating technology.

Details of surface water drainage

Ram Brewery

Strategy is not satisfactory and applicant needs to review complementary technologies.

Randolph and Pembroke

Further information required including link to Croydon Town Centre district heating system

Delivery of ecohomes requirements secured by a planning condition

Improvements to energy and climate change related components of scheme secured

Ransomes Wharf

Carbon reduction proposals below 20% target. Conditions re noise abatement, air quality, climate change adaptation.

Rathbone Market

Broadly consistent 'though not as comprehensive or as robust as requested'

Silvertown Quays

Additional agreement on submission of a site wide energy strategy

Queries on energy strategy. More information required on overheating, passive design, green and brown roofs and walls and water use. CSH4 must be achieved

Southall Gas Works

50% green roof commitment welcomed.

Further information on water usage and water run-off required.

Two alternative energy strategies submitted require assessment. Further modelling required.

St Leonards

Energy strategy broadly acceptable but enhancements sought.

Stockwell Street

Applicant requested to consider brown/green roofs, rainwater harvesting and sustainable urban

drainage

Zenith House

Further information on carbon dioxide savings required

Retail/Offices/Hotels

Battersea Power Station

Updated retail assessment submitted and independently reviewed. Mayor satisfied no adverse impacts on other centres. Proposals supported. Scheme has potential to deliver a major strategic addition to London's modern office stock and strengthen London's global competitiveness

Crossharbour

No figures on employment loss or gain arising from proposed changes of use relative to consented application. There is a reference to 'remaining capacity for office use in the Isle of Dogs opportunity area.

Hartfield

No issues raised. Site planning brief included hotel, but not raised by GLA despite LP policy supporting additional hotel provision.

Ram Brewery

Retail proposals welcomed in relation to town centre regeneration and to enable Wandsworth to fulfil its role in town centre hierarchy.

Retail proposals supported in relation to policies 3D.1, 3D.2 and 3D.3

Museum supported in relation to policy 3D.7 on tourist facilities

Employment generation welcomed

Southall Gas Works

Retail: Scale and impact acceptable – New town centre will complement existing Southall town centre

Other Policy Compliance Issues and Response to Public Objections

Streatham Hill

Initiatives to create training and employment opportunities for local people required
Significant number of local objections to both bulk and content of development proposal, with counter-petition supporting development proposal.

Wharf Road

Recommended flexibility for B1 uses to allow for research and development (B1b) and light industrial (B1c)
Delete proposal for lighting over water as it disturbs bats
Significant local objections to scheme

Barnes Goods Yard

Local objections relating to development on MOL, but no objections from English Heritage or Natural England

Battersea Power Station

Hazardous Installations 3A.34	Positive aspects of the scheme ‘ outweigh the risk of a hazardous event occurring and its consequences’
Blue ribbon network 4C.7, 4C.10, 4C.11	Provision of new pier and access to riverside welcomed Water based recreational uses not pursued.
Safeguarded Wharves 4C.9	Mitigation measures offer sufficient safeguards.
Air quality 4A.19	Further assessment provided. Impacts considered acceptable.

Bentley Priory

Provision of museum complies with LP policy on London’s Built Heritage
Flood mitigation. Environment agent to withdraw objection subject to condition re surface water control measures. Biodiversity: Further detail required on bat mitigation strategy

Caspian

Employment and Training strategy to be submitted

City Pride

Local objections to developments on both sites. Especially overdevelopment of City Pride site and

concentration of affordable housing at Island Point site.

Commonwealth Institute

Commonwealth Institute to be refurbished for Design Museum. Listed building consent granted by English Heritage on basis that public benefit outweighs harm to listed building.

Hartfield

Detailed concerns on noise impacts/ need for sound insulation

Land at Billet works

Employment opportunities should be maximised
Further bat and bird surveys required

The Mayor was prepared to accept loss of employment land in excess of the 50% reduction assumed on the LPAs site allocations.

Employment generation/loss not referred to in report, despite loss of employment space to residential

Land at Kew Bridge

Updated biodiversity and ecological assessment required

Mardyke

Biodiversity: acceptable as long as ecological report proposals implemented

One Tower Bridge

Cultural use – flexible layout as no end user determined.

Drainage and noise mitigation proposals acceptable

Randolph and Pembroke

Concerns re space standards not pursued

Consultee objections re height of building, overdevelopment, noise and highways impacts not pursued.

Ransomes Wharf

Noise concerns can be mitigated by appropriate design and planning conditions

Air quality: Conditions to mitigate impact

Southall Gas Works

Blue Ribbon Network	Broadly acceptable. Flood risk and flood storage need to be assessed.
Green Belt	Pedestrian bridges welcomed as improve access to Green Belt
Biodiversity	Access to Country Park will be improved. Contribution to maintenance should be considered.

Stockwell Street

Temporary relocation of market stalls not possible.

Objections from World Heritage Site Executive discounted

Annex 4 Schedule of Sample Cases

Decision Date	GLA Reference No	Site	LA	Former land use	Proposed use	Outline/Full
01-Jun-11	PDU/2351/02	Inglis Barracks	Barnet (OL)	Army barracks	Housing and health	Outline(access) +Detailed. Change of use
10-May-11	PDU/2655/02	82-84 Piccadilly	Westminster (IL)	Office + retail	Office, resi and retail	Full
30-Mar-11	PDU/0447b, 0447c, 0447d/02	One tower bridge(Potters Field)	Southwark (IL)	Vacant	Residential and cultural	Full
17-Mar-11	PDU/2573/02	Surbiton hospital site	Kingston (OL)	Hospital	Healthcare and primary school	Full
08-Feb-11	PDU/1447b/02	Zenith house	Barnet (OL)	Demolished office building	Residential	Full
19-Jan-11	PDU/0498b/02	Silvertown quays	Newham (OL)	Mainly vacant	Resi, hotel and mixed use	Extension of existing consent
12-Jan-11	PDU/0833a/02	Bermondsey spa. Site C5	Southwark (IL)	Housing and commercial dwellings to be demolished	Resi and commercial	Full
22-Dec-10	PDU/1732/02	Battersea power station	Wandsworth (IL)	Derelict power station	Residential mixed use redevelopment	Outline
22-Dec-10	PDU/0487b/02	Langdon school	Newham (OL)	School within MOL	Extension + Alterations to school buildings	Full
15-Dec-10	PDU/2097a/02	Innovation centre	Tower Hamlets (IL)	Not specified – vacant ?	43 storey resi ,hotel + offices	Full
30-Nov-10	PDU/0861b/01	Athlone house	Camden (IL)	Dwelling to be demolished	Large single dwelling	Full
11-Nov-10	PDU/2540a/02	Woodlands 80 Wood Lane	Hammersmith and Fulham (IL)	Vacant BBC offices	Student accom	Full
12-Oct-10	PDU/1583a/02	Former Randolph and Pembroke house site	Croydon (OL)	Vacant since 1993	Flats + commercial (up to 40 stories)	Full
21-Sep-10	PDU/0855a/02	Fresh Wharf	Barking and Dagenham (OL)	Part vacant; part small scale light industry	Mixed use – shops, restaurants + flats	Outline

13-Sep-10	PDU/2577/02	Temple house, 221-225 Station Road	Harrow (OL)	Office	Hotel	Outline
04-Aug-10	PDU/2635/02	Dormers Wells High School	Ealing (OL)	School to be demolished	New school	Full
07-Jul-10	PDU/1260a/02	Mildmay Mission hospital	Tower Hamlets (IL)	Hospital + church	Redevelop ment to flats + new church	Full
29-Jun-10	PDU/2446/02	Former Nats headquarters site	Hillingdon (OL)	Offices (Air traffic service)	Dwellings, nursing home, health care, shops, business units, energy centre , pumping station	Outline
05-May-10	PDU/2332/02	Land at Billet works	Waltham Forest (OL)	Industrial use - warehouses	Resi, health centre	Full
15-Apr-10	PDU/0075f/02	Chiswick roundabout	Hounslow (OL)	vacant	Office	Full
31-Mar-10	PDU/2518/02	3 Dearsley road	Enfield (OL)	Night club	Retail Change of use and extra floorspace	Full
12-Mar-10	PDU/0162a	Land at Kew Bridge, Brentford	Hounslow (OL)	Vacant – formerly offices + pub	Resi + retail + restaurants	Full
12-Mar-10	PDU/2078a/02	206-214 High Street, Stratford	Newham (OL)	Operational petrol station	Commercia l, offices + flats (26 storeys)	Full
22-Feb-10	PDU/2477a/02	St Leonards Hospital	Hackney (IL)	Healthcare facilities	Mental health unit	Outline
10-Feb-10	PDU/2328a/02	Eric and Treby Estates	Tower Hamlets (IL)	Resi to be demolished	Resi + community facilities	Detailed + conservati on area consent
22-Dec-09	PDU/1663a/02	142-170 Streatham Hill + Wentworth house	Lambeth (IL)	Vacant bowling alley nightclub and former job centre	Redevelop ment for leisure, retail and resi	Full
22-Dec-09	PDU/2310/03	Southall gas works	Ealing, Hillingdon (OL)	Gas holders, industrial uses and airport car parking	Residential (3750 units) mixed use developme nt	Outline + derailed for access highways
02-Dec-09	PDU/2363/02	Former Commonwealth institute, High Street, Kensington	Kensington and Chelsea (IL)	Cultural facility	Leisure (cinema + swimming pool) ,	Full

					retail and resi	
18-Nov-09	PDU/0881/02	Britannia music site, Ilford	Redbridge (OL)	Vacant former office block	Flats + live work in 3 blocks, incl 23 storey tower	Full
04-Nov-09	PDU/2246/02	General Lying in hospital	Lambeth (IL)	Hospital/ health offices	Hotel and restaurant	Full
14-Oct-09	PDU/2431/02	Harold Hill learning village	Havering (OL)	College building and 2 schools (to be demolished)	New educational campus	Full
09-Sep-09	PDU/1122/02	Moor Hall Farm	Havering (OL)	Agricultural site in Green Belt	Golf course	Full
26-Aug-09	PDU/2350/02	Hertsmere House, Columbus Tower	Tower Hamlets (IL)	Office building (to be demolished)	Offices, hotel and serviced apartments (63 storey building)	Detailed + conservation area consent
05-Aug-09	PDU/2161b/02	South Marsh Hackney Marshes	Hackney (IL)	Sport changing rooms on MOL	Community hub + café restaurant	Full
15-Jul-09	PDU/2141/02	Holland Estate, Commercial Road	Tower Hamlets (IL)	Demolition of 43 dwellings	Estate renewal – 209 new dwellings	Full
01-Jul-09	PDU/2196/02	Mardyke Estate, Rainham	Havering (OL)	Residential estate	Estate redevelopment – 555 units + offices+ commercial	Outline
17-Jun-09	PDU/2127/02	18-42 wharf road	Hackney (IL)	Employment floorspace	Residential	Full
27-May-09	PDU/1814b/02	50-57 High Holborn	Camden (IL)	Office, retail + 6 resi units	Flats + student flats + offices	Full
20-May-09	PDU/0044b/02	19/20 Fenchurch Street	City of London (IL)	Consented development – office + retail	Office + retail (38 storey tower)	Full (minor changes to consented scheme)
13-May-09	PDU/2187/2188A	City Pride + Island Point	Tower Hamlets (IL)	Public house	Resi in two blocks (one 62 storeys)	Full
21-Apr-09	PDU/2095A/02	Former goods yard at queens ride, Barnes	Richmond (OL)	Former goods yard within MOL	Public Open space and 14 flats	Full
01-Apr-09	PDU/1730/02	Rathbone Market, Canning Town	Newham (OL)	Retail + resi	Redevelopment - Resi + offices + retail	Hybrid (outline + detailed)

			Havering (OL)	Warehouse unit	Clinical Waste treatment facility	Change of use
18-Mar-09	PDU/2391/02	18/21 Barlow way				
04-Mar-09	PDU/2172/02	Arundel great court	Westminster (IL)	Vacant office, hotel and retail	Office, hotel + resi	Full
			Wandsworth (IL)	Vacant brewery	Resi, offices, retail cultural (in 2 towers)	Full
14-Jan-09	PDU/1519/02	Ram Brewery site				
			Hounslow (OL)	Consented residential and commercial development	Additional floorspace – resi and commercial	Revisions to existing consent
05-Jan-09	PDU/2011a/02	Wallis house, Great West Road				
			Merton (OL)	Car park	Resi led mixed use development	Full
17-Dec-08	PDU/1457a/02	Hartfield car park, Wimbledon				
			Newham (OL)	Scrap metal stocking facility	Waste transfer station	Change of use
17-Nov-08	PDU/2256/02	Thames Wharf				
			Bexley (OL)	Sewage treatment works	Extension to existing sewage treatment works	Full
30-Oct-08	PDU/2151/02	Crossness sewage treatment works				
			Harrow (OL)	RAF office building	Museum + resi	Full
09-Oct-08	PDU/2099/02	RAF Bentley priory, Stanmore				
			Greenwich (OL)	Former petrol station and vacant buildings	Flats, retail, offices	Full
23-Sep-08	PDU/0346a/03	Stockwell street, Greenwich				
			Tower Hamlets (IL)	Mixed use consent	Additional hotel rooms, resi and retail – replacing offices	Revised consent
01-Aug-08	PDU/0511d/02	Crossharbour London arena site phase 2				
			Wandsworth (IL)	Warehouse, office and industrial buildings	Resi, offices and commercial	Full
11-Jun-08	PDU/1759/01	Ransomes wharf, Battersea				
			Tower Hamlets (IL)	Light industrial	Resi, shops, restaurant and offices	Full
14-May-08	PDU/1982/02	Caspian works				

ANNEX 5 Summary of Individual Cases (in alphabetical order)**SCHEME NAME 3 DEARDSLEY ROAD**

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 2518/02

LA Enfield

Planning Application type: Detailed (change of use)

Referral Category: 3E

STAGE 2 Date 31 March 2010

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 29 October 2009

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Change of use of nightclub to non-food retail, and construction of a mezzanine floor to provide 1670 sq.m of additional floor space, new entrance lobby and external alterations to rear.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Non food retail

Existing land use: Nightclub (vacant)

Applicant: Standard Life UK Retail Park Trust Ltd

Architect

Agent: Indigo

Site Area: Existing 2,331 sq m – proposed 4,041 sq m

PTAL : Not specified

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Additional retail floorspace welcomed
Density policy compliance	3A.3	N/A
AH proportions	3A.9/10	N/A
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	N/A
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	N/A
External playspace	3D.13	N/A
Design policies	4B.1/3	No issues. Minor alterations only
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	Not considered
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Satisfactory provision of cycle parking
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Energy strategy submitted

Planning conditions		Not considered
s106 agreement		Not considered
Other Issues		Sequential test satisfied – no suitable town centre sites No detrimental impact on existing stores

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	N/A
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	N/A
Urban Design	No issues raised
Inclusive Design	Disabled parking acceptable. No visitor toilets.
Climate change mitigation/ energy	Details of renewable energy proposals required
Transport	Clarification on number of cycle parking spaces required

Process

Financial viability	Not considered
Documentation	Scheme drawings Design and access statement Planning statement Transport assessment Retail assessment Enfield planning report
Mixed Use requirement	Quantitative need for retail provision demonstrated
Employment generation/loss	No assessment referred to in reports
Climate change mitigation	Energy strategy provided
Policy reference sources (outside	

2008 London Plan)	Draft replacement London Plan
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded

Overall Comments

This scheme was non contentious as it related to provision of retail in a retail park. The applicant argued that the scheme complied with Enfield UDP and should not have been referred to Mayor. The mayor used the referral to ensure policy compliance in relation cycle provision and renewal energy.

SCHEME NAME 18-42 WHARF ROAD

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 2127/02

LA Hackney

Planning Application type:

Referral Category: 1A

STAGE 2 Date 17 July 2009

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 9 October 2008

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Demolition of existing building and erection of a part 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10-storey building with basement, comprising 327 residential units, 6,521 sq.m. of B1(a) offices, car parking, access and landscaping.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential with offices

Existing land use: Employment floorspace

Applicant REEF UK Industrial Property Fund

Architect Munkenbeck and Marshall Urbanism Ltd

Agent DP9

Site Area: 0.83 hectares

PTAL : 4

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Land is designate as employment land within Hackney UDP.
Density policy compliance	3A.3	Density 1,181 hab rooms per hectare. Acceptable though marginally above range. Scheme is not out of context

AH proportions	3A.9/10	Total 327 units: Social rent 53 units (16%); intermediate 42 units (13%) market 232 (71%) 29% units 34% hab rooms AH accepted on basis that HA assumption on grant is reasonable, though availability of grant from HC not confirmed. SR: Intermediate split acceptable at 69%: 31%
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	Studios: 3; 1 Bedrooms 133; 2 Bedrooms 88; 3 Bedrooms 68; 4 Bedrooms 35. 41% total as 3B+ Mix considered acceptable. Proportion of larger units welcomed.
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Compliance
External playspace	3D.13	Child occupation estimate confirmed (L B Hackney methodology generates 345 children compared with GLA methodology which estimates 142). Details of playspace and s106 contribution to parks, so proposal acceptable.
Design policies	4B.1/3	Design satisfactory
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No references in reports
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Parking provision policy compliant (so request for reduction not pursued). £135,000 contribution to bus network and further contributions to bus stop upgrade , walking and cycling improvements and design framework for neighbourhood.
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Additional information requested provided.
Planning conditions		Conditions agreed re energy centre
s106 agreement		Transport contributions as above totalling £270,000
Other Issues		Significant local objections to scheme

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Density above range but acceptable given context 34% AH proposed but dependent on HC grant but no evidence that grant is available.
Air Quality	Acceptable
Children's Playspace	Query of high applicant assessment of child population. More detail of playspace location required. Contribution to park improvements should be discussed with L B Hackney.
Urban Design	Security of residential entrances
Inclusive Design	Acceptable
Climate change mitigation/adaption	Space requirements for energy centre need specified, with further information on type of system. Details of rainwater harvesting system.
Transport	Trip generation figures and transport plans required. S106 contribution to bus route upgrade to be agreed with TfL TfL sought reduction in parking provision

Other issues	Recommended flexibility for B1 uses to allow for research and development (B1b) and light industrial (B1c) Delete proposal for lighting over water as it disturbs bats
--------------	---

Process

Financial viability	Financial Appraisal (Three Dragons) submitted though no copy on file.
Documentation	L B Hackney planning report Planning Statement by DP9 Plans
Mixed Use requirement	Net loss of employment land of 998 sq m.
Employment generation/loss	However development will generate 318 additional jobs with change of use of employment space to offices. Hackney as limited transfer borough – 5-8 hectares of employment land could be lost by 2016.
Climate change mitigation and adaption	Requested information provided
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Mayor's Industrial Capacity SPG Bat conservation trust guidelines
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	April 2008 + site visit by PDU case officer

Overall Comments

Scheme supported as providing 34% AH as maximum reasonable affordable housing, though delivery uncertain as grant dependent. Scheme density over PTAL 4-6 density range, though site PTAL only 4. No assessment of capacity of local social infrastructure. Loss of employment land agreed on basis of estimate of employment generation, though some uncertainty as whether this would be achieved.

SCHEME NAME **21 BARLOW WAY, RAINHAM**

GLA REFERENCE PDU/2391/02

LA Havering (London Thames Gateway DC)

Planning Application type: Full

Referral Category: 2B

STAGE 2 Date 18 March 2009

Decision LPA (LTGDC) to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 4 March 2009

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Change of use to a clinical waste treatment facility.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Waste treatment facility

Existing land use: Vacant

Applicant: Medical Waste Solutions Ltd

Architect: N/A

Agent : N/A

Site Area: Not stated

PTAL : Not stated

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Land use policy compliant
Density policy compliance	3A.3	N/A
AH proportions	3A.9/10	N/A
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	N/A
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	N/A
External playspace	3D.13	N/A
Design policies	4B.1/3	N/A
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including education and health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	N/A
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Requirements secured by conditions. S106 contribution to bus stop not pursued
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Requirements to be imposed by conditions
Planning conditions		Conditions to secure transport requirements and renewable energy

s106 agreement		Not pursued
Other Issues: Waste Policy	4A.27	Policy compliant

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	N/A
Air Quality/ Flood Risk	Concern as to potential air quality impacts and effluent discharge
Children's Playspace	N/A
Urban Design	N/A
Inclusive Design	N/A
Climate change mitigation/ Energy	Scheme needs to demonstrate ways of reducing carbon emissions
Transport	Further information including travel plan requested

Process

Financial viability	N/A
Documentation	LTGDC planning reports, site plans and responses to queries
Mixed Use requirement	N/A
Employment generation/loss	Information neither provided or sought
Climate change mitigation/energy	Some requested information not provided so requirements imposed through planning conditions
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Municipal Waste Management Strategy; Draft Water Strategy
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded

Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded
--	---------------

Overall Comments

Waste treatment facility on vacant land supported as contributing to meeting London's 85% self sufficiency target.

SCHEME NAME 142-170 STREATHAM HILL

GLA REFERENCE PDU/1663a/02

LA Lambeth

Planning Application type : Full
Referral Category: 1A, 1B

STAGE 2 Date : 22 December 2009

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s): 14 January 2009

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Demolition of the existing buildings (except for Megabowl facade) and redevelopment to provide a mixed-use scheme in a building ranging in height from 2 to 9-storeys comprising 2970 sq.m. ground floor retail space, 191 sq.m. community floor space, 839 sq.m. theatre/leisure use together with 286 flats.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Retail, leisure and residential

Existing land use: Leisure (including vacant bowling alley)

Applicant: Glentoran
Architect: Lifshutz Davidson Sandilands
Agent: Montagu Evans

Site Area: 1A., 1B
PTAL : 6

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Mixed use proposals including retail supported
Density policy compliance	3A.3	832 hrph (range of 650-1100)
AH proportions	3A.9/10	20% Affordable housing (with 60:40 social rent: intermediate ratio. Financial viability assessment accepted as justifying under-provision.
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	14% affordable to be 3B+; 23% of social rent to be 3B+. 0% of intermediate homes to be 3B+. More family homes sought but not secured
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	10% units to be wheelchair accessible. Policy compliant.
External playspace	3D.13	651 sq m (increased from 80 sq m at stage 1) Policy compliant
Design policies	4B.1/3	Amendments to design welcomed as acceptable compromise

Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	Satisfied that demolished community facility is to be provided
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Majority of concerns resolved. Contribution to station improvements to be secured.
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Requirements to be met through conditions
Planning conditions		Conditions required re heating network and photovoltaic panels
s106 agreement		TfL requested £160,000 contribution to Streatham Hill station (rather than bus improvements). £30,000 for bus stop improvements not secured
Other Issues		Significant number of local objections to both bulk and content of development proposal, with counter-petition supporting development proposal.

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Insufficient family housing proposed. Financial appraisal to be subject to independent verification
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	Will require assessment once housing mix confirmed
Urban Design	Layout and configuration requires changes. Family housing should have direct access to communal area
Inclusive Design	Confirmation of compliance and design details required
Climate change mitigation/ Energy	Detailed modelling required. Further information required on mitigating overheating
Transport	Further information on transport impacts and commitments needed. Significant contributions to public transport required
Other	Initiatives to create training and employment opportunities for local people required.

Process

Financial viability	Submitted but only summary sheet on file . FV appraisal accepted by Lambeth as justifying 20% affordable housing. No record of any independent assessment by GLA.
Documentation	Scheme drawings

	Planning statement update
Mixed Use requirement	Proposals supported (despite loss of leisure provision)
Employment generation/loss	No assessment in reports.
Climate change mitigation/ energy	Sustainability report provided. However further information required re biomass boiler
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Standard references
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded

Case History: Previous application considered by former Mayor on 2 April 2008. Principle of redevelopment supported but range of detailed comments made. Application was subsequently withdrawn by applicant. The new application was refused by L B Lambeth on the grounds of overdevelopment and loss of amenity for neighbouring residential occupiers.

Overall Comments

While the Mayor supported principle of development, at Stage 2 he was aware that L B Lambeth was intending to refuse consent. This may have been the basis of his decision not to pursue some outstanding concerns. His intervention had appeared to have secured improvements to design of scheme and a significant contribution to public transport improvements. The under-provision of social rented homes and family homes seems to have been accepted on the basis of the borough's financial viability assessment without the GLA itself undertaking or commissioning its own assessment. Here appears to have been no assessment of density policy compliance despite significant local concerns as to development impact. The Mayor considered taking over the application but seems to have taken the view that this was a local matter and that he was not prepared to intervene to support the development proposal, despite the fact that he did not support the local planning authority's

SCHEME NAME 206-214 HIGH STREET, STRATFORD

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 2078a

LA Newham (LTGDC)

Planning Application type: Full
Referral Category: 1C

STAGE 2 Date 12 March 2010

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 26 December 2009 , 5 November 2008

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Redevelopment of site for commercial and office uses (A1, A2, A3, A4, B1) and gymnasium use (D2) total 1,596 sq.m. provision of 147 residential units in 26 storey building with basement car park.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use : Offices and residential

Existing land use: : Operational petrol station

Applicant: Newling UK Ltd

Architect: Levitt Bernstein

Agent:

Site Area: 0.127 hectares

PTAL: 6

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Uses suitable to location
Density policy compliance	3A.3	Density is 1031 dph/ 2701 hrh (compared to LP range of 215-450 dph/ 625-1100 hrph).
AH proportions	3A.9/10	Proposal revised to 16/131 units intermediate with no social rent provision. Applicant offer of £2.1m contribution to affordable housing off-site increased to £3.1m, with overage agreement. Contributions to be used to support regeneration of Carpenters estate and to provide affordable family homes. This was supported by L B Newham. The report does not however give any details of the location, tenure and bedroom size mix of off site provision.
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	While on site mix not policy compliant, Mayor was satisfied by off site
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	100% lifetime homes (but no provision of wheelchair homes)
External playspace	3D.13	Provision through second floor roof garden
Design policies	4B.1/3	Overall design supported as improvement on previous proposal (Architects had changed)
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	Proposed community use within site welcomed. No assessment of impact of scheme on local infrastructure (Scheme below 500 unit threshold)
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Transport contributions agreed
Renewable Energy/ Climate Change	4A.7	Policy compliant
Planning conditions		No consideration
s106 agreement		Affordable housing and transport contributions required. S106 to secure delivery of estate regeneration on Carpenters Estate
Other Issues		

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	45/131 units affordable. (34%).Tenure not specified. Clarification required. BR mix – only 5% 3B units. Proportion of 3B+ units should be increased.
---------	--

	<p>Density is 1031 dph/ 2701 hrh (compared to LP range of 215-450 dph/ 625-1100 hrph).</p> <p>Draft stage 1 report amended from ‘ This high density represents an overdevelopment of the site’ to ‘ This high density could be acceptable subject to the scheme being able to provide adequate amenity space and a good mix of unit sizes and high quality design’.</p> <p>Financial appraisal does not justify proposal which included off site provision.</p>
Air Quality	Not raised
Children’s Playspace	Inadequate provision of playspace
Urban Design	Significant concerns on scheme design massing and access to balconies.
Inclusive Design	Information required on lifetime homes and wheelchair homes provision
Climate change mitigation/energy	Need for sustainable drainage provision. Need for sustainability statement and further information on heating systems.
Transport	Car parking and cycle parking provision acceptable

Process

Financial viability	Toolkit apparently submitted before second report but no assessment on file
Documentation	Planning statement with drawings Newham Design Review panel presentation
Mixed Use requirement	No issues raised
Employment generation/loss	No assessment
Climate change mitigation	No supporting documents on file
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Standard documents + Stratford and Lower Lea Valley Area Action Plan Lower Lea Valley Area Framework
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded

Overall Comments

The Mayor was prepared to approve this very high density scheme once the scheme design and affordable housing offer (primarily off site contribution) were improved. The reports do not however give details of the output to be generated by the contribution in terms of scheme location, tenure, bedroom size mix and timescale of delivery, although this was to be secured by a s106 agreement. This is not in accordance with London Plan policy 3A.10 and the guidance given in the Housing SPG.

SCHEME NAME ARUNDEL GREAT COURT

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 2172/02

LA Westminster

Planning Application type: Full + Conservation Area application for Demolition of buildings

Referral Category: Cat 1A, 1B1b, 1B1c

STAGE 2 Date 4 March 2009

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 12 November 2008

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Full planning permission is sought for the erection of new office, new hotel (including gym and swimming pool), 151 market residential units and a mix of shops, cafe, restaurant, retail, drinking establishment, and financial and professional services. The proposal includes an off-site contribution to affordable housing that has been substantially delivered as part of a previous planning permission at Wilton Plaza. The proposal will also include improvements to the surrounding pedestrian environment and a new public open space.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Office, hotel and residential

Existing land use: Offices, hotel and retail (part vacant)

Applicant: Land Securites

Architect : Wilkinson Eyre/ Horden Cherry Lee

Agent : Gerald Eve

Site Area : Not stated

PTAL : 6

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Principle of development supported
Density policy compliance	3A.3	Density proposed at 275 units per hectare; 889 habitable rooms per hectare. Acceptable as within 650-1100 applicable range.
AH proportions	3A.9/10	No affordable housing on site. Off site affordable housing proposed at Wilton Plaza is 14 units (ie 9% of on site total). Application of Westminster CC policy requires 43% AH. Applicant increased off site offer from 14 to 43 units. Mayor however remained unconvinced of justification for off site Offer and would require further assessment should scheme be considered at appeal or revised application submitted.

Bedroom size mix	3A.5	Reasonable mix of units including some 4 bedroom units. Details of mix however not included in report.
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Proposals remain unsatisfactory.
External playspace	3D.13	Proposal remains unsatisfactory despite applicant offer of contribution to off site provision.
Design policies	4B.1/3	No substantive concerns. Minor issues to be left to Westminster CC to
Strategic views	4B.16	Not raised in reports , though Westminster CC had originally raised effect on setting of St Paul's as grounds for objection, though this was withdrawn
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	Not raised in reports
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Outstanding issues resolved. Travel Plan to be secured through s106.
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Further clarification required re retail and swimming pool not be included in proposed heat network.
Planning conditions		No additional conditions sought
s106 agreement		To secure travel plan
Other Issues		

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	No affordable housing on site. Off site affordable housing proposed at Wilton Plaza is 14 units (ie 10% of on site total). Financial appraisal required to justify offer
Air Quality	No issues raised
Children's Playspace	Required provision not met. Only 200 sq m relative to 340 sq m requirement.
Urban Design	Minor issues raised
Inclusive Design	Proposal is not fully accessible. 10% of hotel bedrooms should be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable
Climate change mitigation/energy	Further information required on renewables strategy and Combined heat and power maximisation.
Transport	Revised trip generation assessment, reduce level of car parking, visitor cycle parking, bus stop upgrading, possible contribution to bus lane , travel plans and s106 contributions (including to Crossrail)

Process

Financial viability	Viability report by GV Grimley for City of Westminster concludes that scheme with off site 43 affordable units at Wilton Place (revised applicant offer) not viable. On site provision of 5 AH units maximum viable, so off site provision preferable.
Documentation	Viability report by G V Grimley City of Westminster planning report Appeal decision report November 2009
Mixed Use requirement	New C1 (serviced apartments) 25,050 sq m and C3 (residential) 2,186 sq m Small reduction in B1 use (office) from 55,491 to 54,253 sq m Small increase in C1 use (hotel) from 11,461 to 11,967 sq m Small increase in A1 use (retail) from 1,644 to 2,993 sq m Overall increase in floorspace from 65,596 sq m to 96,449 sq m
Employment generation/loss	No consideration of issue.
Climate change mitigation	No additional analysis required
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Standard references
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	6 November 2008 3 June 2009

Note: City of Westminster refused application, which went to appeal. The Mayor on 4 March 2008⁹ considered taking over application but decided that there were no sound planning reasons to do so. The appeal was allowed and consent for demolition and redevelopment granted. Westminster CC refusal was on design grounds, so the viability and off site provision issue was not considered at appeal.

Overall Comments

While Mayor supported general principle of development of site and was content with design, despite the fact that there outstanding concerns on affordable housing provision, energy, children's playspace and transport, the Mayor decided to leave to LA to determine, in the knowledge that Westminster CC were refusing the application. The Mayor however decided not to intervene on behalf of the applicant or take over the application. The case also demonstrated that while the previous Mayor had agreed to the principle of up front off site affordable housing credits, there remained concerns about the application of the principle in practice and the methodology of calculating the credit value.

SCHEME NAME **ATHLONE HOUSE**

GLA REFERENCE PDU/0861b/01

LA Camden

Planning Application type: Full + conservation area consent
Referral Category: 3D

STAGE 2 Date 30 November 2010

Decision : Scheme does not comply with London Plan

STAGE 1 Date(s) Not referred by LA

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Demolition of Athlone House and erection of a substantial single family dwelling with ancillary staff and guest accommodation.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Single residential dwelling

Existing land use: Residential dwellings (to be demolished)

Applicant: Athlone House Ltd

Architect: Robert Adam

Agent

Site Area: Not stated

PTAL : Not stated

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Previously developed site within Metropolitan Open Land. Conservation Area. Site of metropolitan importance for nature conservation. Inappropriate development in MOL due to scale. Proposal extends existing footprint by factor of 2.5
Density policy compliance	3A.3	Not considered (scheme as single unit)
AH proportions	3A.9/10	No affordable housing provided and no viability appraisal provided. Applicant claim that requirements met by consented scheme not accepted by L B Camden due to increase in floorspace proposed
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	Not considered
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Not considered
External playspace	3D.13	Not considered
Design policies	4B.1/3	Objection to overall mass of development
Strategic views	4B.16	Concern at visibility of proposal
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	Not considered
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	No concerns
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Carbon savings from renewable energy provision not specified
Planning conditions		

		Need for condition relating to management of grassland
s106 agreement		N/A
Other Issues	Heritage: 4B1,4B11,4B	Loss of building which makes a contribution to Highgate Conservation area
	Conservation 3D.14	Need for condition relating to management of grassland
	Climate 4A.11	No provision for green roofs

Issues raised at stage 1: N/A as Mayor not consulted before L B Camden made a planning decision

Housing	
Air Quality	
Children's Playspace	
Urban Design	
Inclusive Design	
Climate change mitigation	
Transport	

Process

Financial viability	Not provided
Documentation	L B Camden planning report Design and access statement Scheme drawings Responses to consultation
Mixed Use requirement	N/A
Employment generation/loss	N/A
Climate change mitigation/ Energy	Energy strategy submitted

Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Athlone House planning brief (L B Camden) Draft site allocations (L B Camden) Planning Policy Guidance 2 Draft Replacement London Plan (October 2009)
Pre-apply presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded

Case History: Previous application granted in 2005 with previous Mayor deciding to leave application to LA to determine. L B Camden refused 2010 planning application

Overall Comments

Mayor not consulted by L B Camden before making a decision. Application was variation on consented scheme, to which the Mayor had not objected. Mayor in effect endorsed L B Camden to refuse revised application on grounds of inappropriate development within MOL, harm to Conservation area, failure to supply affordable housing and lack of agreement to meet level 3 Code for Sustainable Homes.

SCHEME NAME FORMER GOODS YARD (QUEENS RIDE BARNES)

GLA REFERENCE PDU/2095A/02 LA Richmond

Planning Application type: Full
Referral Category: 3D

STAGE 2 Date 21 April 2009 Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 27 January 2009

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Creation of new public open space and residential development (14 flats), provision of new access road and new pedestrian routes, together with associated enabling works and the provision of parking, servicing and plant areas.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential

Existing land use: Goods Yard/ storage depot. Also used as carpark and travellers site

Applicant: Fulcher Consultants Ltd
Architect: DGA Architects
Agent

Site Area: 1.1 hectares
PTAL: 3

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Site is Metropolitan Open Land. However 2005 UDP and 2006 site brief established principle of enabling development. Residential development Supported as enabling decontamination of site and return of 75% of site to public use.
Density policy compliance	3A.3	Density only 13 units per hectare and below LP range (40-80)but acceptable as minimum enabling development in MOL
AH proportions	3A.9/10	No affordable housing provided. Acceptable given enabling nature of development.
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	71% (10 of 14) units are 3B units. Acceptable
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Compliance to be secured by condition
External playspace	3D.13	Compliant
Design policies	4B.1/3	Acceptable
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including education and health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No references in report
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Compliant. Cycle parking to be provided
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Further information provided on on-site renewables.
Planning conditions		No specific references
s106 agreement		No references in report
Other Issues		Local objections relating to development on MOL, but no objections from or Natural England

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Variation from policy acceptable as enabling development
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	Satisfactory
Urban Design	No issues
Inclusive Design	No issues
Climate change mitigation	Further information on communal heating systems and renewable energy
Transport	Improved cycle parking required

Other	Independent assessment of development to justify scheme as enabling development
-------	---

Process

Financial viability	Appraisal supplied to demonstrate this is minimum development to enable return of majority of site to public use but appraisal not on file
Documentation	L B Richmond planning report and responses to consultation Draft planning obligations schedule
Mixed Use requirement	N/A
Employment generation/loss	No reference in report
Climate change mitigation	Required information provided
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Standard references only
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded

Case History: 1987 residential development proposal rejected at appeal given impact on MOL.
2000 proposal for health and swimming club rejected at appeal.
2008 Residential development refused by L B Richmond as overdevelopment

Overall Comments

Proposal is minimum enabling development to fund decontamination of site and return of majority of site within Metropolitan Open Land to public use.
Consequently normal requirement for affordable housing dropped and low density scheme allowed.

SCHEME NAME BATTERSEA POWER STATION

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 1732 LA Wandsworth

Planning Application type: Outline and Listed building consent
Referral Category: 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 2C, 3E, 3F, 3H

STAGE 2 Date 22 December 2010 Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 27 January 2010

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Repair, restoration, extension and conversion of the former Power Station to provide residential, retail, business, culture, event and conference, with associated plant, servicing and storage. Development of land surrounding the power station to

provide retail, business, hotel, serviced apartments, residential, community and culture, assembly and leisure, construction of basement to provide servicing, parking, energy centre, plant and storage. Landscaping and open space, alterations to existing and creation of new pedestrian and vehicular access routes, parking and enabling works.

Listed building consent is sought for:

Repair, restoration, extension and conversion of the grade II* listed Battersea Power Station.

Repair, restoration, extension and conversion of the grade II listed riverside structures.

Demolition of the grade II listed Battersea water pumping station.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential, retail, commercial, hotel, leisure, cultural uses

Existing land use: Derelict power station and associated land

Applicant: REO (Powerstation) Ltd

Architect: Rafael Vinoly

Agent: DP9

Site Area: 21 hectares

PTAL : 2 (northern part) to 4 (southwestern tip)

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Site within Vauxhall Nine Elms Battersea Opportunity Area and Central Activities Zone. Principle of restoration of power station and mixed use development supported. OAP identifies site as ' a growth pole for delivery of high density residential and commercial development including retail and office uses.
Density policy compliance	3A.3	No density assessment in reports
AH proportions	3A.9/10	517 units (15% of total of 3,856 units) with 60% social rent: 40%
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	Overall mix: 12% studios; 16% 1Bs, 44% 2Bs, 18% 3Bs, 4% 4Bs, 4% penthouses SR Mix: 15% 1Bs, 45% 2Bs, 30% 3Bs, 8% 4Bs, 2% 5Bs. (40% 3B+) Intermediate mix: 35% 1Bs, 45% 2Bs, 17% 3Bs, 3% 4Bs (20% 3B+) Mix considered acceptable
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	To be secured by condition. Other access issues need to be scrutinised as detailed design proceeds
External playspace	3D.13	Policy compliant
Design policies	4B.1/3	Policy compliant. Issues raised at stage 1 resolved.
Strategic views	4B.16	Height of buildings range from 45m to 60m though number of stories not specified. , assumed to be 15-20. No concerns as to any negative impact on protected views or on setting of Battersea Power Station.
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	Assessment undertaken but no reference in stage 2 report to assessment being reviewed to reflect final mix and affordable housing proportions.
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Satisfied by transport mitigation contributions
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Policy compliant. Information requested provided. Measures to be secured

Planning conditions		Range of conditions to secure transport and climate change mitigation measures
s106 agreement		£203m to Northern Line Extension £6.8m to other public transport improvements £1.8m to community and local employment purposes (above payments to Council on behalf of Nine Elms Strategy Board) £1.4m to TfL for bus service improvements £267,000 to TfL for cycle hire Agreement on phasing of payments
Other Issues	Hazardous Installations 3A.34	Positive aspects of the scheme ‘ outweigh the risk of a hazardous event likely consequences’
	Retail 3D.1, 3D.2	Updated retail assessment submitted and independently reviewed. Mayor rse impacts on other centres. Proposals supported.
	Offices 5G.2	Supported. Scheme has potential to deliver a major strategic addition to London’s modern office stock and strengthen London’s global competitiveness
	Blue ribbon network 4C.7, 4C.10, 4C.11	Provision of new pier and access to riverside welcomed Water based recreational uses not pursued.
	Safeguard ed Wharves 4C.9	Mitigation measures offer sufficient safeguards.
	Air quality 4A.19	Further assessment provided. Impacts considered acceptable.

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	3,856 units proposed., with additional 118 assisted living units. No affordable housing provision specified so not policy compliant. Viability assessment not yet submitted.
Air Quality	Clarifications required
Children’s Playspace	Does not demonstrate adequate provision
Urban Design	Generally compliant , but further detail required
Inclusive Design	Further details required
Climate change mitigation	Insufficient information on energy strategy Flood risk assessment satisfactory
Transport	Car parking provision excessive. Transport assessment not sufficiently robust
Retail	Further work on retail assessment necessary
Social Infrastructure	Assessment of impact on social infrastructure undertaken, but reassessment may be needed depending on level of affordable housing and mix of units
Blue Ribbon	Potential for water recreation should be considered

policies	
Hazardous installations	Advice of Health and Safety Executive awaited
Safeguarded Wharves	Relationship to adjacent wharves needs to be reviewed

Process

Financial viability	Cash flow based financial viability assessment submitted. Accepted as basis for AH proportions. L B Wandsworth preferred fixed proportion to review mechanism. This was accepted by Mayor.
Documentation	Briefing for Mayor's meeting with Treasury Holdings Briefing for deputy mayor's site visit Notes of pre-application meetings DP(Scoping report Briefing for Mayoral presentation L B Wandsworth planning report Draft s106 Agreement Mayoral press statement (28 January 2010) TfL note Sustainability Statement Ecodome Analysis Energy Strategy (Design and access statement submitted but not seen) (Air quality assessment submitted but not seen) (Social Infrastructure assessment undertaken but not seen)
Mixed Use requirement	Mix of uses regarded as satisfactory
Employment generation/loss	No assessment of job generation in reports
Climate change mitigation	Specialist reports submitted as requested
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Draft Replacement London Plan Vauxhall Nine Ems Battersea Opportunity Area Framework (consultation draft November 2009)
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	Mayoral meeting with Treasury Holdings 19 June 2008 Deputy Mayor site visit 3 September 2008 Presentation to Mayor 27 May 2009
Pre-application meetings with	1 April 2009, 30 April 2009

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Site within Green Belt. However this is a previously developed site. Proposal is acceptable as footprint reduces from 1.32 hectares to approx 1 hectare.
Density policy compliance	3A.3	No density assessment (despite low PTAL of 0-1)
AH proportions	3A.9/10	Residential development is 'enabling development' for a Battle of Britain museum. Museum cost at £10m. No affordable housing proposed on site. Original offer of £2m for off site AH reduced to £1m to contribute to provision of 20 affordable homes (14 social rent and 6 intermediate), supported by £2.73m social housing grant . All social rented units would be 3B+. Revised FV assessment accepted by LB Harrow as justification in terms of 'maximum reasonable AH requirement'.
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	All private units. 70/103 units are 3B+ (68%). This is welcomed.
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Not considered in reports
External playspace	3D.13	375 sq m secure play area to be provided relative to 770 sq m requirement. 17,000 sq m north lawn for more informal recreation.
Design policies	4B.1/3	Concerns outstanding re pedestrian connectivity but not grounds for refusal
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No assessment for this isolated site (Development is however below 3A.7 500 unit threshold)
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Car parking provision high but acceptable given large units (and assumption that some families will have more than 2 cars).
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Requirements to be satisfied through conditions.
Planning conditions		Condition re bat mitigation strategy. Condition re cycle parking
s106 agreement		£3.2m endowment contribution to museum £200,000 education contribution £200,000 highway works £200,000 to community facilities (ecology centre and health) £1m off site affordable housing
Other Issues	4B.13	Provision of museum complies with LP policy on London's Built Heritage Flood mitigation. Environment agent to withdraw objection subject to condition re surface water control measures.

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	No AH so non-compliant. On or off site provision to be considered with robust case for non compliance
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	Further information required
Urban Design	Broadly compliant. Site access and block typologies require further attention

Inclusive Design	Lifetime Homes/ Wheelchair homes policy not raised. No information in report.
Climate change mitigation/energy	Strategy broadly in line with LP requirements but feasibility of CHP needs to be considered
Transport	Car parking provision to be reduced. Cycle parking for museum required.
Other	Biodiversity: Further detail required on bat mitigation strategy

Process

Financial viability	Appraisal on file. Applicant withdrew original offer on £2.079m for off site provision on basis of financial appraisal and exceptional costs of restoring Mansion House as museum . Land acquisition cost of £14m to fund works at RAF Northolt.
Documentation	Harrow planning report Design and access Statement Three Dragons toolkit appraisal Applicant's Information Pack for pre-application meeting with L B Harrow (Planning submission with designs) Surface water flood risk assessment
Mixed Use requirement	No issues raised
Employment generation/loss	No assessment
Climate change mitigation	No specialist reports (other than surface water flood risk report provided in response to Environment Agency's objection).
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	L B Harrow Bentley Priory SPD (though no copy on file)
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	11 March 2007

Overall Comments

The project was supported as an enabling development to provide a museum. Mayor's intervention ensured £1m contribution to off site affordable housing. Mayor waived normal standards on car parking provision, reflecting fact that

occupants of large private homes would have high number of cars. The land acquisition cost however seems to relate to the Ministry of Defence's wish for receipt to support works at RAF Northolt rather than any site valuation of the development site (the value of which was derived from the planning consent for residential development).

SCHEME NAME BERMONDSEY SPA SITE C5. GRANGE WALK

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 0933a

LA Southwark

Planning Application type: Full

Referral Category: 1A

STAGE 2 Date 12 January 2011

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 15 December 2010

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Full planning permission for demolition of existing buildings and erection of four buildings ranging in height from four to seven storeys to contain 205 residential units, together with flexible commercial floor space, new roads, parking and associated landscaping.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential with commercial

Existing land use: Two residential blocks with commercial

Applicant: Notting Hill Housing Trust

Architect: PCKO

Agent: DP9

Site Area: Not stated

PTAL: 3

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Principle of estate renewal supported
Density policy compliance	3A.3	Proposal 700 hrh (compared with LP range of 300-600). Acceptable
AH proportions	3A.9/10	54 units to be demolished (social rent and leasehold) New provision: 44 SR (21%); 24 Intermediate (12%), 137 Market (67%) No loss of AH so acceptable in terms of LP policy 35% AH acceptable to L B Southwark
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	Market: 9 studios, 29 1Bs, 78 2Bs, 15 3Bs, 6 4Bs SR : 8 1Bs, 21 2Bs, 9 3Bs, 6 4Bs Int: 14 1Bs, 8 2Bs, 2 3Bs Overall 4% studios, 25% 1Bs, 52% 2Bs, 13% 3Bs, 6% 4Bs. Mix acceptable given 3B+ social rented units
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	10% wheelchair provision to be secured by condition
External playspace	3D.13	Satisfactory
Design policies	4B.1/3	Scheme design satisfactory

Strategic views	4B.16	Site within Parliament Hill- St Paul's cathedral viewing corridor but height well below negative impact threshold
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No assessment – scheme below policy 3A.7 500 unit threshold
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Satisfactory. Impact on bus services minimal so no s106 contribution
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Satisfactory
Planning conditions		Condition re wheelchair provision
s106 agreement		£256,250 to cycle and pedestrian facilities
Other Issues		

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Need to demonstrate housing mix reflects housing needs and that scheme provides maximum reasonable affordable housing
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	Further details required to demonstrate provision is satisfactory
Urban Design	Concerns re north-south links through the site, the viability of commercial space with respect to public realm, and the choice of materials.
Inclusive Design	Detailed plans required
Climate change mitigation	Estimate of carbon emissions required
Transport	Contributions towards pedestrian upgrades and details of the directional split of bus trips generated. Details of staff and visitor parking requires clarification.

Process

Financial viability	Not submitted
Documentation	Note of pre-application meeting Energy statement Part L (Building Regs) submission Design and access statement Transport assessment Site layout plans TRAVL trip analysis Servicing and Delivery management plan Statement of consultation

	Planning Statement Noise Strategy Wind microclimate assessment Landscape statement Flood risk assessment Interim residential travel plan Daylight and sunlight report Archaeological assessment Air Quality assessment Arboricultural assessment
Mixed Use requirement	No issues
Employment generation/loss	No assessment
Climate change mitigation	Information requested provided. Energy and Part L statements.
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Draft Replacement London Plan
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	7 September 2010

NOTE. SELECTED DOCUMENTS ONLY. FULL FILE NOT PROVIDED

Overall Comments

Mayor approved once satisfied that there was no loss of affordable housing and that mix met housing needs. The Mayor therefore did not require applicant to provide a viability assessment to demonstrate maximum reasonable affordable housing was delivered. Mayor secured assurances on energy and transport components.

SCHEME NAME BRITANNIA MUSIC SITE, ILFORD

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 0881/02 LA Redbridge

Planning Application type: Full
 Referral Category: 1A, 1B, 1C

STAGE 2 Date 18 November 2009 Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 18 March 2009

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Planning permission is sought for development to provide 332 flats; Class B1 floor space; Class A1, A2, and A3

floor space; and live/work accommodation in three blocks, including a 23-storey tower.
--

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential, retail and offices

Existing land use: Office and warehouse

Applicant: Durkan estates
 Architect: John Thompson and partners
 Agent

Site Area: 0.66 hectare

PTAL: 6

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Principle of mixed use building including high rise building within Ilford Opportunity area supported.
Density policy compliance	3A.3	Height reduced from 25 to 23 stories. Density reduced from 524 to 503 dph (London Plan range is 215-405). This was considered acceptable given design improvements and mitigation.
AH proportions	3A.9/10	30.6 % - 98/332 units. This was acceptable.
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	75 1B units (22%); 238 2B (69%), 33 3B (9%). Accepted on basis that town centre site better suited to smaller units.
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Policy compliant
External playspace	3D.13	Additional play area of 130 sq m proposed.
Design policies	4B.1/3	Some improvements
Strategic views	4B.16	No protected views. Height is 3 storeys above Ilford Area Action Plan guideline but acceptable.
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No consideration despite scheme being high density (Note scheme is however below policy 3A.7 500 unit threshold)
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Cycle parking sufficient. Disappointment that car parking provision not reduced. Crossrail contribution not to be pursued as SPG not published prior to stage 1 consultation. Contribution of £750,000 for gyratory works Proposals acceptable.
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Photovoltaics still sought
Planning conditions		Conditions re biomass boilers being conditional on air quality assessment.
s106 agreement		Transport contribution
Other Issues	Air Quality	Applicant proposal for whole house ventilation acceptable
	Noise	Acceptance that noise could not be mitigated without compromising

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	No affordable housing proposed. Reference made to a financial viability appraisal. This should be subject to independent assessment. Availability of grant needs to be considered
Air Quality	Concern as to air quality for residents of lower floors
Children's Playspace	Inadequate playspace provision
Urban Design	Density twice the appropriate range in London Plan . However design including high rise component, generally supported. Landscaping/ public realm improvements required.
Inclusive Design	No information of lifetime homes or wheelchair homes provision
Climate change mitigation/ energy	Further information required on climate change mitigation and renewable energy
Transport	Further information required on transport impacts

Process

Financial viability	Referred to in reports. However, neither the applicant's appraisal or any independent assessment is on file.
Documentation	Scheme drawings
Mixed Use requirement	No issues raised
Employment generation/loss	No assessment in reports
Climate change mitigation	Alternative options for climate change mitigation discussed, though no specialist reports on file.
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Standard references
Pre-applc presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	Nine recorded

Overall Comments

The Mayor accepted this proposal for a high rise residential led development in Ilford Town Centre despite significant issues of non compliance with London Plan policies on density, bedroom size mix and affordable housing provision. The financial appraisal was accepted as grounds for non compliance on affordable housing proportion despite the fact that there is no evidence of the GLA carrying out a validation exercise or pursuing the potential availability of grant. Some improvements in relation to transport impacts and climate change mitigation and design were achieved as a result of Mayoral intervention, but not all issues were resolved satisfactorily. The Mayor did not pursue the request for a contribution to Crossrail (as had no legal basis to do so), but obtained a significant financial contribution to transport improvements.

SCHEME NAME CASPIAN WORKS

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 1982/02

LA Tower Hamlets

Planning Application type; Full
Referral Category: 1C

STAGE 2 Date 14 May 2008

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 12 December 2007

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Redevelopment to provide three buildings between four and eleven storeys for 142 dwellings, 101 sq.m. shops and restaurant space and 386 sq.m. office floorspace.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential with shops and offices

Existing land use: Light industrial

Applicant: Berkeley Homes

Architect: KKM Architects

Agent : Barton Willmore

Site Area: 0.49 hectares

PTAL : Ranges from 2 to 4

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Site within Lower Lea Valley Opportunity area planning framework.
Density policy compliance	3A.3	302 dph/ 894 hrph . (Ranges are 110-340 dph/ 325-875 hrh) Acceptable
AH proportions	3A.9/10	35 units SR; 12 units shared ownership; 95 market unit 33% AH (units) 37% AH (hab rooms):
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	Increase in 3B social rented units from 34% to 48% welcomed.

Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	No reference in reports
External playspace	3D.13	Increase in playspace by 50 sq m welcomed
Design policies	4B.1/3	Relocation of bin store and cycle store welcomed, together with other minor revisions..
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No references in report (scheme under 150 units so policy 3A.7 does not apply)
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Parking spaces reduced from 31 to 20. Contributions to various transport measures acceptable. Scheme policy compliant
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Conditions applied to achieve 10% renewable energy and optimisation of CHP. Applicant committed to 16% reduction in carbon emissions
Planning conditions		Conditions re renewable energy and transport
s106 agreement		£20,000 to Docklands Arrival Information System £16,386 to bus services
Other Issues		Employment and Training strategy to be submitted

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Toolkit appraisal required. Higher proportion of affordable 3 and 4 bedroom units sought
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	More open space and childrens playspace at ground level sought. 1,830 sq m provided; 2,670 sq m required
Urban Design	Relocate bin store
Inclusive Design	Not raised
Climate change mitigation/energy	Energy strategy should be linked to neighbouring schemes.
Transport	No substantial concerns. Minor issues raised,

Process

Financial viability	It is unclear whether submitted appraisal was subject to an independent
---------------------	---

	assessment as there is no reference to financial viability in the report, though this would have been material to decision not to object to a scheme which was not compliant with 50% affordable housing target. Appraisal assumes no Housing corporation grant and there appears to have been no consideration of whether grant might be available and increase affordable housing output of the scheme.
Documentation	Design and access statement Tower Hamlets planning report Full Three Dragons financial appraisal
Mixed Use requirement	Non resi floorspace only represents 3.6% of total floorspace.
Employment generation/loss	Increase from 22 jobs to estimated 35 jobs.
Climate change mitigation	Points of clarification only
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Lower Lea OA Planning Framework Further Alterations to London Plan (Panel report now published) Note Tower Hamlets core strategy and Leaside Area Action Plan submitted but subsequently withdrawn
Pre-applc presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded

Overall Comments

No reference in report to financial appraisal for affordable housing at 37% habitable rooms being below 50% London Plan target. The revised bedroom size mix and other minor changes to the scheme appear to have satisfied the Mayor and been the basis of decision to leave the decision to the local authority. The possibility of Housing Corporation grant supporting a higher affordable housing output does not appear to have been pursued.

SCHEME NAME CHISWICK ROUNDABOUT

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 0075f/02

LA Hounslow

Planning Application type: Full

Referral Category: 1C

STAGE 2 Date 15 April 2010

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 22 December 2009

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Erection of a 5-storey 52m high 'landmark building' for office use, incorporating 5 media screens and associated parking. Separate advertisement consent to use the 5 LED screens for adverts.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Offices

Existing land use: Vacant site with advertisement hoardings

Applicant: London and Bath Estates

Architect: Make

Agent

Site Area: 0.232 hectares

PTAL: Not stated

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Proposal acceptable
Density policy compliance	3A.3	N/A
AH proportions	3A.9/10	N/A
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	N/A
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	N/A
External playspace	3D.13	N/A
Design policies	4B.1/3	'The design concepts are well developed into a remarkable and vivacious design.. it is imbued with a character that is organic in form, and goes beyond the norms of architecture, to become a sculptural entity with a dynamic design that vividly reflects the fluid movement of the surrounding traffic' However some revisions to scheme sought to fully comply with policies 4B.1, 4B.3 and 4B.9.
Strategic views	4B.16	Not considered
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	Not considered
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Some improvements to be sought through conditions
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Some issues raised at Stage 1 remained outstanding
Planning conditions		Conditions to be imposed on advertising images to minimise negative impact on road safety
s106 agreement		Not considered. No reference to financial contributions
Other Issues	Economic Development 3B.1;3B.2	Scheme contributes to policy objectives

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	N/A
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	N/A
Urban Design	Design changes requested and improvement to lighting of ground level spaces
Inclusive Design	Disabled parking provision needs to be improved
Climate change mitigation	Further information required on energy efficiency, reduction of carbon emissions, cooling proposals and consideration of Photovoltaics.
Transport	Review of pedestrian and cycling facilities

Process

Financial viability	Not considered
Documentation	Design and access statement Energy statement
Mixed Use requirement	No issues raised
Employment generation/loss	175 jobs to be provided.
Climate change mitigation	
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Draft Replacement London Plan 9 October 2009) Chiswick Town Centre Action Plan (1998)
Pre-application presentation to Mayor	8 February 2010 Briefing to Deputy Mayor planned but withdrawn. This was to discuss the case for the Mayor taking over the scheme from L B Hounslow.
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded

Case History: Previous application for a 13 storey office block was approved in September 2001. Consent for a similar scheme was granted in 2006.

Overall Comments

The Mayor supported the development. Although he was aware the scheme was to be refused by L B Hounslow, he decided that there were no strategic grounds on which he could intervene. The arguments in favour of the scheme seem to focus on the scheme design as a Gateway building. The potential distraction to drivers caused by giant video screens was not regarded as a significant issue. Outstanding issues on energy, design and climate change mitigation would have been pursued had the application gone to appeal or a revised application been submitted. Despite this being one of the grounds for the LPA's decision to refuse consent. Hounslow were also of the view that the building would have a negative impact on the amenities, character and appearance of the area.

SCHEME NAME CITY PRIDE/ ISLAND POINT

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 2187/2188a/02

LA Tower Hamlets

Planning Application type: Full (two sites)

Referral Category: 1A, 1B, 1C

STAGE 2 Date 13 May 2009

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 17 December 2008

Scheme Proposal (summary)

City Pride – The erection of a part 9, part 62-storey tower comprising 430 residential units, 203-bed hotel with conference facilities, spa, swimming pool, gymnasium, reception and lounge bar.

Island Point – The erection of six buildings ranging in height from 2 to 8 storeys comprising 189 residential units.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: City pride: Residential with hotel
Island Point: Residential

Existing land use: City pride: Public house
Island point: Vacant

Applicant: Glenkerrin Ltd

Architect: Fosters and partners/ Darling Associates

Agent

Site Area: Not stated

PTAL City Pride : 6

Island point : 4

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Acceptable uses for both sites. City Pride site within Isle of Dogs Opportunity area.
Density policy compliance	3A.3	City Pride : 4172 hrh (LP range 650-1500) acceptable as 'not out of context' Island Point: 545 (within LP range 450-700)

AH proportions	3A.9/10	30% units (41% habrooms) – SR 64: Int 36 City Pride: Market: 412 (96%); Int 18 (4%) No social rent Island Point: Market 23 (12%), SR 118 (62%), Int 48 (26%) Mayor accepted applicant view that City Pride development unsuitable for social rented housing – though justification not set in reports. Mayor satisfied by applicant supplementary viability appraisal that this was maximum reasonable AH and therefore policy compliant.
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	Overall: Studios: 57 (9%) ; 1Bs 231 (32%); 2Bs 231 (37%), 3Bs 72 (12%), 4Bs 44 (7%), 5Bs 18 (3%) Acceptable (3B+ 22%)
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Policy compliant
External playspace	3D.13	Additional information provided. Policy compliant on both sites.
Design policies	4B.1/3	Design acceptable
Strategic views	4B.16	Not considered in reports (City Pride development is a 62 storey tower)
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	Given impact of affordable housing residents in Island Point scheme, applicant to make contributions to social infrastructure for discussion with Tower Hamlets.
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Policy compliance through contributions and conditions
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Additional information provided. Compliance to be secured through conditions.
Planning conditions		Conditions re transport mitigation and renewable energy
s106 agreement		City Pride: £20,000 for bus stops £200,000 for increased bus capacity Island Point: £20,000 for bus stops £113,000 for increased bus capacity
Other Issues		Local objections to developments on both sites. Especially overdevelopment of City Pride site and concentration of affordable housing at Island Point site.

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Concerns re impact of concentration of affordable housing on Island Point site on social infrastructure. Independent financial appraisal required.
Air Quality	Proposals satisfactory
Children's Playspace	Details of calculations and provision for City Pride required. Kick about area required for Island Point
Urban Design	Design for both sites welcomed
Inclusive Design	Proposals satisfactory
Climate change mitigation	Alternative energy strategy required for City Pride. Link to Barkentine heating system should be considered. Further details for energy systems at Island Point required.
Transport	

	Further assessments and contributions required for both sites
--	---

Process

Financial viability	Three Dragons appraisals submitted by applicant and by AtisReal for Tower Hamlets. Independent assessment concluded that higher affordable housing output of 46% achievable. Developer's further submission successfully challenged this.
Documentation	Note of pre-application meeting. Financial appraisal by Atis Real for L B Tower Hamlets Affordable Housing Economic Appraisal : Knight Frank report including toolkit appraisal, with supplementary report Townscape and visual appraisal. 2 volumes (The Pride) Sustainability statement (The Pride) Statement of community involvement (The Pride) Application Drawings (The Pride) Energy Statement (The Pride) EIA Scoping report (City Pride) Tower Hamlets EIA Scoping Opinion for City Pride
Mixed Use requirement	No issues raised
Employment generation/loss	No assessment
Climate change mitigation	Specialist reports relating to City Pride development provided as required.
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Standard documents only
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	10 June 2008

NOTE. SELECTED DOCUMENTS ONLY. FULL FILE NOT PROVIDED

Case History. Previous application for Island Point submitted and referred to Mayor in January 2008 but withdrawn by applicant.

Overall Comments

The proposal for a development on the City Pride site which was a very high density and had only 4% affordable housing provision (intermediate units only) was accepted because it supported development of the Island Point site as 88% affordable housing, including larger social rent homes. The main concern was not the social polarisation involved but the potential impact of social rented families on the infrastructure adjacent to the Island Point site. This matter was however left to Tower Hamlets to resolve in terms of negotiating social infrastructure contributions from the developer. The main role of the mayor was to negotiate limited contributions to TL in relation to bus stops and increasing bus capacity and to secure improvements in relation to climate change mitigation and assurances on childrens' playspace. The Mayor also accepted the applicant's case on financial viability despite this being challenged by an independent assessment.

SCHEME NAME FORMER COMMONWEALTH ISTITUTE

GLA REFERENCE PDU/2363/02 LA Kensington and Chelsea

Planning Application type Listed building consent, Conservation area consent
Referral category: 1C

STAGE 2 Date 2 December 2009 Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 27 May 2009

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Refurbishment, alteration and change of use to non-residential institution of the former Commonwealth Institution building. The erection of three buildings, comprising 72 residential units, retail, restaurant/cafe, cinema, fitness centre, swimming pool and spa facilities.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential, retail and leisure

Existing land use: Cultural institution

Applicant: KHS Developments
Architect: Office for Metropolitan Architecture
Planning consultants: DP9

Site size Not stated
PTAL 5-6

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Change of land uses acceptable. No site designations to prevent them
Density policy compliance	3A.3	Density below guidance in London Plan but compatible with local context. Density is 210 hab rooms per hectare compared with 650-1100 range
AH proportions	3A.9/10	No affordable housing proposed. 15% AH could have been achieved from sought reduction in floorspace of £2,065m which removed ability of scheme to support AH. This option was endorsed by the Mayor. (Labour group on K and C council made representations that scheme should include AH)
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	47/72 units 3B+ (65%) so policy compliant
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Policy compliance
External playspace	3D.13	120 sq m child play space provided (child yield reassessed as 12 not 16 under 5s)

Design policies	4B.1/3	Mayor supported reduction in building height and reduction in floorspace
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No reference in report
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Delivery and servicing plan and travel plan secured through conditions Car parking provision to be monitored. TfL to be consulted on planning conditions on cycle parking, car parking And coach drop off
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Concerns on biomass boiler not pursued following submission of further documentation
Planning conditions		TfL To be consulted on conditions
s106 agreement		No details of s106 agreement in report
Other Issues		Commonwealth Institute to be refurbished for Design Museum. Listed building consent granted by English Heritage on basis that public benefit outweighs harm to listed building.

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	AH proposal needs to be supported by a financial viability assessment
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	No playspace for children under 5
Urban Design	No concerns
Access/ Inclusive Design	No concerns
Energy and Climate change mitigation	Concerns re biomass boiler and compatibility with CHP
Transport	Residential parking level too high

Process

Financial viability	FV report from DVS consultants on file. Claims receipts from market sales Needed to support refurbishment of listed building.
---------------------	--

Documentation	FV assessment and climate change mitigation note on file. English Heritage response on file Documentation on listed building demolition consent Site plans and images ; Design brochure for 'Parabola' Kensington and Chelsea planning brief for site (SPG)
Mixed Use requirement	No issues raised or justification sought
Employment generation/loss	No assessment of job creation/ job loss (Site was vacant)
Climate change mitigation	Climate change mitigation note on file
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	None
Pre-apply presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded

Overall Comments

Support for restoring the vacant site to effective use as Design Museum and the need for an acceptable design solution and obtaining English Heritage consent led to the value of the residential development being needed to support this objective with no value left to contribute to affordable housing. The Mayor accepted the very low development density for the scheme and did not pursue original objection in relation to excess car parking. Private housing development did include a high proportion of market homes, It is however significant that property values related to the bottom of the market recession (falls of 19% from peak) and no provision was made to ensure public benefit, including affordable housing, should values significantly increase during the development period.

SCHEME NAME **CROSSHARBOUR LONDON ARENA Phase 2**

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 0511d/02

LA Tower Hamlets

Planning Application type Amendment to consented scheme
Referral category: 1B, 1C

STAGE 2 Date 1 August 2008

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 29 May 2008

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Amendment to an approved application, GLA reference 0511c, involving revised designs, layout and land uses, removing office uses and providing six additional hotel rooms (143 in total), 195 serviced apartments, 54 additional residential units (1,111 in total), additional retail floorspace, a health club and additional open space.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential, hotel, retail

Existing land use: London Arena (leisure/exhibition centre)

Applicant Ballymore
Architect SOM Architects
Planning consultant GVA Grimley

Site area: 0.98 hectares

PTAL: 5

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Change of use from existing consent supported (loss of office floorspace increase in hotel, residential and retail floorspace)
Density policy compliance	3A.3	No density calculations in the report.
AH proportions	3A.9/10	AH proportion 27% units and 36% habitable rooms.
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	Increase relative to consented application in 3B+ units from 38 units to 103 (10% to 24%) welcomed. Increase in studio units from 51 to 70 (14% to 17% noted)
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	No reference in report
External playspace	3D.13	No reference in report
Design policies	4B.1/3	Design supported as tower blends in with Canary wharf cluster. Concern that inter-relationship between development and dockwater not set out.
Strategic views	4B.16	Development visible in view from Greenwich Park to Greenwich world heritage site, but acceptable given high quality of design.
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No reference in report (except in LDA comments)
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Additional small S106 contributions to transport measures. Street layout changed to avoid bus stop relocation. Condition required to increase cycle
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Energy proposals now policy compliant
Planning conditions		Conditions re cycle parking
s106 agreement		Details of additional s106 contributions for education and healthcare not included in report.
Other Issues		None

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Financial appraisal required to support housing proposal as AH % less than 50%.
Air Quality	No concerns raised
Children's Playspace	No concerns raised
Urban Design	No concerns raised
Inclusive Design	No concerns raised
Energy/ Climate change mitigation	Further details required on energy proposals. Detailed assessment included in Stage 1 report. Water efficiency measures should be secured by condition.
Transport	Parking provision could be reduced. Insufficient cycle parking. Removal of bus stop not supported. Delivery and servicing plan required.

Process

Financial viability	Appraisal submitted but no copy on file.
Documentation	File includes LBTH planning report
Mixed Use requirement	No requirement for assessment of impact of variations in uses.
Employment generation/loss	No figures on employment loss or gain arising from proposed changes of use relative to consented application. There is a reference to 'remaining capacity for Isle of Dogs opportunity area.
Climate change mitigation	Further documentation supplied by applicant's consultants in response to stage 1
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	None
Pre-apply presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded in relation to this application

--	--

Overall Comments

This application involved significant changes of use relative to consented scheme including removal of office components, increased residential units and increased hotel spaces. There is however no evidence of any impact assessment in relation to employment loss or gain and on assessment of impact on social infrastructure of additional residents. There are no details in the report on whether additional s106 contributions were sought, other than in relation to some transport impacts. The revised application was however an opportunity to pursue improvements in relation to energy proposals and water efficiency measures.

SCHEME NAME CROSSNESS SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 2151/02 LA Bexley

Planning Application type Full application +Conservation area consent
Referral category : 1C,1D

STAGE 2 Date 30 October 2008 Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 11 June 2008

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Extension to the existing sewage treatment works to include additional industrial buildings (2,534 sq.m), plant and tanks increasing the total floor space by 47,162 sq.m. The applicant has also proposed the installation of a 2.5 megawatt wind turbine, 86 metres in height to hub, with 90 metre diameter blades. Mitigation works are proposed at the site, including creation of a reed bed and wetland area.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: waste treatment centre

Existing land use: Existing waste treatment site and adjacent marshlands

Applicant Thames Water Utilities
Agent Charles Planning associates

Site Area Not stated
PTAL Not stated

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Part of site within MOL. Loss of MOL justified by overall benefits of development to biodiversity and health. Site is also within a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation
Density policy compliance	3A.3	N/A

AH proportions	3A.9/10	N/A
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	N/A
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	N/A
External playspace	3D.13	N/A
Design policies	4B.1/3	N/A
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A Wind turbine is 86 metres high but not visually intrusive within industrial area and complements existing wind turbines
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	Not specified
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Some additional information requested provided though level of car parking outstanding
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Additional information provided satisfactory
Planning conditions		Conditions to achieve mitigations
s106 agreement		Contribution to MOL enhancement not pursued as biodiversity mitigation measures considered to be sufficient.
Other Issues		Applicant agreed to advertise jobs locally Potential concerns on impact on operation of National Air Traffic Services not pursued by NATS. Thames Water confirmed no unacceptable flood risks impact

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	N/A
Air Quality	Increase in odour level of 12%. Mitigation measures will reduce to 7.5%. Other measures should reduce by further 4%
Children's Playspace	N/A
Urban Design	Need to improve landscape design of scheme
Inclusive Design	Not raised
Climate change mitigation/energy	Need to demonstrate compliance with energy hierarchy.
Transport	Information on car and cycle parking provision required Potential for river based transport should be considered
Other	Developer should contribute to strategic open space provision to offset harm LDA sought local recruitment targets and skills training for local residents LDA also sought contributions to off site childcare and public transport

Process

Financial viability	N/A
Documentation	Bexley planning report; Environmental statement; Marine access study; Ecological mitigation strategy; Wetland management plan
Mixed Use requirement	N/A
Employment generation/loss	No information provided on additional jobs created (or requested)
Climate change mitigation	Flood risk assessment undertaken.
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	EU Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive DfT Water Freight Planning Guidance
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded

Overall Comments

Environmental improvements to water quality and mitigation measures offset loss of MOL. Mayoral intervention achieved some improvements in development proposal.

SCHEME NAME DORMERS WELLS HIGH SCHOOL

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 2635/02

LA Ealing

Planning Application type: Full

Referral Category: 3C

STAGE 2 Date : 4 August 2010

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 29 June 2010

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Full planning permission for the demolition of the existing Dormer Wells School buildings and the construction of a new school building with a single storey storage building, a greenhouse and polytunnel on the northern part of the site. New playing fields would be created on the southern part of the site to replace the developed playing fields and the existing multi-use game area would be retained. 86 car parking spaces, including nine disabled spaces, 150 cycle parking spaces, and associated landscaping

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: School

Existing land use: School

Applicant: Balfour Beatty Education
Architect : Nicholas Hare Architecture
Agent

Site Area: 4.2 hectares
PTAL : Not stated

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Development of school buildings on playing fields with replacement with net increase in recreational open space
Density policy compliance	3A.3	N/A
AH proportions	3A.9/10	N/A
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	N/A
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	N/A
External playspace	3D.13	Net increase in open space
Design policies	4B.1/3	Design not fully satisfactory but compliance to be achieved through planning condition
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	Improvement of educational provision meets policy 3A.24
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Cycle parking provision increased Security concerns accepted as reason for not providing additional pedestrian access
Renewable Energy/ climate change mitigation	4A.7	Required information on renewable energy provided. Development to include living roofs
Planning conditions		Condition to improve internal connectivity Travel plan to be secured through conditions
s106 agreement		No references to s106 contributions
Other Issues		Local objections relating to traffic congestion and potential disturbance and noise from school pupils.

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	N/A
Air Quality	Further information required to demonstrate compliance
Children's Playspace	Net increase in recreational open space welcomed
Urban Design	Revision required to internal configuration to improve connectivity
Inclusive Design	Need to improve level access links for disabled users
Climate change mitigation	Further information required. Commitment to renewable energy and photovoltaic panels welcomed
Transport	Concerns re pedestrian access, possible increases in trip generation and need for a travel plan
Other	Community use of buildings to be secured through conditions or agreement

Process

Financial viability	Not applicable
Documentation	Scheme plans L B Ealing planning report Biomass boiler specification and air quality assessment Flood Risk assessment
Mixed Use requirement	No issues
Employment generation/loss	No consideration
Climate change mitigation	Flood risk assessment provided
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Draft replacement London Plan (October 2009). Policy 3.20 Proposals which result in a net loss of sports and recreational facilities including playing fields should be resisted
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded

Overall Comments

The proposal provided a net increase in recreational space. The Mayor therefore focused on obtaining improvements to the scheme to meet inclusive design and climate change mitigation and adaptation policy objectives.

SCHEME NAME ERIC AND TENBY ESTATES

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 2328a/02

LA Tower Hamlets

Planning Application type: Detailed with conservation area consent

Referral Category: 1A

STAGE 2 Date 10 February 2010

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 25 November 2009

Scheme Proposal (summary)

The applicant proposes the demolition of 29 existing units (27 bed-sits and 2 one-bed units) and the construction of 179 new units, with two community buildings totalling 460 sq.m, a new housing management office and commercial space at 215 sq.m. in twelve new buildings. The scheme also includes 189 car parking spaces, 179 cycle parking spaces and a range of open space and public realm measures.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential and commercial

Existing land use: Residential

Applicant: East End Homes

Architect: David Wood Architects

Agent

Site Area: 5.8 hectares

PTAL : 6

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Site adjacent to conservation area.
Density policy compliance	3A.3	Density would increase from 106 dph to 131 dph (and from 325 hrph to 414). Within LP range of 70-260 dph. Acceptable as proposal includes large amenity spaces
AH proportions	3A.9/10	Demolition of 29 social rented homes 50 affordable (29 re-provision of social rent + 21 additional social rented) 129 private
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	Acceptable standards relative to draft replacement LP
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Policy compliant
External playspace	3D.13	Net increase of 120 sq m in open space (Previous application rejected by LA on grounds of reduction in open space) Playspace proposal of 960 sq m is policy compliant.
Design policies	4B.1/3	Design supported

Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including education and health	3A.7/18/21/24	Not considered in report (Additional provision below 500 units policy threshold)
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Policy compliant on car parking, with reduction in car parking spaces. Travel plan secured. Relocation of bus stop
Renewable Energy/ Climate change	4A.7	Renewal energy: Refurbishment of district heating system proposed + photovoltaic panels. Climate change mitigation: Acceptable (though lack of green roofs disappointing)
Planning conditions		Conditions to secure transport and climate change mitigation measures
s106 agreement		No schedule of s106 contributions within reports
Other Issues		Significant local objections to demolition and new development

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Assessment of financial appraisal required
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	Policy compliant
Urban Design	No concerns
Inclusive Design	Policy compliant
Climate change mitigation/Energy	More information required on sustainable drainage and living roofs. Assessment of potential for communal energy system required. More information required on photovoltaic panels
Transport	Improvements to pedestrian and cycling conditions required, together with a travel plan.

Process

Financial viability	Copy on file seeks to justify 38.4% affordable housing provision with no social housing grant
Documentation	Planning and regeneration statement Energy strategy Archaeological assessment Air Quality assessment Site plans

	Addendum to design and access statement Financial viability assessment
Mixed Use requirement	No issues
Employment generation/loss	No assessment
Climate change mitigation	Additional documentation provided to support climate change mitigation and energy proposals.
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Draft Replacement London Plan (2009)
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded

Case History: Previous application considered by Mayor on 17 December 2008. Concerns re affordable housing output. On 7 October he agreed to leave to LA to determine.

Overall Comments

Mayor supported overall redevelopment of estate to provide additional home, with private homes to cross-subsidise refurbishment. Overall scheme was policy compliant. Mayor's intervention secured improvements in relation to renewable energy, climate change mitigation and transport.

SCHEME NAME FORMER NATS HEADQUARTERS SITE, WEST DRAYTON

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 2446/02 LA Hillingdon

Planning Application type: Outline (but with considerable detail)

Referral Category: 1A, 1B, 3F

STAGE 2 Date 29 June 2010 Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 22 June 2009

NB The file also includes a letter signed by the Deputy Mayor on 10 June 2010 directing the LA to refuse application on basis that scheme did not provide sufficient affordable housing. This letter is not on GLA website, and appears to have been superseded by the Mayor letter of 29 June 2010.

Scheme Proposal (summary)

An outline application for a comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment comprising 773 dwellings, a primary healthcare facility (including room for joint community use), a nursing home, shop units (classes A1-A3), class B1 business units (including a site management office), an energy centre; and a foul-water pumping station with associated access roads from Porters Way

and Rutters Close (pedestrian & cycle access only); 1,122 car parking spaces, cycle parking, public open space, cycle-ways and footpaths; and landscaping works.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Offices

Existing land use: Residential, offices, retail, health and care facilities

Applicant: Inland Developments plc
Architect: Arch-Tech
Agent

Site Area: 12.6 hectares
PTAL : 1

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Site no longer suitable for industrial use (due to neighbouring residential development and poor public transport access). Site allocated in South Drayton Area Action Plan for mixed used residential scheme
Density policy compliance	3A.3	205 hrph (61 dph) compared with LP applicable range of 150-200 hrph (40-65 dph) . At upper end of range but acceptable.
AH proportions	3A.9/10	Independent assessment justified proposal as providing maximum reasonable AH 11% AH. 40 SR units; 19 intermediate units,714 market units
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	35% of homes to be 3B+. Mix is acceptable.
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Policy compliant
External playspace	3D.13	Policy compliance
Design policies	4B.1/3	Satisfactory. Design points raised at stage 1 not mentioned in stage 2 report..
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No assessment in report. Scheme is above 500 units policy 3A.7 threshold. Scheme includes primary health care
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Parking provision should be reduced
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Energy centre with CHP and district heating network to be provided.
Planning conditions		Renewable energy compliance to be secured by conditions
s106 agreement		£5.05 m package of community benefits negotiated by L B Hillingdon. This thin the reports.
Other Issues		Unit sizes meet standards in draft replacement London Plan Local objections to development

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	11% AH appears to be low. Financial Viability appraisal subject to independent review. Tenure split to be finalised.
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	Satisfactory
Urban Design	Minor amendments suggested. Design code for development acceptable.
Inclusive Design	Policy compliant
Climate change mitigation/energy	Clarification of energy proposals required.
Transport	Car parking provision needs to be reduced. Contributions to bus services required

Process

Financial viability	L B Hillingdon commissioned independent assessment by G L Hearn. GL Hearn report on file but not applicant assessment. Detailed summary of FV issues in stage 2 report contrary to normal practice on confidentiality of FV information). High remediation costs challenged. Report refers to 20% profit on gross development value as reasonable.
Documentation	Planning Statement Design and access statement Environmental statement summary Remedial options appraisal L B Hillingdon planning report Scheme drawings
Mixed Use requirement	No issues raised
Employment generation/loss	No assessment in report
Climate change mitigation	Technical reports supplied
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Draft Replacement London Plan Draft Housing Strategy Draft revised interim Housing SPG L B Hillingdon SPD for site South Drayton Area Action Plan

Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	May 2009 GLA advice report issued 15 June 2009

Overall Comments

The decision to support the scheme appears to have been predicated primarily on the acceptance of the FV appraisal as justifying the low affordable housing proportion. This is despite queries raised in the independent assessment by GL Hearn. It is however unclear what the basis of the policy shift from the Deputy Mayor's refusal letter of 10 June to the decision of the Mayor on 29 June 2010 to leave the matter to the LA to determine. This may be because the Mayor considered that it was for LB Hillingdon to finalise the terms of the s106 agreement, which related mainly to a disagreement over the costs of site remediation. The file does not however record and new information received between these two dates.

SCHEME NAME FRESH WHARF

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 0855a/02

LA Barking and Dagenham (LTGDC)

Planning Application type: Outline

Referral Category: 1A, 1B, 1C

STAGE 2 Date 21 September 2010

Decision LPA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 17 December 2008; 13 July 2010

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Outline planning application for Class A1 (Shops) and/or Class A2 (Financial and Professional Services) and/or Class A3 (Restaurants and Cafes) and/or Class A4 (Drinking Establishments) and/or Class A5 (Hot Food Takeaways) (up to 1,987 sq.m.); Class C3 (Dwellings) up to 950 dwellings (up to 88,606 sq.m.); and Class D1 (Non-residential Institution) (up to 1,616 sq.m.); all in buildings ranging in height between 6 and 22 storeys; erection of a 4 metre high landscaped acoustic bund 'Green Screen'; provision of 418 residential car parking spaces and 16 visitor and club car parking spaces; provision of 113 motorcycle parking spaces and associated bicycle parking spaces; open space and landscaping including riverside walk; highways and transport works; works to river wall; demolition; engineering operations; moorings; together with all associated and ancillary works.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential led mixed use

Existing land use: Small scale light industry and warehousing

Applicant: Countryside properties

Architect: Jestico and Whiles/ Glenn Howells

Agent Gerald Eve

Site Area: 4.4 hectares
PTAL : Less than 1

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Mix of uses acceptable
Density policy compliance	3A.3	Proposed density is 215 dph . Appropriate range is 50-95 dph. Density acceptable as ‘ the scale of development is supported in design terms and results in an acceptable quality of housing’
AH proportions	3A.9/10	S106 fixes minimum of 10% AH, with higher proportion depending on view of scheme viability. Mayor accepted that SR could be lower than norm of 35% given neighbouring Gascoigne estate.
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	Indicative mix has insufficient family sized homes
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Conditions to ensure compliance
External playspace	3D.13	Application fails to demonstrate adequate provision.
Design policies	4B.1/3	Broad support – detailed design to be subject to applications for detailed
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No assessment in reports despite PTAL being below 1 and density being 2-3 times appropriate range. Scheme size is above 500 unit threshold for policy 3A.7.
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Concerns re public transport accessibility to site. £600,000 contribution to bus and transport infrastructure. Other transport requirements to be secured through s106.
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Further technical information requested.
Planning conditions		Conditions to ensure
s106 agreement		To fix mix of affordable housing Planning obligations within LTGDC fixed rate tariff (discounted from £28,000 per resi unit to £6,000 per unit)
Other Issues		

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Need for more family sized units. No justification for 35% affordable housing proposal. No specification of tenure mix for AH. Proposed density acceptable
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	Need to demonstrate sufficient provision
Urban Design	Design acceptable
Inclusive	Need to demonstrate accessible landscaping and Lifetime Homes compliance

Design	
Climate change mitigation/energy	Proposal for rainwater collection required. Concerns re use of river transport for waste and construction materials. Further information required re renewable energy
Transport	Contributions required for highway monitoring, bus capacity and upgraded pedestrian facilities.
Other	Significant noise concerns

Process

Financial viability	Base appraisal on file with draft agreement to relate AH output to financial review across scheme phases. This also had regard to standard LTGDC tariff.
Documentation	S106 Agreement LTGDC planning report Site plans Designs and images
Agreement Mixed Use	No issues
Employment generation/loss	No assessment in report
Climate change mitigation	Additional information provided in response to queries
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Draft replacement London Plan
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded

Case History: Outline consent granted in 2000, with Masterplan approved in December 2000.

Overall Comments

This was an outline application for a major development site to be developed over phases and subject to a series of

detailed applications. As the detailed applications would not be referable to the Mayor, the Mayor had to secure policy compliance through conditions and the s106 agreement. While it is appropriate to have an agreement which allows for flexible responses to changing market circumstances, the agreement guaranteed a minimum of only 10% affordable housing (with 7% of total as social rent), with no guarantees on bedroom size mix as proportions stated were only indicative. Even within these figures, the proportion of family sized homes was lower than sought. Moreover the level of development proposed was excessive in relation to density policy in a location with very poor public transport access and continuing concerns from TfL as to how this could be improved significantly. While the site was perceived as being at the edge of Barking Town Centre, the reports to the Mayor do not consider the availability of social infrastructure such as health, education and leisure facilities. There was no assessment of loss of employment capacity.

SCHEME NAME HARTFIELD ROAD CAR PARK, WIMBLEDON

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 1457a/02

LA Merton

Planning Application type: Full

Referral Category: 1B1c; 3F1, 2C1f

STAGE 2 Date

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s)

Scheme Proposal (summary)

A full planning application for the redevelopment of existing car park site to provide a mixed use development, comprising retail and 110 dwelling units with 245 car parking spaces and improvements to bus stop area.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: residential and retail

Existing land use: Car park

Applicant: Wimbledon Phoenix Ltd

Architect: Woods Hardwick

Agent : DTZ

Site Area: 0.45 hectares

PTAL: 6

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Support for mixed use development on this town centre site. (Previous application had included hotel)
Density policy compliance	3A.3	275 dwellings per hectare; 750 hab roms per hectare (Within 215-405 dph; 650-1100 hrh ranges)
AH proportions	3A.9/10	AH % 32% units (28% hab rooms) acceptable on basis of resubmitted financial appraisal, and having regard to £1.2m s106 contributions 26 SR; 9 Int; 75 market
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	Bedroom size mix (without any 3B+ units) accepted as acceptable to L B Merton. Affordable studio units to be converted to 1B units. 4 studios, 22 1Bs, 84 2Bs
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Condition to achieve lifetime homes and wheelchair homes
External playspace	3D.13	

		1375 sq m provided on site relative to 2190 sq m requirement. Noted nearby park. S106 contribution of £72,250 in lieu of deficit
Design policies	4B.1/3	Design changes made to meet GLA concerns.
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No references in report
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	TfL concerns resolved. £500,000 contribution to bus garage
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Some information provided in response to GLA queries. Other to be imposed through planning conditions
Planning conditions		Conditions re renewable energy
s106 agreement		Contributions to bus station and off site playspace, but no full schedule on file.
Other Issues	Air quality	Concerns met by conditions

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Scheme entirely studios, 1 and 2 bed flats. Mix unacceptable. AH proportion 32% units (28% habitable rooms) Questions on Financial viability assessment
Air Quality	A number of detailed concerns raised
Children's Playspace	400 sq m required
Urban Design	Acceptable but disappointment as to standard design
Inclusive Design	No commitment to lifetime homes and wheelchair provision.
Climate change mitigation/energy	Photovoltaic panels requested. Water conservation strategy required.
Transport	Remodelling of bus station required – TfL would prefer larger footprint. Justification for 20 extra car parking spaces required. Cycle parking required. Travel plan and servicing strategy required.
Other issues	Detailed concerns on noise impacts/ need for sound insulation

Process

Financial viability	Appraisal submitted but not on file. Queries on lack of scheme specific input and use of default data.
Documentation	Site plans Response to energy queries Child yield calculations

Architect : Mark Weintraub architects
Agent: G V A Grimley

Site Area: 0.356 hectares
PTAL : 4 (Proposed Crossrail station at Canary Wharf will enhance accessibility)

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Mix of uses supported subjected to contribution to affordable housing off Site. Site adjacent to conservation area.
Density policy compliance	3A.3	No assessment
AH proportions	3A.9/10	2004 AH contribution of £1 was considered acceptable by previous Mayor. Should Mayor take over application, the policy requirement would need to be addressed in further detail.
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	N/A
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Not raised in stage 2 report
External playspace	3D.13	N/A
Design policies	4B.1/3	Design supported.
Strategic views	4B.16	Development impacts on panoramic views from Greenwich Park, Primrose Hill and river prospect from Waterloo Bridge. Considered to have minor impact as part of Canary Wharf cluster.
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	Not raised
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Developer and TfL had agreed Crossrail contribution. S106 agreement necessary to secure Crossrail and bus capacity contributions. Some outstanding concerns on car parking.
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Developer proposals acceptable.
Planning conditions		Conditions re noise mitigation and renewable energy. (As Mayor determined application, arrange of additional conditions were attached to the consent)
s106 agreement		S106 agreement necessary to secure Crossrail and bus capacity contributions. Contributions proposed: Off site affordable housing £1,155,340 DLR 3,581,553 Employment and training £332,756 Cycleway extension: £433,252 Total 5,502,901 (2004 consent included a primary healthcare facility at £375,000)
Other Issues		Noise impact to be satisfied through condition

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Details of contribution to off site affordable housing required
Air Quality	No concerns raised
Children's Playspace	N/A
Urban Design	No substantive concerns
Inclusive Design	Additional wheelchair accessible rooms sought (only 5% proposed). Information on disabled parking spaces required.
Climate change mitigation/ Energy	Further information required on energy use and renewable energy policies. Further information required on flood risk mitigation
Transport	Car parking should be reduced with more provision for cycle parking. Need for contributions to Crossrail, DLR and increased bus capacity. Further transport modelling required.
Noise	Need for mitigation re Crossrail impact

Process

Financial viability	There is no reference to any financial viability assessment. This was not required as there was no residential component within the scheme.
Documentation	L B Tower Hamlets planning report (4 August 2009) and decision letter Review of Daylight, sunlight and overshadowing effects by Lichfield and partners for GLA. Environmental statement, review and consultation responses. File of consultation response to application to LB Tower Hamlets, with invitations to Mayoral representation hearing. File of Freedom of information Requests Representation hearing report 7 October 2009
Mixed Use requirement	Mix of uses supported subjected to contribution to affordable housing off site.
Employment generation/loss	The report does not refer to any employment generation/loss assessment
Climate change mitigation	The applicant provided satisfactory responses to issues raised by the Mayor.
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Draft Crossrail SPG (Further policies were referred to in the Representation Hearing (stage3) report
Pre-application presentation to Mayor	No pre application presentation Mayoral site visit 25 September 2009 prior to representation hearing

Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded
--	---------------

Case History: Previous application in 2004. Previous Mayor left to LA to determine. This was granted by L B Tower Hamlets but not implemented and was due to expire. Revised application is in effect seeking further 7 year consent, with relatively minor alterations, including a new energy strategy. L B Tower hamlets refused consent on 4 August 2009 on grounds of negative impact on adjacent conservation area and listed buildings and unacceptable loss of daylight and sunlight to nearby residential properties.

Mayor took over the planning application from LA and granted consent on 2 December 2009.

Overall Comments

The Mayor was of the view that the application was not significantly different for the application granted consent by L B Tower Hamlets with the support of his predecessor in 2004. The stage 2 report did not deal with the issues of daylight/sunlight or impact on adjacent listed buildings or the conservation area (the main concerns of L B Tower Hamlets) as these issues had not been raised in the stage 1 report. The Crossrail contribution was later increased to 4m. In granting consent for the application, the Mayor accepted that there would be a negative daylight and sunlight impact but concluded that on balance these impacts were acceptable. As the on site proposal did not involve housing (though it did include serviced apartments) there was no residential density assessment and no assessment of impact on social infrastructure. While London Plan policy only applies to residential provision, which excludes serviced apartments, it should be recognised that the occupants of serviced apartment may have an impact on local services. Moreover there is no assessment of what housing would be delivered by the affordable housing contribution and where the provision would be made and whether it would contribute to mixed and balanced communities objectives. This is not in conformity with London Plan policy 3A.10 and guidance in the 2005 Housing SPG. It would appear that the increased contribution to TfL was a factor in the Mayor's decision.

SCHEME NAME HOLLAND ESTATE, COMMERCIAL ROAD

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 2141/2

LA Tower Hamlets

Planning Application type: Full

Referral Category: 1A

STAGE 2 Date 15 July 2009

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 11 February 2009

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Estate renewal scheme comprising a refurbishment of retained dwellings, the demolition and replacement of 43 dwellings within Ladbroke House, Bradbury House, Evershed House and Denning Point; the erection of 209 new dwellings; the provision of a new community centre, an Eastend Homes local housing office and head office; six new retail units, and the introduction of an estate-wide landscaping scheme

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential development

Existing land use: Housing estate

Applicant East End Homes

Architect Jestico and Whiles

Agent

Site Area: 2.4 hectares

PTAL: 6

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Residential led redevelopment of residential site supported. Site within City Fringe Opportunity Area
Density policy compliance	3A.3	Density increases from 529 hab rooms per h to 725. Acceptable as within 650-1100 range.
AH proportions	3A.9/10	Total 209 units. 128 for sale; 68 social rent; 13 intermediate. 39% units; 46% habrooms as AH. Net of demolitions: AH is 31% units; 39% hab rooms. SR: Int tenure split is 84:16 Proportions justified by toolkit appraisal
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	27% of total provision is 3B+; 41% of AH provision is 3B+. Mix has following resident consultation and is acceptable.
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Policy compliance
External playspace	3D.13	1,608 sq m provision exceeds requirement of 1,380 sq m
Design policies	4B.1/3	Satisfactory
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No reference to social infrastructure requirements generated by increased population.
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	The new build component of the scheme to be car free.
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Revisions made to achieve policy compliance
Planning conditions		Conditions to deliver renewable energy and secure transport requirements
s106 agreement		£785,000 for community centre. £1,322,000 in total.
Other Issues		None

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Assessment of toolkit appraisal required to determine policy compliance on maximum affordable housing
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	Satisfactory
Urban Design	Satisfactory

Inclusive Design	Satisfactory
Climate change mitigation/energy	Further details required
Transport	TfL sought a car free development Servicing requirements for commercial units not acceptable

Process

Financial viability	Full 3 Dragons financial viability assessment undertaken
Documentation	LBTH planning report Architect's presentation with site plans and images FV Assessment Presentation by East End Homes Energy strategy addendum
Mixed Use requirement	No loss of employment floorspace.
Employment generation/loss	Potential net gain in employment capacity
Climate change mitigation	No substantive issues
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	No substantive references
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	24 April 2008 Also considered by London Access Forum on 10 February 2009

Overall Comments

Much consideration was given to whether the scheme provided 50% affordable homes and whether under-provision was justified. If the scheme is treated as an estate refurbishment scheme, policies 3A.9 and 3A.10 do not apply as the London Plan policy requirement is that 100% of demolished affordable homes are replaced (policy 3A.15), which is delivered by the scheme. Moreover while the Three Dragons toolkit should be applied to new build schemes, it was not designed for estate regeneration schemes involving demolitions. The assessment however failed to take into account the social

infrastructure requirements arising from the provision of significant additional new homes. The Mayor's intervention generated improvements relating to transport and renewable energy.

SCHEME NAME INGLIS BARRACKS

GLA REFERENCE PDU/2351/02

LA BARNET

Planning Application type OUTLINE

Referral category: 1A, 1B, 3C(b)

STAGE 2 Date 1 June 2011

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 6 January 2010

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Redevelopment of the site for residential led mixed use development, involving the demolition of all existing buildings (excluding the Officers Mess building) and ground re-profiling works, to provide 2,174 dwellings, a primary school, doctor's surgery, 1,100sqm of commercial uses, 3,470sqm of business employment uses, a district energy centre, and associated open space, means of access, car parking, and other infrastructure.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential

Existing land use: Army Barracks

Applicant Mill Hill East Consortium

Architect: PRP

Agent: GVA Grimley

Site Area: 33.6 hectares

PTAL: part 1; part 2-3

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open industrial locations	3D.9/10	Land uses compatible with adopted Mill Hill East Area Action Plan
Density policy compliance	3A.3	Different density zones within site at 40 dph; 65 dph and 144 dph considered to be compliant with density matrix
AH proportions	3A.9/10	30% (with 60 SR; 40% intermediate split – 'compliant with 'emerging policy'). Minimum of 15% ON SITE. Profit share agreement could generate funds for off site AH.
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	517 houses; 1657 flats (641 1Bs, 966 2Bs, 290 3Bs, 239 4Bs, 38 5Bs so 567/2174 3B+ = 26% (50% of social rented units to be 3B+. This is considered acceptable as exceeding 42% requirement
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	100% lifetime homes + over 10% wheelchair provision. Compliance.
External playspace	3D.13	Child yield assumptions recalculated and hectarage requirement met
Design policies	4B.1/3	Compliant. Condition to be attached re site wide design code
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A However concern re maintaining green appearance within views
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	New primary school and doctor's surgery proposed Sport England objections re loss of playing fields and inadequate leisure facilities rejected

Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Contribution of £2.9m to be made to Mill Hill East station. Developer making contributions to bus network (£625,000) and bus stop upgrades (£50,000) TfL agreed flexibility on parking provision given low PTAL level Barnet agreed that TfL could be party to s106 agreement
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Revised energy strategy with biomass boiler to be replaced by gas fired CHP
Planning conditions		Conditions re viability review, housing standards; phasing of energy centre
s106 agreement		Transport contributions; TfL to be signatory
Other Issues		Site within Area for Intensification

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Conditions required on quality standards; Review mechanism for affordable housing delivery as phased scheme
Air Quality	Detail on biomass boiler as condition
Children's Playspace	9,590 sq m playspace required
Urban Design	Conditions to ensure high quality finish
Inclusive Design	Comprehensive access statement required
Climate change mitigation	Further technical detail required. Request to increase area of living roofs
Transport	Phasing plan required for public transport improvements Car parking provision excessive Improvements to Mill Hill East Underground station required Road junction improvements required

Process

Financial viability	No assessment of affordable housing offer but LA requested to apply review condition. Condition to be applied scheme review by phase to reassess affordable housing potential.
Documentation	Planning Statement with addendum Plans and images Access Statement Environmental sustainability and energy strategy Sports facilities report Draft s106 agreement and s106 schedule Barnet planning report Responses to consultation
Mixed Use requirement	N/A
Employment generation/loss	N/A
Climate change mitigation	Energy assessment submitted. Some further detail required.

Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	However text in report on social rent: intermediate ratio refers to emerging policy not 2008 Plan.
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded

Overall Comments

Significant improvements made to proposal following Mayor's stage I response. Significant contributions made to public transport so that TfL withdrew objections. TfL conceded on parking standards. Improvements to energy proposals. Improvements made to housing mix so that family % exceeded LP guidance. High proportion of small market homes accepted as SR family proportion met. Lack of clarity on onsite/off site provision of affordable housing, though profit share agreement could support provision. Density of development compliant with SRQ principles. Overall Mayoral intervention improved the development proposal.

SCHEME NAME INNOVATION CENTRE. ISLE OF DOGS

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 2097a/02 LA Tower Hamlets

Planning Application type: Full (revised)
Referral Category: 1A, 1C

STAGE 2 Date 15 December 2010 Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 29 October 2009

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Erection of a part 11, part 43-storey building, comprising 265 residential units, 56-bed hotel, office, retail and leisure floorspace.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential with hotel, offices, retail, leisure

Existing land use: Not specified

Applicant: Angel House Development Ltd
Architect: Jacob Webber Ltd
Agent: GVA Grimley

Site Area: 0.28hectares
PTAL: 4

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Site within Isle of Dogs OA. Resi-led mixed used schemer supported,
Density policy compliance	3A.3	2,542 hrph compared with 650-1100 range. 'Proposed density is however justified in this instance as the site is relatively small and most of its ground floor area is developed over, this combined with its height produces a relatively high density. The scheme is not out of context with the surrounding development and the site's location on the Isle of Dogs' This is despite fact that adjacent buildings as low/medium rise.

AH proportions	3A.9/10	56 SR (21%); 19 intermediate (7%); 190 market (72%)
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	22% 3B+
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Policy compliant
External playspace	3D.13	
Design policies	4B.1/3	Concern re single aspect orientation of most flats
Strategic views	4B.16	Site within Greenwich/ St Pauls viewing corridor. Acceptable as part of Canary Wharf cluster. However no images shown in report (or in 2008 reports on previous application).
Social infrastructure including education and health education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No assessment (Resi scheme under 500 unit threshold)
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	No major concerns. Some £300,00 of transport contributions proposed
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Requested information submitted. Scheme policy compliant.
Planning conditions		Conditions to mitigate transport impacts
s106 agreement		Transport contributions
Other Issues		

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	No information provided on unit sizes relative to Housing Design Guidance Low proportion of 3B+ units at 22%. However concern at lack of amenity and childrens playspace for more family homes.
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	To be provided on 11 th floor on podium roof. 21sq m shortfall acceptable.
Urban Design	Minor concerns re internal arrangements. Concerns re single aspect flats.
Inclusive Design	Satisfactory
Climate change mitigation/ energy	Energy strategy insufficiently robust.
Transport	Parking provision acceptable. Public transport capacity sufficient £20,000 contribution to Docklands Arrival Information system sought.

Process

Financial viability	No references on file. A Three Dragons appraisal was submitted with 2008 report., which was then assessed for Tower Hamlets by Atis Real. However the resi component of the revised application is substantially different (reduction from 302 to 265 units)
Documentation	Tower Hamlets planning report
Mixed Use requirement	No issues raised
Employment generation/loss	No assessment in reports
Climate change mitigation	Information provided (but no specialist reports on file)
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Draft replacement London Plan
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	19 March 2008

Case History: Previous application was considered by Mayor in September 2008. Mayor supported in principle raising minor issues. Tower Hamlets were intending to grant consent, but applicant withdrew application. Revised application reduced resi from 302 units to 265, reduced office provision from 1,308 sq m to 1,039 sq m and replaced 18 serviced apartments with a 56 bed hotel. LPA determined to refuse application on grounds of over-development.

Overall Comments

This scheme is not compliant with LP policy in a number of areas – notably density, bedroom size mix and affordable housing provision. The financial viability justification relies on a 2 year old assessment relating to a different scheme. There is no assessment of the impact of scheme changes, including hotel provision, loss of serviced apartments and reduction in residential and office floorspace. The impact on the Greenwich to St Pauls view is discounted even though the proposed development is separate from the main canary Wharf cluster and the 43 storey building would be surrounded by low and medium rise developments. The community benefits from the scheme are minimal and there are no details of significant s106 contributions to transport or to social infrastructure or to mitigate negative impacts of the scheme. There is no assessment of the capacity of the infrastructure of the area to support significant residential population growth in terms of education, health or leisure facilities. The justification for the Mayor's decision to leave the application to the LPA to determine is unclear.

SCHEME NAME LAND AT BILLET WORKS

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 2232/02

LA Waltham Forest

Planning Application type: Full
Referral Category: 1A

STAGE 2 Date 5 May 2010

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 17 December 2008

Scheme Proposal (summary)

A mixed-use development on existing industrial land comprising 562 residential units, retail floor space, cafe/restaurant, business floor space, a medical health centre, community forum, a creche/day care facility, basement and surface level parking, open space (public and private), landscaping, plant and servicing. The buildings range in height from two to seven storeys.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential, retail, health facilities

Existing land use: Industrial

Applicant: Hadley Homes
Architect: Divine Ideas UK
Agent

Site Area: Not stated
PTAL : 2

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Residential led mixed use redevelopment policy compliant. Site is not a Strategic Employment Location. UDP designates site as 50% resi/ 50% industrial. Lower proportion of non residential is however acceptable.
Density policy compliance	3A.3	570 hrph compared with LP range of 300-450. Density acceptable as long as employment, design, housing and transport issues resolved.
AH proportions	3A.9/10	32% proposed (of which 60% social rent; 40% intermediate). Some concerns on small units sizes.
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	Concerns re low proportion of 3B+ homes
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Policy compliant
External playspace	3D.13	Policy compliant
Design policies	4B.1/3	Changes welcomed. Design acceptable.
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including education and education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/2	Not considered. Scheme was above policy 3A.7 500 unit threshold.
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Car parking reduced. Significant contributions to mitigate transport
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Some improvements in energy proposals made , but CHP capacity needs to be maximised
Planning conditions		Conditions to resolved outstanding transport,
s106 agreement		£2.529m transport contributions

Other Issues		Local objections on grounds of overdevelopment, inappropriate housing mix and negative impacts on neighbourhood
--------------	--	---

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Maximum reasonable AH provided but mix not consistent with LP guidance. More family sized units required Density high but acceptable as long as employment, design, housing and transport issues resolved.
Air Quality	Confirmation of carbon emission reductions required
Children's Playspace	Satisfactory
Urban Design	Good design overall – minor changes sought
Inclusive Design	No concerns
Climate change mitigation	Generally satisfactory though some flooding, biodiversity and noise issues need to be addressed.
Transport	Parking provision excessive. Contribution to bus services required.
Other	Employment opportunities should be maximised Further bat and bird surveys required

Process

Financial viability	Full Three Dragons appraisal on file (Atis Real) Lack of clarity on availability of HCA funding.
Documentation	Waltham Forest planning report Planning statement Design and Access Statement Financial Viability Assessment Sustainability/ energy reports Images and schedules Blackhorse Lane Interim Planning Policy Framework
Mixed Use requirement	The Mayor was prepared to accept loss of employment land in excess of the 50% reduction assumed on the LPAs site allocations.
Employment generation/loss	Not referred to in report, despite loss of employment space to residential
Climate change mitigation	Information provided in response to points raised

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Acceptable uses for site
Density policy compliance	3A.3	209 dph/ 669 hab room per hectare. LP range is 200-450 hrh with PTAL 3. PTAL 4 would allow 450-700. Justified by proximity of station and high frequency of bus service.
AH proportions	3A.9/10	Stage 1 proposal :44/170 units affordable (26% units; 23% hab rooms) Stage 2 proposal: 21/164 units affordable (13% units) as Housing Corporation confirmed no grant available. Agreement on off site provision from any 'surplus' profit.
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	Applicant justified high proportion of 1 bed units with reference to LA's strategic housing market assessment
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Modifications to achieve level access for all units
External playspace	3D.13	Revised requirement of 558 sq m to be provided. Contribution of £12,000 to upkeep of local parks
Design policies	4B.1/3	Number of single aspect dwellings not reduced
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A Assessment of development impact on views satisfactory
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No references in reports. No impact assessment of significant residential
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Contributions secured for transport provisions and controlled parking zone Provision of spaces still considered excessive
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Requirements met
Planning conditions		District heating network secured by planning condition
s106 agreement		Parks contribution and a range of transport contributions
Other Issues		Updated ecological assessment submitted as requested

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Lack of justification for AH proportion. Lack of detail on social rent: intermediate split by bedroom size. Insufficient family sized homes overall.
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	Provision of 600 sq m children's playspace required
Urban Design	Generally welcomed but concern with high proportion of single aspect dwellings.
Inclusive Design	Concerns on internal layout
Climate change mitigation/ Energy	Further information required on flood risk assessment and management of water run-off. Further information required on energy provision and renewables

Transport	Over-provision of car parking spaces Need for cycle parking for commercial floorspace
Other	Updated biodiversity and ecological assessment required

Process

Financial viability	FV assessment checked by Hounslow but no copy of original assessment on GLA file . Agreement in relation to revised financial assessment in completion with payment of surplus profit up to £3.6m to LA to provide off site affordable housing.
Documentation	Design and access statement addendum
Mixed Use requirement	No issues raised
Employment generation/loss	No assessment. The scheme involves employment generating uses.
Climate change mitigation	Modelling for commercial elements supplied as requested
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Standard references
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded

Note: Case History. Previous application for 263 homes and 2032 sq m retail and commercial space refused by Hounslow in March 2005. Appeal dismissed in March 2006.

Overall Comments

The Mayor accepted that the non-availability of grant reduced the proportion of affordable housing. It however appears that the GLA relied on L B Hounslow to check the viability assessment. Agreement included 50% of any 'surplus' profit being paid to LA up to cap of £3.6m. The Mayor also accepted a relatively high level of development (relative to density supported by Sustainable Residential Quality density matrix) without any assessment of social infrastructure capacity, based primarily on assumptions on transport access. Mayor did not pursue objection to car parking level, accepting a contribution to controlled parking zone. Mayor's intervention generated some improvements relating to renewable energy but objection to single aspect dwellings not pursued.

SCHEME NAME LANGDON COMPREHESIVE SCHOOL

GLA REFERENCE PDU/0487B/02

LA Newham

Planning Application type; Full
Referral Category: 3D (a and b)

STAGE 2 Date 22 December 2010

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 17 November 2010

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Partial demolition to provide for a new dining hall and extensions and alterations to existing school, buildings, parking and landscaping.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: School

Existing land use: School

Applicant: L B Newham
Architect: Laing O'Rourke
Agent: RPSSite Area: 16.7 hectares
PTAL : Not stated

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Site within Metropolitan Open Land. Special circumstances to justify development and outweigh harm. Site already in educational use. Redevelopment involves reduction in floorspace. Educational need demonstrated
Density policy compliance	3A.3	N/A
AH proportions	3A.9/10	N/A
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	N/A
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	N/A
External playspace	3D.13	N/A
Design policies	4B.1/3	Design approach supported
Strategic views	4B.16	Visual impact assessment requested
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	Educational need for school extension demonstrated.
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	No concerns
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Policy compliance

Planning conditions		Conditions to secure access arrangements Flood management evacuation plan and water run-off arrangements to be secured by condition Conditions to secure energy improvements
s106 agreement		Not considered
Other Issues		

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	N/A
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	Not raised
Urban Design	No concerns
Inclusive Design	Accessibility measures welcomed
Climate change mitigation	Carbon emissions reduction target should be increased.
Transport	Cycle parking should be increased. Contribution of £70,000 to enhance bus capacity.

Process

Financial viability	Not considered
Documentation	Scheme drawings Planning statement Design and access statement with addendum Newham planning committee reports
Mixed Use requirement	No issues raised
Employment generation/loss	No assessment
Climate change mitigation	Requested information provided
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Draft replacement London Plan Ministerial statement on education (July 2010)

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	No issues as redevelopment of existing estate. Redevelopment is next to Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. Impact of redevelopment seen as positive.
Density policy compliance	3A.3	Density increase from 106 to 113 dph – LP range 35-95 dph. This is acceptable)
AH proportions	3A.9/10	Proposal has flexibility for between 50% and 80% affordable housing , reflecting market position as scheme develops. Indicative mix gives 334 (61%) SR; 57 intermediate (10%) ; 155 market units (28%). 85:15 social rent: intermediate mix accepted as part of LA disposal agreement. (Demolition of 490 social rent and 57 leasehold units – Ex RTB – total of 547)
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	Indicative mix: 198 1B; 258 2B; 90 3B. Applicant claims that LA does not require 4 bedroom units and that these would not be appropriate for a wholly flatted development. Agreement that mix would be reviewed in later phases of development. Pre application report gives mix of existing estate as 37 Bedsits, 245c 1Bs, 164 2Bs, 101 3Bs, so the redevelopment proposals involves a significant increase in 2B units, with a reduction in Bedsits, 1Bs and 3Bs.
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	To be secured through condition
External playspace	3D.13	Policy compliant
Design policies	4B.1/3	Acceptable though some improvements sought
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No assessment (though scheme above policy 3A.7 500 unit threshold. However this is replacement of an existing estate, there is an overall increase of 12 dwellings
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Acceptable with s106 contributions
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Secured by planning conditions
Planning conditions		Conditions re Wheelchair homes and affordable housing floorspace.
s106 agreement		£60,000 for Controlled Parking Zone and £30,000 for bus shelters
Other Issues		

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Some 4 bedroom units should be included
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	Acceptable
Urban	"Further development of the design quality guide to move beyond generalities and to demonstrate a

Design	commitment to the highest quality design, incorporating variation, visual richness, layering and to ensure an avoidance of generic housing design should be pursued.”
Inclusive Design	Provision of ‘up to 10% wheelchair homes’ not acceptable
Climate change mitigation	Energy proposals acceptable. Query as to why applicant states that rainwater harvesting not viable.
Transport	Additional information sought on car parking and bus provision.
Other	Biodiversity : acceptable as long as ecological report proposals implemented

Process

Financial viability	No reference in reports to any assessment – though higher density is justified by need for cross-subsidy from private units
Documentation	Pre application meeting file note. Circle Anglia. Planning policy review (June 2008) Energy statement addendum
Mixed Use requirement	No issues raised
Employment generation/loss	No assessment
Climate change mitigation	Flood risk assessment provided
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Standard references
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	10 July 2008

NOTE. SELECTED DOCUMENTS ONLY. FULL FILE NOT PROVIDED

Overall Comments

While the scheme involves no loss in overall housing supply, there is a potential loss of over 100 affordable housing units, which would appear to be in breach of policy 3A.15. However the report refers to an agreement to replace affordable housing floorspace . however given the replacement mix is mainly 1B and 2B units, and details of unit sizes are not given, it is unclear how this agreement is to be brought into effect. The slight increase in density was accepted. The Mayor did not pursue his initial concerns that scheme should include 4 bed homes, and accepted the Boroughs view of the appropriate mix for the development. As an outline application the Mayor was not able to secure full policy compliance, but some requirements were to be secured by conditions and a commitment that the mayor would be consulted on detailed design proposals.

SCHEME NAME ONE TOWER BRIDGE (POTTERS FIELD)

GLA REFERENCE PDU/0447b/o447c/0447d/02 LA Southwark

Planning Application type Full planning application + Listed building consent for alterations to Lambeth College
Referral category: 1A, 1B, 1C, 4

STAGE 2 Date 30 March 2011

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 22 December 2010

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Main site

45,075 sq.m. of residential floorspace comprising 356 residential units; 6,554 sq.m. of cultural floorspace (Class D1/D2 to accommodate concert hall or gallery or exhibition space; 1,827 sq.m. of commercial floorspace to accommodate class A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1, D2 and B1 uses, the latter not to exceed 500 sq.m.); all accommodated within buildings of up to 11 storeys (45.505m AOD) and a residential campanile of 20 storeys, plus roof garden and light box (79.3m AOD), together with 6,523.9 sq.m. of communal and private amenity space, including an extension to and improvement of Potters Fields Park; 143 parking spaces including two surface level parking spaces for car club use; 425 cycle parking spaces; together with associated highway, access and landscape works and other associated works and uses.

Corporation of London site

The construction of 4,723 sq.m. of residential floorspace comprising 46 affordable units, 379 sq.m. of commercial floorspace (to accommodate class A1, A2, A3, A4, B1, D1 and D2) and 1,044 sq.m. of replacement workshop space all accommodated within a building of 8 storeys (34m AOD), 10 replacement car parking spaces, 1 motorcycle space, 80 cycle spaces and associated highway and access works. The demolition of part of the compound wall and construction of a new wall, and creation of a new access at basement level at the Bridgmaster's house (Listed Building consent)

Access application

Ground level, rear elevation and access alterations to former Lambeth College building to enable the construction of a mixed use development on the neighbouring site.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential with retail and cultural facilities.

Existing land use: Coach park, vacant land (previously industrial wharf)

Applicant: Berkeley Homes

Agent: Barton Willmore

Site Area: 1.55 hectares

PTAL: 6

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/ strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Proposed uses in line with London Plan policy and designations established by existing consent. Landswap but no loss of MOL. Increase of 112 sq m LP policy 3D.4 supports cultural use/
Density policy compliance	3A.3	Density on main site 930 hab rooms per h; on Corp of London site- 1,260 hab rooms per h. Acceptable as average 938 within range (1100)
AH proportions	3A.9/10	Main site – 356 units - no affordable units proposed. 43 social rented units on CoL site . Justification that service charges would make SR on main site

		unaffordable. £10.51m AH contribution offered - estimated to fund an additional 88 hab rooms AH (at £120,000 per hab room). £8m scheme contribution to cost of AH in block 9. No housing grant available. AH offer accepted on grounds of viability (noting cost of cultural facility).
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	Main site 76/356 as 3B+ (21%) considered acceptable
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Requested for additional lift not pursued. Alternative lift to bridge to be provided.
External playspace	3D.13	Playspace deficit acceptable given adjacent park and s106 contribution of £460,580
Design policies	4B.1/3	Design issues raised at stage 1 satisfactorily addressed.
Strategic views	4B.16	L B Greenwich objected to impact on view of St Paul's from Blackheath. Objection discounted.
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No issues raised
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	S106 payment of £25,000 to compensate for environmental impact of cars.
Renewable Energy/ Climate change mitigation	4A.7	Matters raised at stage 1 resolved. Photovoltaic panels to be provided.
Planning conditions		Architect bound in to scheme. Parking management plan
s106 agreement		Significant transport contributions + £103,000 to Crossrail + £10.51m off site affordable housing
Other Issues		Cultural use – flexible layout as no end user determined. Drainage and noise mitigation proposals acceptable

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	11% affordable housing proposed overall. Concerns as to phasing of off site delivery. Potential for additional off site payment.
Air Quality/Noise	Design measures for noise mitigation required
Children's Playspace	Playspace below requirement. but may be acceptable given adjacent park and s106 contribution of £460,580
Urban Design	Minor changes to design required. Overall design acceptable (C ABE objections to design especially Campanile)
Inclusive Design	Additional lift required
Climate change mitigation/energy	Further details on heating technology. Details of surface water drainage
Transport	Financial contributions for junction improvement, way finding, cycle hire scheme and Crossrail

Process

Financial viability	Financial cash flows on file with full scheme costings. Economic viability assessment using Circle developer by BNP Paribas Real Estate.
Documentation	Details of energy strategy on file; Energy strategy on file; Access statement on file; Planning obligations schedules on file..
Mixed Use requirement	Mixed use proposals in accordance with site designations.
Employment generation/loss	No loss. No calculations of additional employment capacity included in reports.
Climate change mitigation	Documentation provided with some scheme changes to resolve outstanding issues. Planning conditions applied to assure measures taken S106 contributions to compensate for negative impacts.
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Draft replacement plan on housing standards and Mayor's Housing Design Guide. Standards met. Crossrail SPG.
Pre-applc presentation to Mayor	Presentation to Mayor and Deputy Mayor on 17 December 2008. Design concerns – Reduce overall by one storey. 29% AH as in consented scheme. 67% of units as 3Bs – none in consented scheme. Design revisions welcomed as scheme now 'subservient to City Hall and Tower Bridge'.
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	15 July 2010 Pre-application report with layout plans and images Report submitted to Deputy Mayor's meeting on 19 July 2010. Issues raised: design concept, landscape and public realm, sustainability, impact strategic views, inclusive access, CHP and energy hierarchy, transport affordable housing and unit size mix

Previous case history

Applicant appealed against non determination by LPA in July 2003. Planning Inquiry held April- July 2004. SoS granted detailed planning consent on 14 February 2006 for 374 dwellings in 8 12-19 storey towers. Not implemented. Existing consent for Lambeth College to be converted into a hotel.

Overall Comments

Design acceptable as preferred to previous scheme despite CABA objections. Low AH output accepted on basis of no grant and cost of cultural facility demonstrated by FV appraisal Provision of social rented housing on adjacent site accepted. Underprovision of playspace accepted on basis of scheme location and s106 contribution. Cultural space supported despite lack of end user and negative impact on affordable housing output. (This was also the case in the previously consented scheme). No information on where AH contribution is to be used in terms of delivering mix of social rent and intermediate homes, appropriate mix of bedroom sizes and contributing to delivery of mixed and balanced communities. No indication of timescale of delivery of off site housing relative to development timescale of One Tower Bridge.

SCHEME NAME RAM BREWERY

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 1519/02

LA Wandsworth

Planning Application type: Full
 Referral Category: 1A, 1B,1C, 3E

STAGE 2 Date 14 January 2009

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 4 July 2008

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Demolition of some buildings, the alteration and change of use of retained listed buildings, and the erection of eight new buildings, including 32 and 42-storey tower blocks, as part of a residential-led mixed-use development to provide: 829 residential units; 12,204 sq.m. of retail shops, restaurants and drinking establishments; 2,226 sq.m. of office accommodation; 2,673 sq.m. of community/leisure space; 473 sq.m. of showroom space and 909 sq.m. for a new micro-brewery/Young's Heritage Centre; together with the creation of new vehicular and pedestrian access points; 10,197 sq.m. of public open space, including a riverside walk; an energy centre; 415 residential and 77 public/commercial car parking spaces, 1,108 cycle spaces, service areas and associated landscaping

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential, with retail, offices and leisure

Existing land use: Brewery (vacant since 2006) , film studio, light industrial works

Applicant: Minerva (Wandsworth) Ltd
 Architect: EPR Architects
 Agent

Site Area: 3.66 hectares
 PTAL : 5

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Mix of uses acceptable. Site not designated as Strategic Industrial Location.
Density policy compliance	3A.3	Proposal 227 dph/ 631 hrph – slightly below 650-1100 range. Acceptable given listed buildings and range of uses within site. (Density calculation on basis of gross area not residential component of site)
AH proportions	3A.9/10	Proposal that 207 units (25%) affordable reduced to 11%. This is all within Cockpen house, with no affordable housing proposed within main Ram Brewery scheme.
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	Ram Brewery proposal : all market housing : 353 1Bs, 336 2Bs, 131 3Bs, 9 4Bs. (14% 3B+) No issues raised.
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Information not included in the report
External playspace	3D.13	502 sq m proposed relative to 1,040 sq m requirement. Deficit can be met through roof space and financial contribution to park.
Design policies	4B.1/3	Some minor design changes in response to points raised at stage 1. Overall design acceptable

Strategic views	4B.16	Site does not fall within any strategic views.
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No reference in reports to any assessment of social infrastructure (Scheme above 500 unit policy 3A,7 threshold)
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Proposals policy compliant subject to completion of s106 agreement to which TfL would be a co-signatory.
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Strategy is not satisfactory and applicant needs to review complementary technologies.
Planning conditions		Transport and climate change mitigation measures to be secured by conditions
s106 agreement		£38m towards highway improvements (Wandsworth gyratory) £1m towards Wandsworth Town station £350,000 to local bus services £250,000 towards improved access between town centre and River Thames £10,000 for a river bus £200,000 towards public realm £261,000 towards public safety and security £250,000 for enhancements to River Wandle £70,000 for Controlled Parking Zone £150,000 towards junction improvements £100,000 for Home Zone scheme £275,000 for local employment agreement
Other Issues	Town Centre Policies 3D.1; 3D.2; 3D.3	Retail proposals welcomed in relation to town centre regeneration and to enable Wandsworth to fulfil its role in town centre hierarchy.

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Principle of reduced affordable housing to deliver alterations to gyratory is supported
Air Quality	Concern re potential impact of biomass boiler
Children's Playspace	2,170 sq m required (requirement later reduced with reduction in affordable housing provision from 31% to 11%)
Urban Design	Design generally supported. Concern that some balconies too small, and that some single aspect dwellings are sensitive to noise from main roads. Some concern with design of tower blocks.
Inclusive Design	Not considered
Climate change mitigation	Energy strategy satisfactory. Further information required on technologies.
Transport	Concerns re proposed highways improvements. Contributions to buses and transport improvements required.
Other	Retail proposals supported in relation to policies 3D.1, 3D.2 and 3D.3 Museum supported in relation to policy 3D.7 on tourist facilities Employment generation welcomed

Process

Financial viability	Appraisal independently assessed for L B Wandsworth, who accepted that exceptional level of planning contributions limited potential affordable housing output. However if rerouting of gyratory system not possible, contribution could be used for off site affordable housing.
Documentation	Design and Access Statement Environmental statement (4 volumes + addendum) Landscape Strategy Transport Assessment (2 volumes) Statement of Community Involvement Plans Mayor's statement for Public Inquiry (June 2009)
Mixed Use requirement	No issues raised
Employment generation/loss	Development would provide an uplift of approx 1,000 jobs.
Climate change mitigation	Full reports submitted
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Standard references
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	5 September 2007
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded

Case History: Wandsworth granted planning consent. THE Health and safety Executive objected to the development because of neighbouring gasholder. The Secretary of State then called in the scheme. The Mayor supported the application at the Public Enquiry. The SoS endorsed recommendation of Inspector to refuse application on basis of a) unacceptable impact of high rise development on neighbourhood, and b) 11% affordable housing was too low, c) conflict with national policy on hazardous installations. (gasholder) .

Revised scheme proposed in May 2011, but not as yet referred to Mayor. This comprises a single tower further away from the gasholder with retention of some listed buildings.

Overall Comments

The Mayor supported the scheme in terms of its contribution to the regeneration of Wandsworth town centre and its retail offer. He was prepared to relax affordable housing requirements in order to support the improvement of the gyratory system and public realm and transport improvements. The content of the residential development in terms of bedroom size mix (only 14% 3B+) was not considered in any detail, nor was the issue of off site provision of affordable housing pursued. The issue of the relationship with the gasholder, which was to be one of the main reasons for the Inspector and secretary of State rejecting the scheme, was not considered in reports to the Mayor.

SCHEME NAME RANDOLPH AND PEMBROKE HOUSE SITE

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 1583a/02

LA CROYDON

Planning Application type: Full

Referral category: 1A, 1B,1C

STAGE 2 Date 12 October 2010

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 13 September 2010

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Redevelopment of the site to provide six new linked buildings, ranging in height from 4 to 45 storeys, providing 755 flats and approximately 2,000 sq.m. of commercial floorspace, with associated new public open space and new vehicular access to the site.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential and commercial

Existing land use: Vacant since 1993

Site size 0.9 hectares

PTAL 6

Applicant Berkeley Homes

Agent Rolfe Judd

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Land uses acceptable
Density policy compliance	3A.3	No density calculation in report. High density scheme/ tall building welcomed in this location.
AH proportions	3A.9/10	Reduced affordable housing proportion supported by robust financial appraisal. Social rented provision is off-site. Total AH 140/859 units (16%); 426/2186 bedspaces (19%) On site 36/754 units (5%); 92/1852 habrooms (5%) AH tenure split is 75% SR: 25% intermediate. Acceptable (as review mechanism could deliver 65%:35%)
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	SR 3/4Bs now 37% (30% in previous application) Private : Reduction in studio units and increase in 1B and 2Bs relative to Previous application
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Policy compliant
External playspace	3D.13	4,800 sq m amenity space and 2,700 sq m off private rooftop space. No reference to children's playspace or child yield (2007 report referred to 82 children and 110 sq m of playspace)
Design policies	4B.1/3	Acceptable (no major changes since 2007 scheme)
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including	3A.7/18/21/24	No references in report

education, health and leisure		
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Transport impacts acceptable, though disappointment at lack of electrical points.
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Delivery of ecohomes requirements secured by a planning condition Improvements to energy and climate change related components of scheme
Planning conditions		Use to secure ecohomes requirements
s106 agreement		£331,000 contribution towards sustainable transport (cycle, bus pedestrian and tram improvements), including £100,000 towards accessibility improvements at five bus stops £200,000 contribution towards capacity enhancements at East Croydon contribution towards capacity enhancements at West Croydon station
Other Issues		Concerns re space standards not pursued Consultee objections re height of building, overdevelopment, noise and highways impacts not pursued.

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Some concern with single aspect and low space standards of some units
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	Not raised
Urban Design	Satisfactory
Inclusive Design	Not raised
Climate change mitigation/energy	Further information required including link to Croydon Town Centre district heating system
Transport	None

Process

Financial viability	BNP financial appraisal for L B Croydon
Documentation	File includes design statement, drawings, L B Croydon planning report, sustainability statement, economic viability assessment for L B Croydon, December 2007 stage 1 report on a previous application.
Mixed Use requirement	No references
Employment generation/loss	No references

Climate change mitigation	Additional documentation provided re technical details
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Opportunity Area Planning Framework under preparation for Croydon Metropolitan Town Centre; Interim Mayor's Housing Design Guide; draft interim Housing SPG
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded

Previous case history

A similar application for the site was granted by L B Croydon in July 2008. In July 2010 L B Croydon agreed a deed of variation in relation to the agreed s106 to address financial concerns of the applicant. This agreed

- increase in number of units from 739 to 755
- decrease in affordable units from 208 to 140
- Revised review mechanism for affordable housing contributions
- Decrease in commercial space from 3,026 sq m to 2,080 sq m
- One additional storey on Block D
- 62 additional cycle bays

Overall Comments

Intervention constrained by previous consent. Reduction in affordable homes accepted in light of financial circumstances, but no evidence of independent financial appraisal by or for GLA. Revised application created opportunity to secure some climate change mitigation/ energy improvements but not to secure higher space standards for housing units.

SCHEME NAME RANSOME'S WHARF, BATTERSEA

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 1759/02

LA Wandsworth

Planning Application type: Full
Referral Category: 1C, 1D

STAGE 2 Date 11 June 2008

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 11 June 2008

(combined stage 1 and stage 2)

Scheme Proposal (summary)

The demolition of existing warehouse, office and industrial buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide 158 residential units, 3,353 sqm of commercial floorspace for a variety of uses including retail, restaurants, cafes and artists' units (A1-5 & B1) within three buildings of between three to eleven storeys. A public piazza, dockside walkway and landscaping are also proposed along with 122 car parking spaces.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential, with commercial and retail

Existing land use: Warehousing and light industrial

Applicant: Curatus Trust Company (Mauritius) Ltd

Architect: CZWG

Agent : Nathaniel Litchfield

Site Area: 0.54 hectares

PTAL: 3

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Site allocated in Wandsworth UDP for mixed use. Principle of mixed use development supported.
Density policy compliance	3A.3	324 dph/ 1077 hrph . This is above applicable range for PTAL 3. However accepted that in practice PTAL is 4 given bus route frequency.
AH proportions	3A.9/10	53 units AH out of 151. SR :Intermediate split is 27:24 (51 %:49 split). Developer had originally proposed 21:32 AH % is 34% (units) or 35% (hab rooms). Wandsworth policy requirement is 33% Applicant claims area has 28% social rent (over Londonwide 25% norm) and this is justification for not meeting London Plan b 70:30 SR: Intermediate norm ratio.
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	Only 7% 3B units, with no 4Bs.
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Applicant committed to meeting lifetimes homes and wheelchair homes
External playspace	3D.13	400 sq m requirement. Original proposal had no provision, applicant claiming balconies and Battersea Park were sufficient provision. Applicant agreed to reserve part of ' amenity deck' for children's playspace and make s106 payment in relation to any deficit.
Design policies	4B.1/3	Design including new public square acceptable
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No references in report (Note scheme over 150 units)
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Policy compliance subject to £40,000 contribution to junction
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Carbon reduction proposals below 20% target
Planning conditions		Conditions re noise abatement, air quality, climate change adaptation
s106 agreement		Contributions to transport
Other Issues	4A.20 Noise Air Quality	Noise concerns can be mitigated by appropriate design and planning Conditions Conditions to mitigate impact

--	--	--

Issues raised at stage 1:

NO SEPERATE STAGE 1 REPORT

Housing	
Air Quality	
Children's Playspace	
Urban Design	
Inclusive Design	
Climate change mitigation	
Transport	

Process

Financial viability	Three Dragons appraisal submitted to GLA but not in case file. Identifies £1.4m deficit in commercial element of scheme. Commercial element is required by L B Wandsworth. Toolkit assumes £7m HA purchase of affordable housing. This is considered reasonable assuming 70% of norm HC grant available.
Documentation	Consultation responses Scheme drawings
Mixed Use requirement	Wandsworth requires commercial element.
Employment generation/loss	No assessment
Climate change mitigation/adaptation	Range of issues considered with additional information provided by applicant and planning conditions applied.
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Standard references only
Pre-applc presentation to Mayor	None recorded

Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	<p>June 2007</p> <p>Scheme also considered by London Access Forum</p>

Overall Comments

Density at top of PTAL 4-6 range accepted although PTAL only 3. Affordable housing target not achieved, partly due to significant subsidy to commercial element. Bedroom size mix deficient in terms of family sized accommodation. This scheme was deficient in a number of significant policy areas and should arguably not have been left to LA to determine. The cross-subsidy to the commercial elements of the scheme significantly reduced the potential affordable housing output and was not justified by London Plan policies. The absence of a stage 1 consultation limited the ability of the Mayor to negotiate improvements to the scheme.

SCHEME NAME RATHBONE MARKET

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 1730

LA Newham (LTGDC)

Planning Application type: Hybrid (Outline for whole scheme; detailed for plot 1)

Referral Category: 1A,1B,1C

STAGE 2 Date 1 April 2009

Decision LPA (LTGDC) to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 11 February 2009

Scheme Proposal (summary)

A hybrid planning application seeking: outline planning permission for up to 60,600 square metres of retail, office, residential (circa 652 units) and market space together with parking, associated highway infrastructure and public realm works and provision of open space; and incorporating detailed planning permission for the development of land to the south of Barking Road, including 1-19 Rathbone Market, for 25,907 square metres of retail and residential space (271 units) in buildings ranging from 2 to 23 storeys in height, together with parking, associated highway infrastructure and public realm works.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Retail, office, residential and market space

Existing land use: Market, retail units and 11 storey residential block

Applicant: English Cities Fund

Architect: CZWG

Agent: Longboard consulting

Site Area: 1.56 hectares

PTAL : 6

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Proposals are policy compliant
Density policy compliance	3A.3	418 dph/ 1660 hrph. Significantly above 200-700 hrph LP range. However proposed density is supported.
AH proportions	3A.9/10	165/ 652 to be affordable (25%) with 49 Social Rent and 116 intermediate (30:70 ratio) so 7.5% of total social rent and 17.8% total as intermediate. 40 of 49 social rented units needed for decants so only 9 additional social rented units. This is not compliant with London Plan proportions of 35% social rent and 15% intermediate. Financial appraisal demonstrates that this is maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing having regard to significant exceptional costs, including the market square.
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	Plot 1 is 50% 1 bed units and 50% 2 bed units and does not comply with London Plan policies and Housing SPG which requires a significant proportion of larger units. Applicant proposed more family homes in later plots.
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Compliance
External playspace	3D.13	Satisfactory
Design policies	4B.1/3	Policy compliant
Strategic views	4B.16	Not applicable (scheme involves a 23 storey tower)
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No assessment of social infrastructure requirements (Plot 1 on its own exceeds the 500 unit policy threshold)
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Satisfactory with s106 contributions; £270.000 from bus capacity enhancements (from LTGDC tariff)'
Renewable Energy/ climate change mitigation	4A.7	Broadly consistent ' though not as comprehensive or as robust as requested'
Planning conditions		Condition re estate management plan
s106 agreement		£280,000 for subway:
Other Issues		

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Justification required for affordable housing proportions and bedroom size mix. Low proportions of social rented housing and no 3B or larger homes
Air Quality	No concerns
Children's Playspace	No concerns
Urban Design	No concerns
Inclusive Design	No concerns
Climate change mitigation	Commitment to electric charging points for cars required
Transport	Further information and s106 contributions required

--	--

Process

Financial viability	Full toolkit appraisal on file
Documentation	LTGDC planning report Scheme drawings and plans Affordable housing strategy and toolkit appraisal Environmental impact assessment scoping report Sustainability and renewable energy report Newham Design review Panel report Pre-application meeting reports Consultation responses
Mixed Use requirement	No issues raised
Employment generation/loss	No assessment in reports
Climate change mitigation	Full supporting documentation provided
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Canning Town and Custom House SPD Lower Lea OA Planning Framework
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	23 May 2007 23 September 2008

Overall Comments

The Mayor accepted that the initial phase of the regeneration of Custom House and Canning Town would not be policy compliant in relation to affordable housing and mix, given the exceptional costs of the market replacement and providing a public square and pedestrian subway. The Mayor also accepted a development proposal which was significantly in excess of the density range appropriate for the site. It should nevertheless be recognised that this was not an ideal location for family housing, and that waiving of a number of policy requirements was appropriate to kickstart the regeneration of the area. However the could have sought more specific information to provide assurances that the wider

development would have been in compliance with his housing, affordable housing and density policies. The proposal was policy compliant in other areas, reflecting extensive pre-application discussions. An assessment of employment/regeneration benefits of the scheme would have however strengthened the Mayor's case for supporting the project.

SCHEME NAME SILVERTOWN QUAYS

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 0498b/02 LA Newham

Planning Application type: application for extension of existing outline consent

Referral Category: 1A,1B,1C

STAGE 2 Date : 19 January 2011

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) : 18 May 2010

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Application for an extension for implementation of the previously approved scheme 03/2006; an outline application for the redevelopment of the site for mixed-use purposes, including the alteration and conversion of the Millennium Mills and Silo D buildings and the construction of 4930 residential units, 25,290 sq.m. of shop, food, drink, and office floorspace, leisure (including an aquarium), 300 bed hotel, library, school and health centre and public open space.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential, retail, office, leisure, hotel, community facilities

Existing land use: Vacant site, with two vacant buildings

Applicant: London Development Agency

Architect

Agent

Site Area: 24 hectares

PTAL : Not stated

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Principles of uses for site established by existing consent
Density policy compliance	3A.3	No new assessment. Issue not referred to in reports.
AH proportions	3A.9/10	Consented scheme was 27.5% AH (60% SR; 40% intermediate). Revised financial assessment demonstrates this is maximum reasonable AH. Original agreement states that if no AH provider offers to purchase units, requirement is commuted to off site provision.
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	Original BR size mix accepted.
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Not raised
External playspace	3D.13	Applicant provided information to demonstrate policy compliance
Design policies	4B.1/3	Compliance with new housing design standards secured
Strategic views	4B.16	No new issues
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No new issues

Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Crossrail contribution of £627,040. Contribution to bus services increased from £1.5m in original s106 to £2.2m.
Renewable Energy	4A.7	New energy strategy to be submitted
Planning conditions		Compliance with new design standards secured by condition
s106 agreement		Contributions to Crossrail and bus services. New clause on site wide energy
Other Issues		

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Approved housing mix should be revisited and justified against housing need, revised policy and viability. Possibility of increasing 3B+ units should be considered. Viability submission may require further independent assessment
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	Assessment of playspace required
Urban Design	Scheme should demonstrate that it meets draft Housing Design Guide standards
Inclusive Design	No issues raised
Climate change mitigation	Queries on energy strategy. More information required on overheating, passive design, green and brown roofs and walls and water use. CSH4 must be achieved
Transport	Contribution to Crossrail required. estimated at £517,040 – £627,040. Noted £3.5m contribution to DLR extension paid in advance of original s106 agreement. Need for new assessment of scheme impact and additional mitigation measures required.

Process

Financial viability	New assessment submitted. This demonstrated that the existing consented scheme would only be viable in terms of delivering a 20% profit (relative to toolkit 17% norm) with a 20% increase in houseprices.
Documentation	Briefing for Deputy Mayor May 2010 Energy Strategy New financial appraisal on approved scheme (August 2010) by Knight Frank L B Newham planning report including 2007 s106 agreement Phasing plan Open space plan Masterplan design code (2003) Access Statement (2006)

	Transport statement by Halcrow 92010)
Mixed Use requirement	No issues raised
Employment generation/loss	No new assessment
Climate change mitigation	Additional agreement on submission of a site wide energy strategy
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Draft Housing Design Standards
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded

Case History: Scheme was originally approved on completion of section 106 agreement on 27 April 2007. The original consent was granted to Silvertown Quays Ltd. In April 2005. Consent granted for site-wide energy strategy in September 2007.

NOTE. SELECTED DOCUMENTS ONLY. FULL FILE NOT PROVIDED

Overall Comments

Although this was an application for extension of existing planning consent, agreed under the 2004 London Plan policies, the Mayor in effect treated the application as a new application requiring a full assessment in relation to the 2008 London Plan policies. The main new requirement was a contribution to Crossrail. A revised financial appraisal was accepted as justification for original affordable housing proposal. Given the financial appraisal and additional requirements to fund Crossrail and bus services, it is perhaps surprising that the applicant did not seek to negotiate a lower affordable housing proportion. The Mayor also ensured that the 2007 energy strategy was updated and secured compliance with new housing design standards. The Mayor did pursue the proposition raised at stage1 that more family sized homes could be provided. The contentious issue of the aquarium consent was not revisited, even though this was a factor in the overall scheme viability and the relatively low affordable housing proportion.

SCHEME NAME SOUTHALL GAS WORKS

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 2310/02

LA L B Ealing and LB Hillingdon

Planning Application type: Outline (+ full application for access works)

Referral Category: 1A;1B

STAGE 2 Date 22 December 2009

Decision Mayor took over application and granted consent on
29 September 2010

STAGE 1 Date(s) 9 December 2008; 23 September 2009

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Outline application

Demolition of 22 houses; the remediation of the land and the redevelopment of the site to deliver a large mixed use development including residential, non-food retail, food retail, restaurants, bars and cafes, hotel, conference and banqueting, cinema, health care facilities, education facilities, office/studio units, sports pavilion, an energy centre, multi-storey car park and associated car and cycle parking, landscaping, public realm, open space and children's play space.

Full application

New access roads from the Hayes bypass and Southall centre to the application site for vehicle, cycle and pedestrian access, including drainage and a flood relief pond. Widening of South Road across the railway line, widening of South Road over the railway line for the creation of a bus lane and three new accesses onto Beaconsfield Road. Two new footbridges to provide central pedestrian and cycle access to the Minet Country Park, bridging over the canal and Yeading Brook and to Minet Country Park and Springfield Road

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential with retail, leisure and offices (one operational gasholder to be retained)

Existing land use: Operational gas holders, industrial uses and car parking

Applicant: National Grid Property Ltd
Architect: MAKE architects
Agent: RPS

Site Area: 44.7 hectares (stage 1 report says 36.5 hectares)
PTAL: Ranges from 3 (eastern end of site) to 0 (western end of site)

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Site within Southall Opportunity Area. Principle of mix of uses on site Impact on Green Belt: Pedestrian bridges welcomed as improve access to
Density policy compliance	3A.3	Residential density does not appear to have been considered in either stage 1 or stage 2 reports, neither of which include any density calculations.
AH proportions	3A.9/10	3,750 residential units AH offer increased from 20% to 30% in bedroom spaces : (50% social rent and 50% intermediate)- 915 units out of 3,750 (24% units) This was acceptable to LB Ealing. However Mayor remained concerned that review of viability necessary to demonstrate maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing was delivered.
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	SR mix: 10% 1B;49% 2B; 31% 3B; 10% 4B+ Intermediate mix: 30% 1B; 40% 2B; 20% 3B; 10% 4B+ Market housing mix not specified

Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Not raised in stage 2 report
External playspace	3D.13	Further information supplied so policy compliant
Design policies	4B.1/3	Policy compliant – ‘one of the most humane and well thought out masterplans’. Concern re eastern access (change of level) resolved.
Strategic views	4B.16	Not considered
Social infrastructure including education and he education, health	3A.7/18/21/24	Reports do not include social infrastructure impact assessment. However health facility and junior school and other facilities to be provided through s106 agreement.
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Significant contributions to transport improvements (see below) TfL concerned to ensure appropriate phasing of transport developments, and need for clarification through s106 agreement. Proposed parking provision meets London Plan standards. Provision for electric vehicles necessary. Cycle provision enhancement required.
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Generally satisfactory. Measures to be secured through planning conditions.
Planning conditions		Conditions needed to ensure cycle parking provision, footbridges and other access links..
s106 agreement		£6.6m for buses; £4.3m to mitigate other transport impacts. Crossrail contribution not sought as stage 1 report preceded publication of draft Crossrail SPG (October 2009) Extensive list of other s106 contributions: Provision of 2,550 sq m health facility Provision of 3,450 sq m junior school and nursery £5,131,456 contribution to secondary school provision £1,000,000 for local parks and open space £100,000 for allotments £262,000 for provision and maintenance of trees £750,000 for burial space £1,500,000 contribution to a swimming pool £678,000 to employment and training provision £360,000 to shop mobility scheme £596,000 public realm improvements £ 689,000 for low emissions strategy £50,000 for council contaminated land officer post 200 sq m facility (value of £350,000) for community police station £50,000 signage for town centre £100,000 for Southall town centre car parking £100,000 for controlled parking zones £2,752,520 for Minet Country Park £821,000 for secondary and post 16 education in Hillingdon £20,000 for strategic master plan for wider area £4,000,000 for land remediation £660,000 improved access along canal
Other Issues	Retail	Scale and impact acceptable – New town centre will complement existing

		Southall town centre
--	--	----------------------

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Initial proposal 20% affordable , of which 60% social rent; 40% intermediate) Broad compliance with requirements but financial appraisal required
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	Substantial provision but compliance cannot be assessed until dwelling mix fixed.
Urban Design	Design proposals supported
Inclusive Design	10% of hotel rooms need to be made accessible. Concern that no wheelchair accessible units in market housing
Climate change mitigation/Energy	50% green roof commitment welcomed. Further information on water usage and water run-off required. Two alternative energy strategies submitted require assessment. Further modelling required.
Transport	Car parking: 950 non-resi spaces and 2,625 resi spaces proposed.
Blue Ribbon Network	Broadly acceptable. Flood risk and flood storage need to be assessed.
Retail	No concerns
Green Belt	Pedestrian bridges welcomed as improve access to Green Belt
Biodiversity	Access to Country Park will be improved. Contribution to maintenance should be considered.

Process

Financial viability	Financial appraisal submitted by RPS and subject to independent assessment by DVS (Valuatin Office). Copies on file. Independent assessment concluded that increased affordable housing output possible but that 50% affordable housing was unlikely to be viable. Mayor requested review mechanism for 20 year scheme, which was not accepted by developer. L B Ealing decided not to pursue issue.
Documentation	L B Hillingdon planning report LB Ealing planning report Consultation responses Ss106 agreement Mayoral site visit briefing March 2010 Final Decision and s106 agreement – 29 September 2010. Stage 4 report 25 March 2010 Stage 3 Report 22 December 2009 Indicative site masterplan from developer (2008) , comprising: Planning Statement Housing strategy Retail assessment PADHI Report (hazards from high pressure pipelines)

	Sustainability Strategy Retail assessment Energy Strategy Remediation Strategy Design and access statement Energy report CHP report Flood risk appraisal Site and scheme plans
Mixed Use requirement	No issues raised
Employment generation/loss	No figures on employment generation are included in stage 1 or stage 2 reports.
Climate change mitigation	Series of detailed reports submitted.
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Standard references Ealing Core Strategy (Issues and Options) Hillingdon Core Strategy (Preferred Options) Ealing UDP (2004)
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded Mayoral site visit in March 2010 Mayoral hearing on 25 March 2010
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded

Case history: On 4 November 2009, L B Ealing refused application, overturning officers' recommendation to approve. The ground for refusal was the anticipated increase in local road congestion.

On 10 December 2009, L B Hillingdon refused consent on their officers' recommendation. The grounds for refusal were: visual impact on Green Belt (Minet country park); detriment to ecological value of Minet country park; lack of contributions to mitigate impact on local infrastructure ; adverse impacts on highway network.

Overall Comments

Mayor supported the overall development as meeting arrange of strategic objectives relating to housing provision and retail and leisure and office uses with contributions to health and education facilities. The project was based on a Masterplan provided by the developers, without any L B Ealing planning brief or masterplan for the site. There seems to have been no comprehensive independent assessment of scheme impacts and social infrastructure requirements, other than in relation to calculations of s106 contributions (though the basis of these calculations is not on file). While there is a comprehensive assessment of transport impacts, there is no analysis of residential density either for the overall scheme or for individual phases. Given the low PTAL level of the western end of the site, there appears to have been no assessment of whether the scheme complied with London Plan policies of Sustainable Residential Quality at either stage 1 or stage 2. A density calculation is included in the representation hearing report of 25 March 2010, but even at that

stage there is a statement that until bus routes were completed, PTAL levels - and consequently applicable density ranges, could not be determined. There also appears to be no reference in the reports to any quantification of jobs to be created from the significant non-residential floorspace. The Mayor's intervention did however lead to significant improvements if the overall proposal, both in terms of the affordable housing offer, and contributions to infrastructure provision. The application finally determined by the Mayor appears to have been not significantly different from that rejected by L B Ealing. It should be noted that the Secretary of State decided not to call in the application and left to the Mayor to determine.

SCHEME NAME ST LEONARDS HOSPITAL, HACKNEY

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 2477a/02 LA Hackney

Planning Application type: Outline
Referral Category: 2

STAGE 2 Date : 22 February 2010 Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) : 2 February 2010

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Outline application for erection of a 3-storey building to accommodate a secure mental health unit (use class C2A) and associated works including landscaping, car parking, cycle parking and access.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Health facility

Existing land use: Health facility

Applicant: East London NHS Foundation Trust/ City and Hackney Primary Care Trust
Architect Sonnemann Toon Architects Ltd
Agent

Site Area: 1.61 hectares

PTAL : 3 (will increase to 5 with opening East London Line Station later in the year)

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	No change of use involved
Density policy compliance	3A.3	N/A
AH proportions	3A.9/10	N/A
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	N/A
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	N/A
External playspace	3D.13	N/A
Design policies	4B.1/3	No concerns
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	Complies with policy 3A.18 on health facilities

Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Policy compliant with s106 contributions
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Policy compliance through condition
Planning conditions		Conditions to secure access consultant, renewable energy
s106 agreement		£10,000 for bus stop and £2,500 for travel plan monitoring.
Other Issues		

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	N/A
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	N/A
Urban Design	Broadly compliant. Further images requested
Inclusive Design	Access consultant should be involved in detailed design.
Climate change mitigation	Energy strategy broadly acceptable but enhancements sought.
Transport	Reduction in car parking provision welcomed. Further cycle parking should be considered. £10,000 sought to improve nearest bus stop.

Process

Financial viability	N/A
Documentation	Full file not provided so not known if any supporting documentation.
Mixed Use requirement	No issues raised
Employment generation/loss	No assessment
Climate change mitigation	Further information on energy strategy provided
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Standard documents. Text refers to Draft Replacement London Plan policies

Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None Recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None Recorded

NOTE. SELECTED DOCUMENTS ONLY. FULL FILE NOT PROVIDED

Overall Comments

The Mayor secured compliance on access, climate change mitigation and adaptation through conditions and section 106 contributions. The Mayor supported the use of a health site for an additional health facility. The application did not raise substantive strategic policy issues.

SCHEME NAME STOCKWELL STREET, GREENWICH

GLA REFERENCE PDU/0346a/03

LA Greenwich

Planning Application type: Full

Referral Category: 1B

STAGE 2 Date 23 September 2008

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 25 June 2008

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Mixed use development comprising 129 flats, retail and restaurant uses, office accommodation and market stalls, together with associated landscaping, car parking, servicing, plant and access.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential, with retail and office uses

Existing land use: Former petrol filling station used as market

Applicant: Capital and Counties Properties

Architect : Siddell Gibson

Agent : Montagu Evans

Site Area: 0.85 hectares

PTAL : 5 (will increase with DLR upgrade and Greenwich Waterfront Transit)

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Site is within World Heritage. Site boundary and within West Greenwich Conservation Area. Mixed use redevelopment supported with provision for continuation of market stalls
Density policy compliance	3A.3	Not specified or raised in reports.

AH proportions	3A.9/10	129 flats :14 SR; 31 intermediate; 84 market . AH 35% of total. SR: intermediate ratio inverted from 70:30 to 30:70
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	2 4B SR and 1 4B market units now included in the scheme. 17% units as 3B+ . FV appraisal justifies maximum viable AH provision. Proposal acceptable.
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Not specified or raised in reports.
External playspace	3D.13	Requirement of 490 sq m not provided within application but L B Greenwich to apply condition. Noted Greenwich Park playground close to site.
Design policies	4B.1/3	Proposals acceptable ‘ if far from exemplary’ Some design changes made in response to representations from CABE.
Strategic views	4B.16	Not raised in report.
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No references in report (Scheme less than 150 dwellings)
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	£220,000 transport contribution secured. Though below TfL’s total request, this is acceptable.
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Responses to queries generally satisfactory.
Planning conditions		Playspace provision conditioned.
s106 agreement		Significant transport contributions.
Other Issues		Temporary relocation of market stalls not possible. Objections from World Heritage Site Executive discounted

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Proposed tenure split not justified. Maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing not adequately demonstrated by financial appraisal.
Air Quality	Not raised
Children’s Playspace	No on site provision proposed.
Urban Design	Concern that many flats lack internal space and that balconies are too small.
Inclusive Design	Not raised
Climate change mitigation	Applicant requested to consider brown/green roofs, rainwater harvesting and sustainable urban drainage.
Transport	TfL concerned at level of cycle parking provision and absence of trip generation assessment
Other	Concern that part of site remains available for use by market traders

Process

Financial viability	FV assessment submitted and on file. GLA accepted it justified AH proposal as maximum reasonable. Greenwich supported proposed mix, with disproportionate level of intermediate flats. GLA raised a number of queries which were answered satisfactorily.
Documentation	Planning application drawings L B Greenwich planning report Consultation responses ARUP report on energy and response to GLA queries on energy proposals + BREAM pre-assessment Car parking survey Toolkit appraisal
Mixed Use requirement	No issues raised. (other than market retention issue)
Employment generation/loss	No impact assessment
Climate change mitigation	Detailed information provided I response to queries.
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Standard references only. Greenwich core strategy not yet adopted.
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded

Case History

Previous development proposal refused by L B Greenwich in 2002 on grounds of overdevelopment. Previous Mayor had supported principle of development of site but raised concerns on design being of unsatisfactory standard for location within World Heritage site.

Overall Comments

The assessment is deficient in that neither density or inclusive design issues seem to have been considered. The quantum of affordable housing, proportion of social rent and bedroom size mix were deficient. The Mayor in supporting the 'long overdue' development of this key site accepted a scheme that was in a number of ways not fully policy compliant and only satisfactory design quality. While the reports draw attention to the difficulty of full policy compliance on a town centre site, it is a matter of judgement as to the degree of policy non compliance which is acceptable. It is significant that while planning consent was granted by L B Greenwich, the s106 agreement was never signed and the development has

not taken place. Planning consent was granted in May 2011 for the development of an academic building for the University of Greenwich on this site, with the Mayor deciding to leave the LPA to make this determination.

SCHEME NAME SURBITON HOSPITAL SITE

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 2573/02

LA Kingston

Planning Application type
Referral Category: 3E

STAGE 2 Date

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 25 January 2011

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Demolition of existing hospital buildings, and erection of a part-two, part-three storey healthcare building (4,341 sq.m.), and a part-two, part-three storey two-form entry primary school and nursery (2,803 sq.m.), together with associated, landscaping, access, parking, external stores and ancillary works.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Healthcare and educational buildings

Existing land use: Hospital

Applicant NHS Kingston
Architect Roberts Limbrick Architects
Agent

Site Area 1.47 hectares
PTAL

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Land uses supported as appropriate
Density policy compliance	3A.3	N/A
AH proportions	3A.9/10	N/A
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	N/A
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	N/A
External playspace	3D.13	N/A
Design policies	4B.1/3	Design suitable for site within a conservation area. Accessibility satisfactory
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	Proposal comprises health and educational facilities which are supported
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Additional information provided demonstrated policy compliance

Renewable Energy	4A.7	Policies now met. Applicant proposes joint energy centre for primary school and health centre. Photovoltaic panels proposed.
Planning conditions		
s106 agreement		Transport mitigation measures
Other Issues		Objections from local residents association discounted as not relating to strategic matters. These included querying suitability of site for educational Use or for health use.

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	N/A
Air Quality	Not raised in report (though raised by objectors)
Children's Playspace	N/A
Urban Design	No issues raised
Inclusive Design	No issues raised
Climate change mitigation and Energy	No renewable energy proposals. Insufficient information on sustainable design and construction
Transport	Further information and commitments required on trip generation, modal splits, traffic impact, parking, cycling, bus stop provision, travel planning, and servicing and construction management.

Process

Financial viability	N/A
Documentation	Planning statement; Design and access statement; L B Kingston planning report with objections
Mixed Use requirement	No issues raised in reports
Employment generation/loss	No references (though objectors queried whether additional jobs created or whether additional employees were relocated.
Climate change mitigation	No references

Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Draft replacement plan policies on Health and education, design and inclusive design, climate change and transport
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	16 December 201

Overall Comments

Mayor supported substantive proposal for education and health facilities and did not pursue local objections relating to site unsuitability. Mayor sought and obtained scheme improvements relating to energy, climate change mitigation and transport.

SCHEME NAME THAMES WHARF

GLA REFERENCE PDU/2256/02

LA Newham (LTGDC)

Planning Application type : Full

Referral Category: 2B,4

STAGE 2 Date

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s)

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Change of use from a scrap metal stocking and export facility to a construction and excavation waste transfer station with exportation of waste by river using the existing wharf facilities. The application is for a temporary period up to July 2014.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: construction and excavation waste transfer station

Existing land use: Scrap metal facility

Applicant Keltbray

Architect N/A

Agent Matthews and Son

Site Area: 0.75 hectares

PTAL : 1

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Use of site as safeguarded wharf and strategic industrial location for waste management supported.
--	---------	--

Density policy compliance	3A.3	N/A
AH proportions	3A.9/10	N/A
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	N/A
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	N/A
External playspace	3D.13	N/A
Design policies	4B.1/3	N/A
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	N/A
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Applicants justifications for transport proposals accepted
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Applicant demonstrated minimal additional energy requirements which were acceptable
Planning conditions		TfL support for draft conditions re transport matters
s106 agreement		No references
Other Issues		Applicant demonstrated no reduction in waste capacity. Applicant provided reassurances as to recycling technology and justification for export to Belgium.

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	N/A
Air Quality	
Children's Playspace	N/A
Urban Design	N/A
Inclusive Design	N/A
Climate change mitigation/ Energy	Applicant needs to explore ways of reducing carbon dioxide emissions. Concern that waste being exported to Belgium and not reprocessed within UK.
Transport	Applicant should consider ways of transporting incoming waste to site by river Link to nearby cycle route. Define pedestrian crossings Need to safeguard land for Silvertown Link
Other	Applicant needed to demonstrate no reduction in waste capacity

Process

Financial viability	N/A
Documentation	London Thames Gateway DC planning report Flood Risk Assessment Air Quality Impact Assessment Transport Statement Noise Impact Assessment Sustainability Statement
Mixed Use requirement	N/A
Employment generation/loss	No reference in reports to any employment gain or loss
Climate change mitigation	Applicant responded to points raised.
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Safeguarded wharves strategy; draft Water strategy; Municipal waste management strategy
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	None recorded

Overall Comments

Mayor supported proposed use of site. Reassurances sought and obtained on energy, climate change and transport impacts.

SCHEME NAME **WOODLANDS**

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 2540a/02

LA L B Hammersmith and Fulham

Planning Application type: Full

Referral Category: 1B, 1C

STAGE 2 Date 11 November 2010

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s) 13 September 2010

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Development of postgraduate student accommodation comprising 606 student residential units

and associated facilities, along with a local community hall and 9 residential units.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Student accommodation

Existing land use: Vacant BBC offices

Applicant: Imperial College London

Architect: Aukett Fitzroy Robinson

Agent: Jones Lang LaSalle

Site Area: Not stated

PTAL : 5

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Site within White City Opportunity Area. Mix of uses acceptable. Postgraduate student accommodation compliant with objectives for Opportunity Area.
Density policy compliance	3A.3	Acceptable (though no calculations in reports)
AH proportions	3A.9/10	AH requirement does not apply as proposal primarily student housing and general needs housing of 9 units is below 10 unit threshold. Legal agreement re student use satisfactory.
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	N/A (as student housing)
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Amendments made so scheme compliant
External playspace	3D.13	Amendments made so scheme compliant
Design policies	4B.1/3	Some changes to design made. LA supported design proposal. Concerns dropped in light of infrastructure contribution
Strategic views	4B.16	Not considered
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	Proposals supports policies on higher education provision. Other social infrastructure not considered
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Satisfactory response to queries raised.
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Information provided to address concerns
Planning conditions		Required climate change measures to be secured by conditions.
s106 agreement		£1m for infrastructure improvements £120,000 for development infrastructure funding study
Other Issues		

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	No substantive issues
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	Further information required.
Urban Design	Not acceptable - concerns with general layout and landscaping
Inclusive Design	Lifetime homes compliance but only 5% wheelchair accessible not 10%. Access statement weak.
Climate change mitigation/energy	Compliance with energy hierarchy. Further information required on carbon savings. More information required on water use and biodiversity.
Transport	Car parking and cycling provision acceptable. Pedestrian Environment Review System (PERS) audit required.

Process

Financial viability	Assessment not required
Documentation	Scheme drawings Energy calculation Travel Plan targets PERS audit (Pedestrian access) Response to GLA transport queries
Mixed Use requirement	No issues
Employment generation/loss	Not considered
Climate change mitigation	Specialist reports submitted
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	White City Opportunity Area Framework Housing SPG EIP draft Draft Replacement London Plan (October 2009) Hammersmith and Fulham Core Strategy Options
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	15 April 2010
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	1 March 2010 19 April 2010 30 June 2010

--	--

Overall Comments

Mayor supported scheme as contribution to policy objects on higher education. Concerns re design not pursued in the light of minor design changes and contribution to infrastructure improvements. No consideration of density of development and local social infrastructure impacts.

SCHEME NAME **ZENITH HOUSE**

GLA REFERENCE PDU/ 1447b/02

LA Barnet

Planning Application type: Detailed

Referral Category: 1A, 1C

STAGE 2 Date :8 February 2011

Decision LA to Determine

STAGE 1 Date(s): 30 November 2010

Scheme Proposal (summary)

Detailed planning permission is sought for 309 residential units in the form of 292 flats and seventeen mews houses, 1,611 sq.m. of office (B1) or community (D1) floorspace and 97 sq.m. retail (A1 or A3). The proposal comprises two and three storey mews houses, a 6-storey perimeter block around a central landscaped courtyard, a seven storey street block fronting Edgware Road and a sixteen storey tower. 226 residential car parking spaces, 335 cycle parking spaces and refuse storage are proposed at basement level, with vehicular access from Colindeep Lane.

Scheme proposal: predominant land use: Residential with office and retail

Existing land use: Office (with residential consent)

Applicant: Genesis Housing group

Architect: Pollard Thomas Edwards

Agent: Rolf Judd

Site Area: 1.1 hectares

PTAL: 2 (north of site); 3 (east of site); 4 (south and west of site)

Policy compliance

Change of land use/protected open space/strategic industrial locations	3D.9/10	Site within Colindale Opportunity Area and within Edgware Road Corridor of Change. Mix of uses acceptable.
Density policy compliance	3A.3	816 hrh 9 LP range for PTAL 3 200-450 hrh. Proposal acceptable as 'well designed, will provide good quality

		accommodation with adequate amenity space, and will relate positively and be well integrated into the existing and emerging context”
AH proportions	3A.9/10	97 SR (35%); 38 intermediate (13%), 174 private (52%) Policy compliant. Intermediate homes meet LP affordability definition.
Bedroom size mix	3A.5	109 1Bs, 160 2Bs, 29 3Bs, 11 4Bs. Acceptable
Lifetime homes/wheelchair homes	3A.5	Policy compliant
External playspace	3D.13	Revised layout to be submitted
Design policies	4B.1/3	Welcomed as improvement on consented scheme. Revisions to ensure compliance but additional work on wind mitigation required.
Strategic views	4B.16	N/A (Scheme includes 16 storey tower)
Social infrastructure including education, health and leisure	3A.7/18/21/24	No assessment, despite high density (Scheme under policy 3A.7 500 unit threshold)
Transport including parking provision	3C.1	Satisfied by s106m contributions
Renewable Energy	4A.7	Policy compliant with further information provided in response to queries
Planning conditions		Condition re revised carparking layout to ensue accessible access
s106 agreement		£135,000 for bus network enhancements, £100,000 for step free access at Colindale underground station, £20,000 for bus stop upgrades, £100,000 for junction improvements, £50,000 for public realm, £10,000 for CPZ review and implementation. £92,700 for Oyster card, car club and cycle vouchers.
Other Issues		Local objections do not raise strategic issues

Issues raised at stage 1:

Housing	Tenure and BR mix satisfactory. Applicant do demonstrate that 3 bedroom intermediate units meet LP affordability criteria.
Air Quality	Not raised
Children's Playspace	Additional on site playspace for under 5's required
Urban Design	Concerns re materials, wind levels, cycle access and design of retail unit
Inclusive Design	Additional blue badge holder car parking spaces sought
Climate change mitigation	Further information on carbon dioxide savings required
Transport	Car and cycle parking management plan required

Process

Financial viability	Three Dragons Toolkit submitted (but not seen).
Documentation	Note of pre-application meetings Proposal summary (for pre-application meeting) Pre-application submission Scheme layouts and schedules Energy strategy Childrens Playspace Strategy Planning Statement (Design and access statement and Landscape Strategy submitted but not seen)
Mixed Use requirement	No issues raised
Employment generation/loss	No assessment
Climate change mitigation	Further information on climate change mitigation provided. Energy reports on file.
Policy reference sources (outside 2008 London Plan)	Draft Replacement London Plan Colindale Action Plan
Pre-applic presentation to Mayor	None Recorded
Pre-application meetings with PDU officers	6 July 2010; 20 September 2010

NOTE. SELECTED DOCUMENTS ONLY. FULL FILE NOT PROVIDED

Case History. Site was granted planning consent for 215 residential units and 4,286 sq m community (D1) floorspace in 2007 with renewal for three years in August 2010.

Overall Comments

Mayoral intervention secured significant transport contributions. High density scheme supported as meeting other strategic policy requirements. No assessment as to impact of development on social infrastructure within the area.