

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	
Outline application for redevelopment of site involving the demolition of 1314 existing residential units and construction of 2977 new residential units providing a total of 3400 units on the Estate; provision of approximately 9074sqm replacement retail (class A1), food and drink (class A3) and social and community (class D1) uses with associated public and private open space, car parking and access arrangements.	Grahame Park, Colindale	Barnet	543a	14/06/04	1A 3A	Stage 2	The conclusion states that it is a comprehensive, first rate master plan. Only commented upon affordable housing; whilst 36% provision does not meet the London Plan provision of 50%, the scheme would not be viable at higher levels.	Agreed; the proposal is welcomed and will provide various strategic benefits.	No		1224 (36%). Circa £1m transport and pedestrian improvements.	Yes. "There would be a minor reduction in open space provision; however a substantial gain in the quality of open space is proposed." It is likely that this meets policy 3d.12. A range of different types of open space will be provided.		No. No energy assessment or renewables were provided/requested, failing 4a.8. However it is understood that the applicant has formed a company to supply communal energy. It is unclear if the application meets policy 4a.7. The demolition of 1314 flats has not been justified in environmental terms. 460 are being retained, and there may be design solutions that would enable further retention. More selective demolition plus redesign were briefly considered but ruled out for profit/funding reasons, but this is not a material consideration. Built in the 1970's, they are not said to suffer from defects, and are likely to have cavity walls suitable for insulating. They are brick-built and so have very high embodied energy; the proposal for replacement also seems to be brick. Existing density is 193hr/h, broadly commensurate with the London Plan guide of 200-300 in this area. Whilst demolition may be justified in social terms, the demolition of these buildings conflicts with a key objective of 4B.6, which is to re-use land and buildings.	The stage 1 report states the applicant "has illustrated development layouts that take account of solar orientation and other non-technical mechanisms to promote energy efficiently [sic] and light airy spaces". The issue is not raised in the stage 2 report.	No	No. SuDS/rainwater recycling/low water use appliances have not been provided/requested. Whilst this is an outline application the Mayor should have raised this at an early stage to ensure compliance, but no mention of it in stage 1/2 reports. There would be sufficient roof space to provide rainwater for irrigation purposes at the very least. SuDS may be suitable since much open space is proposed and the land is unlikely to be contaminated. The developer is Countryside Properties who are known for their sustainable building credentials in some developments.	None	Partially; there will be some loss of trees but in general, existing bland grassed space will be given a greater variety of planting and uses. A management plan and further details would be required to secure the proposed ecological improvements to the pond, meadow creation and planting of trees and shrubs. Private gardens will be created to some flats/houses, and these can offer a valuable habitats if the applicant commits to include certain types of planting/water/soil before letting/selling. The stage 1 report states that the applicant "has identified the need to undertake an ecology audit and action plan to identify built solutions such as brown/green roofs". This is less committal than agreeing to install the features. The issue is not followed up in the stage 2 report.		The Mayor did not take the opportunity at the outline permission stage to ensure the redevelopment meets his energy and water policies. The demolition of so many units of housing represents a large energy cost and no renewable energy measures are proposed.

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	
Demolition of 603 existing residential units, school and all other existing buildings on the site and redevelopment to include the erection of 1355 new residential units, community centre with health facility, church, church Hall and parsonage and provision of associated public and private open space and car parking with new accesses onto Stonegrove and Spur Road and retention of existing accesses at Green Lane and Kings Drive	Land at Stonegrove, Edgware	Barnet	546	09/03/04	1A 3A	Stage 2	Supported; the existing estate is of poor quality and the increase in density and amount of affordable housing is welcomed; it maximises the potential for this location.	"The concerns raised by the Mayor at the consultation stage have been appropriately addressed by the applicant."	No	City Academy adjacent to the north of the site has outline planning permission.	638 (47%)	Partially; The area is adjacent to green belt land and consists mostly of grass punctuated by tall buildings. The proposal will increase the built surface and the distribution of buildings across the site. Some loss of what is currently a school playing field will occur, to be replaced by alternative space over a road, but this was permitted by a approval of a separate application for the adjacent school academy. Policy 3d.7, 4b.6 and 4b.9 are met to a good extent, with high quality spaces around buildings, designed in consultation with residents.	Accepted	The application makes little reference to sustainable design and at present does not meet the Mayor's policies 4a.7 (energy efficiency), 4a.8 (energy assessment), 4a.9 (renewables). The stage 1 report states "This is an Outline Planning Application. However, the applicant has illustrated development layouts that take account of solar orientation and other non-technical mechanisms to promote energy efficiently and light airy spaces. Within the Design Statement there is commitment to promoting waste separation in kitchens, recycling of receptacles for each property and door-to-door collection." This does not reflect the breadth of requirements of policy 4b.6 (sustainable design and construction principles.	None	No	Brief mention of SuDS but this appears to be for paved/surfaced areas not for the buildings. Therefore the application meets 4C.8 but not policy 4a.11.	None	This is only at outline stage but make little commitment to corridors/networks of green spaces with regard to biodiversity, nor any indication that a management plan is desirable and forthcoming. The 'Landscape Strategy' is more concerned with the human response to the environment; a 'green chain' is proposed but this does not provide the physical links necessary for animals and plants. Up to 46 trees protected by TPO's will be lost; these may contain bat roosts but this is being mitigated. The application does not propose gains to the biodiversity of the site, so only partially meets policies 3d.12 and 4b.6.	Potential loss of bat habitat mentioned in stage 1 report but loss of trees not commented upon.	It is of concern that energy-efficient design issues were not addressed by the applicant nor followed up in the stage 2 report. Reserved matters will not be referred to the Mayor this large development may be built out despite not meeting London Plan policies on water use and in particular energy efficiency and renewables.
Demolition of existing golf club house and erection of a new leisure centre with provision of 156 car parking spaces, parking for 3 coaches, landscaping and alterations to existing access road	Sidcup Golf Club	Bexley	0197a	22/03/04	3D	Stage 2	Principle of the development is accepted. Concerns on pedestrian access, inclusive design, lack of energy statement and no consideration of CHP.	For the LPA to determine itself. The circumstances for development on MOL are agreed to be exceptional; applicant has responded to most concerns on access and energy.	No			Unclear. The stage 1 report considers in detail all 9 justifications by the applicant for the inappropriate development on MOL and says that there is only one persuasive exceptional reason for the development, and that itself "has its faults" (the test for alternative sites). If this is accepted as proper then most open space policies are met. Although there will be a small		Partially. 4a.7 is met in part, since £100k of PV's are to be included to reduce CO2 emissions by 1% pa. 4a.8 is met in part; an energy assessment was submitted upon request, considering renewables and design measures for energy efficiency. It does not explicitly have regard to the energy hierarchy but it is in line with it to a fair extent. CHP and solar water heating are considered unviable/unnecessary since the design minimises heat requirements to the extent that there is no heating demand in the summer. However	Energy assessment was requested by GLA prior to stage 1, with a strong request for 10% renewables.	No	No. No consideration of rainwater recycling or SuDS. The energy assessment considers extracting water from a borehole rather than mains supply, but does not proceed with this despite evident viability. The proposal accordingly fails policy 4a.11 since it does not minimise the use of treated water. SuDS may have been viable given the open nature of the site, with space for soakaways etc, and the development represents a large increase in impermeable surface since it replaces open ground; therefore the development fails policy 4c.8 and 4b.6 with respect to water.	None	Partially. The EIA considers the few negative potential impacts of the development and gives adequate mitigation measures. However, enhancements are not proposed, not meeting 3d.12. It is not clear that the building incorporates enhancements in line with 4b.6.		There was strong political will in favour of this application which the applicant conceded was inappropriate development on MOL but represented very special circumstances. Those circumstances are not robust but in the absence of further proof to the contrary the one strong argument was accepted as valid by the Mayor, namely that it was the only suitable site for this much-needed facility. It is disappointing that given the less than robust justification of how the application met the Mayor's open space policies, that it did not also properly meet or exceed the requirements of the Mayor's energy, water and biodiversity policies. GLA officers raised MOL and energy issues from the earliest stage as high

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?		
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)			
												loss in open space, the layout of the existing playing fields will be reconfigured to allow provision of an equal number of playing fields, also sports courts and a sports hall will be made available for the schools affected. In practical terms, this re-provision is more usable and beneficial to the schools.		the applicant does not state if this is space heating or water heating; water will require heating all year round. 4b.6 is met in part since heat recovery and passive solar heating are included, although buildings are not re-used and waste minimisation/recycling has not been proposed.									priorities and followed them through the course of the process.
Outline planning permission for the demolition of existing college buildings and students residential accommodation and redevelopment of the site for residential purposes. Approximately 251 residential dwellings, amended vehicular access, landscaping and open space.	Ravensbourne College	Bromley	1016	12/11/04	3D 3E	Stage 1	Principle is accepted; openness of MOL will not be affected though conditions will be required to protect woodland on the site. A guarantee to meet Lifetime homes standards must be in place before referral at stage 2. This is an outline application but reserved matters should take account of energy and community access.	Has not reached stage 2 yet.	No	N/A	75 (30%) £225,000 to public transport, £1.3m to education, £250,000 to highway works, £115,000 to public art and £25,000 to environmental improvements.	Yes. MOL designation is being reviewed by LB Bromley on an Inspector's recommendation, since the site is already partially developed. Therefore much of the land is being re-used (policy 4b.6). The wooded edges are being protected and enhanced; the redevelopment represents an overall slight reduction in building footprint, but it will increase in its coverage of the site (i.e. buildings more spread out). It may result in lower building heights since the present buildings vary between (equivalent of) 1-4 storeys. New footpaths are proposed (3d.10).	Extensive negotiation with the applicant and LB Bromley.	No. This is an outline application, so leaves certain details to 'reserved matters' stage. However the stage 1 report calls for an obligation whereby the applicant must provide an energy assessment and a renewables feasibility study with regard to policy 4a.7, and selecting heating in line with the Mayor's energy hierarchy. This is a positive way of ensuring that the development meets the Mayor's energy policies, since once approved at outline, the application will not be referred to the Mayor. Waste issues were not mentioned.	Report states "The scheme is in relatively early design stages therefore, the applicant has a significant opportunity to include renewable energy technologies, where feasible."	No	No. It is an outline application but these matters have not been considered in the application nor by the GLA in the stage 1 report. 4a.11 and 4c.8 are not discussed yet it may be that the development could support SuDS and rainwater harvesting, and similar measures. However the overall built area of the site will not increase except for the amount of road surfaces into which SuDS which is more difficult to incorporate.	None as yet	Yes. The applicant has been open to negotiation on this aspect, and only is developing the centre of the site which is already highly developed. The wooded edges are being protected and enhanced. Applicant submitted an ecological assessment, tree assessment, and protected species survey. The 'outline landscape and wildlife management plan' does not constitute a management plan as it stands. However it does meet policy 3d.12, having regard to nature conservation and exploring opportunities for gains for nature.	Negotiation leading towards conditions and s106 to protect and manage woodland habitats.	The report demonstrates a strong will to secure good environmental standards from the applicant and is particularly strong in requesting s106 agreement to include the provision of an energy assessment and renewables feasibility study to be provided prior to the reserved matters stage of granting full permission. It is disappointing that the stage 1 report does not refer to policy 4a.11 and 4c.8 since it looks feasible and beneficial to include SuDS etc, as it is not on contaminated/densely-built land.		
Demolition of existing buildings and erection of part 8, 11 and 20 storey residential building comprising 69 private residential units and 81 affordable units and a 9 and 10 storey buildings comprising B1, A1/2/3/D1 uses at	Euston, Osnaburgh and Longford Street	Camden	1030	04/08/04	1C	Stage 1	Will make better use of the site and bring significant improvements in urban design, mixed use and housing, including an acceptable affordable housing contribution. All	Not yet reached Stage 2	No		81 (54%)	Yes. 4b.6 and 4b.9 are met as a variety of high quality spaces are being created. The site is already built on, and the applicant is creating landscaped areas related to ground floor	No s106 suggestions yet.	No. An energy assessment is included but there is no demonstration that heating has been chosen in line with the energy hierarchy (condensing gas boilers), failing 4a.8. The feasibility of CHP is to be 'reviewed'; this should have been done at the earliest	Stage 1 report asks for a sustainability assessment that shows that the requirements of policies 4a.7, 4a.8 and 4a.9.	Yes	No. Some low-water use appliances incorporated; whilst seeking a 'Very Good/Excellent' BREEM rating for the offices, it only seeks a 'Good' rating for the residential. The feasibility of a rainwater and/or grey water recycling scheme is to be 'reviewed'. As the application stands it fails policies 4a.11, 4b.6 and	Sustainability statement requested in stage 1 report.	Partially. No significant losses to biodiversity; the site is already heavily developed. The only gains proposed in line with policy 3d.12 are "nesting boxes for the black redstart", however the applicant also states that the proposed development offers no suitable habitat. It is the case that boxes are	No comments in stage 1 report, notwithstanding the fact that it was considered in this application not to be an issue.	This application currently lacks renewable energy measures, limited energy efficiency and water conservation measures. The development does not currently meet the exemplary 'sustainable construction and standards required in policy 4b.9. However this may change after stage 2		

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	
ground floor level plus basement and sub basement levels, single storey cafe associated access points including in/out roadway, parking, servicing, open areas and landscaping							will contribute to the objectives of the London Plan. Some issues raised in relation to urban design.					uses e.g. cafes, with trees and other planting. These will be between tall buildings and follow desire lines, of access for pedestrians across the site and to neighbouring buildings. However they are unlikely to be a destination of themselves, rather for such users of the buildings. A "semi-private" horticultural garden is being created with water features. No recreational space is proposed however, and could be secured by s106 to meet 3d.7.		design stage. No renewables are proposed, failing key objectives of 4a.7 and 4a.9. Energy demand is only slightly lower than the benchmark allowed under Building Regulations as quoted by the applicant. Whilst seeking a 'Very Good/Excellent' BREEAM rating for the offices, it only seeks a 'Good' rating for the residential, It does not represent "exemplary standards or sustainable construction and resource management" as expected in tall buildings under policy 4b.9.			4c.8. It does also not represent "exemplary standards or sustainable construction and resource management" as expected in tall buildings under policy 4b.9.		unlikely to be used by black redstarts if they are simply placed on vertical walls birds or if there is no habitat nearby. The applicant is not providing brown/green and it is not apparent whether the boxes will be on vertical walls.		
New development comprising a new hospital complex constructed on basement ground and 7 floors, roof plant, subterranean energy centre, surface car park and new pedestrian and vehicular access. Alterations to east wing, KGV block, old and new pathology building, Robin Brook centre and catering block. Landscaping and engineering operations to the hospital square including removal of trees, refurbishment of fountain, shelters and lamps.	St Bartholemews Hospital	Corporation of London	0973	07/05/04	1B	Stage 2	Agreed; architecture and wayfinding are good; some outstanding details on accessibility to be resolved.	Agreed; issues raised have been resolved except for cycle provision	No		None	Open space is being enhanced for hospital visitors and pedestrians, by preventing vehicular access to squares. However the LPA is concerned that there may be a loss of mature trees.	Stage 1/2 reports do not mention.	4a.7, 4a.8, 4a.9: Partially; 10% renewables but no details/commitment; energy hierarchy not observed. The energy requirement is very high. The first stage of the energy hierarchy is 'use less energy'. CHP is dismissed due to lack of economic viability in the short term, however the applicant contradicts this by elsewhere stating "the procurement route ... encourages the provider to consider the sustainable and efficient energy provision through the FM responsibilities inherent in this process." The applicant states that NHS Trust requirements preclude non-carbon fuels due to the need for continuity of supply. The relevant Trust policies are not quoted. The LPA strongly wishes the hospital link to the Citigen district trigeneration CHP. This is secure with a full backup; the same company supply hospitals in Leeds and	Stage 1/2 reports do not mention.	Stage 1/2 reports do not mention.	Partially. Water-efficient appliances included. Other measures are said to be precluded due to stringent NHS guidelines such as continuity of energy/water supply. However it achieves fairly low scores (44%, "Good" rating) on the NEAT assessment developed by the BRE to assess NHS buildings. This is compared to 60% and higher ratings in other areas. It has not been demonstrated why this building cannot achieve a higher score. The LPA is asking for rainwater collection for irrigation purposes.	Stage 1/2 reports do not mention.	No. Whilst there are no significant negative impacts due to lack of existing habitat, opportunities are not being taken to enhance habitat, e.g. by providing green/brown roofs. Peregrine falcon box may be installed on completion of the development. There will be losses of semi-mature trees.	Stage 1/2 reports do not mention.	Both the stage 1 and 2 reports are notable for not mentioning the Mayor's policies on energy and water. This is a large scale building and so should be 'exemplary' (4b.9). The Mayor could have supported the LPA's strong request for CHP, by directing refusal on energy policy grounds until and unless CHP was included. The development does not meet the Mayor's energy and water policies. Whilst a BRE assessment for hospitals it the refurbishment rates "Very Good" and the new-build "Excellent"; the energy and water scores were only "Good"; social and economic indicators increased the score. The NHS should regard this as unacceptable as all should aim for 'Very Good'/'Excellent'; their policy states CHP is required to secure their intended energy savings. CHP has not been properly considered, yet is entirely viable e.g. via neighbouring district trigeneration system. PPG11 and the London Plan state that it should be included and at the earliest design stage.

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?	
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)		Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?		Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)
Detailed planning application for a 26 storey tower at the junction of Fairfield Road and Altyre Road, together with a stand alone 5 storey block fronting Addiscombe Road and Hazledean Road and a stepped L-shaped building facing Addiscombe Grove and Fairfield Road. The scheme comprises 196 residential units (34% affordable).	Fairfield Road	Croydon	1005	23/11/04	1C	Stage 1	Contributes to townscape; outstanding concerns on energy, sustainable design and construction and affordable housing, transport s106 contributions	Has not reached stage 2 yet.	Yes	Very similar, but with around three quarters as dense housing as the latest proposal. It was recently granted (May 2004) and so is eminently developable.	196 (34%). This may reduce to 30% to meet the costs of providing 10% renewables. £300,000 s106 contributions	Partially. The site is built on, but s106 contributions will improve local open space. There is a large park designated as Local Open Land in the Croydon UDP to the south west of the site which provides substantial play and open space. It is not clear what types of open space will be provided on- or off-site. The building will be set back from the road with trees and grass, and possibly other planting. It is not clear if this will be 'high quality' to meet 4b.9, but it is likely to meet 4b.6 and 3d.7.	s106 contribution of £165,000 to landscape a nearby urban park	No. 4a.7 and 4a.8 are not currently met as there are no renewables and no energy assessment, although these are requested by the Mayor in the stage 1 report. Fairly normal measures made such as gas condensing boilers and low energy lighting. The stage 1 report makes an extensive list of measures it should incorporate before referring back at stage 2. BREEAM Ecohomes 'Very good' standard is aspired to, which while possibly meeting 4b.6 would not be sufficient to meet 4b.9 for exemplary tall buildings.	Stage 1 report calls for an energy assessment, and the incorporation of sustainable development measures.	Yes	Not currently. Only low water use taps are proposed, which are only one of several possible water-efficient fittings/appliances that could be used (i.e. shower heads, A-rated white goods, small bathtub, low-flush WC) so to only include taps appears tokenistic. There is no SuDS/rainwater recycling.	Stage 1 report calls for SuDS and rainwater recycling before being referred back at stage 2.	No; while the site is built up, it does not appear that any opportunities have been taken to increase biodiversity in line with policy 3d.12. Green roofs or ground level planting could be included.	None; s106 to landscape local park does not seem intended for biodiversity gains.	Given that this application has not been determined yet it is too soon to reach any conclusions on this scheme. However, the Stage 1 report demonstrates a strong will to secure good energy standards from the applicant	
Erection of temporary buildings to provide 30 classrooms and ancillary facilities, together with the erection of new administrative block at NE corner of site	Lea Valley High School	Enfield	0658a	08/07/04	3D	Stage 2	N/a	Agreed; the classrooms are prefabricated so ugly but are temporary and enable redevelopment to go ahead.	No.	Previous application for school encroaching upon MOL was withdrawn after concerns of LPA and GLA	None	Yes; the encroachment onto MOL is temporary and the classrooms are required for teaching whilst the school is redeveloped. There are no alternative sites at the school that are not MOL. A condition ensures that the land will be		No. Whilst the buildings are only planned to be in place for 1 year, a simple statement of expected energy demand and any ways in which the development attempts to be energy efficient could have been requested.		No	No. Whilst the buildings are only planned to be in place for 1 year, a simple statement of water use and any measures to conserve water (e.g. low water use taps, WC cisterns, management devices for communal WCs) could have been requested.	None	No as there was no biodiversity assessment. However the buildings are temporary on a playing field, and may not have any significant impacts.		A small application. 0658 was originally submitted with the school being redeveloped with a permanent encroachment onto MOL. After the Mayor expressed concerns over this, it was decided to redevelop within the existing footprint, with teaching to continue during works in modular buildings located on MOL. This is in contrast to other schools applications which often build anew on the playing fields then relocate sports facilities onto the site of the old building.	

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?	
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)		
												reinstated to its previous condition after the works.										
Masterplan for a mixed use development within existing and refurbished buildings comprising 3000 residential units and 31591 sq.m non residential, including full application for the first phase of the development for Buildings 10, 11 and 13, for a mixture of residential and commercial uses.	The Warren, Woolwich Arsenal	Greenwich	0020a	02/08/04	1A 1B	Stage 2	Principle accepted; high density in an accessible location, which will help regenerate Woolwich. CHP and other sustainability measures are supported. 35% affordable housing in the full application site is accepted, but the quantum in subsequent phases would be judged on its own merits.	Accepted; the affordable housing level and tenure mix has been examined by GLA officers.	No	Adjacent site has a masterplan with permission. A draft framework was funded by the LDA and done in partnership with the Mayor's Architecture and Urbanism Unit (AUU), although this never led to the Mayor's formal approval. This proposal is based upon that framework.	319 (35%) Play space strategy, waste strategy.	Yes. Green space dominates the west of the site, with two multi-use parks and many rows of trees, but is sparse on the east side. Fountains and an artificial 'river' are to be created near the road entrance. The proposal therefore meets policies 4b.6 and 4b.9. A play space strategy will be submitted as part of the s106 and the Hectare park provides a variety of other open space types, meeting policy 3d.7. Bringing disused space into accessible private use meets policy expressed in para 3.246. Car parking cannot be located underground but will be covered by a new level of landscaped decking. The stage 1 report makes only a brief reference to Blue Ribbon Network policies.		The sustainability appraisal of July 2004 (and revised September 2004) refers to the Mayor's renewables policies as draft when they are statutory. Renewables are not considered, although CHP is being incorporated to provide part of the electricity needs of the development and possibly district heating. Insulation and building management systems are being considered that may be slightly better than Building Regulations standards. LB Greenwich policy asks for trees to offset CO2 emissions, but there is no explanation of what proportion of CO2 is offset by proposed trees. Waste measures are addressed in the Sustainability appraisal, against all relevant aspects of the Mayor's waste strategy and LB Greenwich UDP.		No; sustainability appraisal considers air quality to be minimally affected by the development, and mitigation measures are proposed for construction activities.	The sustainability appraisal lists London Plan and UDP policies. SuDS are not considered however, as the existing surface water drainage system is considered adequate. The appraisal misses the opportunity to reduce the demand for treated water in London, so fails policy 4a.11. This is disappointing given the number of inhabitants and the amount of space available to install SuDS/rainwater collection. If surfaces are to be cleaned on a regular basis, there may be additional run-off beyond rainfall? Low water use appliances will be fitted however.		Green roofs were included in the AUU and LDA joint draft framework on which the masterplan is based; the stage 1 report calls for conditions to secure the proposals made in the Sustainability appraisal, of brown roofs to provide habitat for Black Redstarts and bat boxes attached to buildings. Positive mitigation measures are proposed so the development would appear to meet policy 3d.12 though little detail is provided in the Sustainability appraisal. Landscaping including trees are proposed but little change is proposed for the predominantly hard-surfaced spaces between all the buildings, missing an opportunity to meet policy 4b.9.		It is disappointing that renewables, water/rainwater recycling and SuDS were not considered by the applicant or insisted upon by the GLA. There are no apparent reasons why these would not have been feasible. This is a large development with less than 50% affordable housing. It already incorporates innovative urban design and brown roofs, so it should further demonstrate how developments with heritage aspects can meet the Mayor's energy and water policies. Biodiversity is reasonably addressed but the site is already fully developed so presented few issues. Open space is a strong point and the GLA have pushed for a play strategy, so spaces will be for more than just leisure or visual amenity.	
Demolition of existing school and sports centre buildings and erection of new academy for 1200 pupils with associate external play and sports facilities	Abbey Wood Secondary School	Greenwich	0979	15/03/04	3E	Stage 2	N/A - was referred to Mayor late.	Supported in principle; effects on local buses require mitigation.	No		N/A	Unclear. There is a loss of 2.21ha of playing fields which is protected community open space. This is so the school can remain operational in the existing building during the construction of the new building. This will be replaced by at least the same quantum	None	Partially. No energy assessment accompanies the application, failing 4a.8. However, the application pre-dates the publication of the London Plan. The applicant intends to achieve a BRE SEAM 'Very Good' rating or better, and will explore the potential for passive solar gain, solar shading devices, buffer spaces, thermal mass, night time cooling, wind driven	A 'commitment to sustainable building measures' is included in s106 heads of terms	No	Partially. The applicant intends to explore water conservation measures and rainwater recycling. There is insufficient detail to know if this is guaranteed. If it is guaranteed it is likely to meet the Mayor's policies 4a.11 and 4b.6. However there is no mention of SuDS, despite a likely high viability of this. Whilst it is essentially a like-for-like replacement, if open playing fields are replaced by non-permeable surfaces more	A 'commitment to sustainable building measures' is included in s106 heads of terms	No - outline application but should have had regard to potential biodiversity losses in building on playing fields and demolition of existing school, and enhancements to biodiversity, to meet 3d.12.	None	While the application was referred late, the Mayor could have directed refusal until and unless energy and water policies were met, as in the case of St Josephs Academy. The architects have worked on other academies that have included good provision of renewables so it would have been desirable to secure such features in this application. A 'commitment to sustainable building measures' is included in s106 heads of terms but does not sufficiently consider the London Plan.	

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?	
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)		
												of "outdoor sports facilities" on the site of the existing building. To meet the requirements of para 3.252 of the London Plan which states that replacement open space must be of an equivalent type and facility i.e. open grassed playing fields. It is not stated that grassed playing fields can/will be created on the replacement space.			ventilation, maximum daylighting, high performance envelope, air tightness. This fulfils some of the requirements of policies 4b.6 and 4b.9, however there is no commitment to renewables or consideration of the energy hierarchy, failing 4a.7 and 4a.9.			run-off could result; the application fails 4c.8.				
Redevelopment for health care research and academic uses, comprising a seven storey research building with plant and a four storey administration building with lecture theatre together with a glass link at first floor level to the existing Kennedy Institute building providing a total gross floor area of 8050 sq.m excluding plant	Charing Cross Hospital Campus	Hammersmith & Fulham	1029	13/07/04	1C	Stage 2	Agreed in principle; some detailed design issues to resolve, and sustainability improvements.	Agreed; some pedestrian movement concerns to be dealt with at reserved matters stage.	No		None	No.	None	No. No energy assessment is submitted although similar documents (e.g. daylight assessment) were. PV's have already been dismissed, with the explanation that they would compromise the aesthetics of the façade or on the roof they would be overlooked. The latter point is entirely unjustifiable, since it is 33m high and there will be no effect on visual amenity at street level, nor from taller neighbouring buildings given that the roof houses 7m height of plant. CHP has been dismissed as unnecessary since there are said to be no significant 24-hour heat demands. This is unlikely to be an acceptable reason since CHP can be scaled to suit most developments and need not run 24h. None of these decisions are acceptable without an energy assessment.	Condition that an energy assessment will be submitted prior to development works to "ensure satisfactory energy efficiency in accordance with ... London Plan policy 4a.8". Therefore renewables are unlikely to be incorporated as they have not been cited.	No	No. Water-efficient toilets are proposed in line with Building Regulations. SuDS not considered as run-off said to remain the same; this is unlikely since the building is far taller than the existing, and may catch slightly more rain on its westerly-facing façade.. In any case this fails key objectives in 4b.6 and 4c.8. On rainwater recycling the applicant simply states "Rainwater could be collected in an underground storage vessel and pumped to toilet cisterns for flushing, the proposed sanitary provision would not warrant this". The meaning of this is unclear. If there is no rainwater collection or equivalent the application fails policy 4a.11 by not using alternatives to treated water. The building will probably use more water than the existing, less tall, building.	None	None. Therefore is unlikely to meet Mayor's policies.	None	Whilst only an outline application the consideration of energy issues is limited. CHP and renewables have been dismissed prematurely without any energy assessment having been carried out. Similarly water, biodiversity and open space issues have not been properly addressed, although the latter two are unlikely to be highly relevant to this application. There is insufficient regard to environmental issues in the stage 1 report and none at stage 2, and the condition to provide an energy assessment may not be worded appropriately to secure 10% renewables provision,	
Erection of 7 storey plus basement building to provide A1/A3 floor space, 24017 sq.m of B1 space plus 25 car parking spaces, 20 motorbike spaces 74 bicycle spaces together with roof terrace and balcony or	105 Clifton Street	Hackney	320a	03/08/04	1B	Stage 1	Agreed in principle; regretted but accepted that it does not contain residential uses, but a contribution to off-site provision should be made.	Agreed; it is a well-designed office building in a suitable location. s106 has been negotiated and is an appropriate amount, justified after the applicant's costs were	Yes	Similar; demolition and redevelopment of 32,000sqm across 8 floors of offices and ground floor retail.	Contribution of £600,000 for off-site provision of affordable housing. £100,000 for education/training, £400,000 for environmental	No; site is built already. £400,000 of s106 contribution towards local environmental improvements, but details of this are not specified.	None	No. Will meet BREEAM 'Very Good' but there appears to be no condition to secure this.	None. The stage 1 and 2 reports omit reference to the Mayor's policies on sustainable design and construction, energy, and renewables.	No.	None. Does not meet Mayor's policy 4a.11. May partially meet 4b.6 if BREEAM 'Very Good' Ecohomes standard is attained, but this cannot be known from the details supplied.	None. The stage 1 and 2 reports omit reference to the Mayor's policy 4a.11 and 4b.6.	None. Does not meet Mayor's policies.	None. The stage 1 and 2 reports do not consider biodiversity.	The stage 1 and 2 reports do not raise any environmental issues beyond daylighting/amenity issues for local residents who lodged objections. However, there was an extant permission for a similar scale of development, which pre-dated the London Plan.	

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	
erection of 7 storey plus 2 level basement building to provide A1/A3, 27699 sq.m B1 plus 22 car parking spaces, 28 motorbike spaces, 74 bicycle spaces with roof terrace and balcony								evaluated by an independent valuer, and satisfactory to the Mayor.			improvements in the local area.										
Erection of a part 4, part 10 storey building to provide B1 floorspace, live/work units, residential units and demolition of existing units	15 Ramsgate Street	Hackney	702	05/10/04	1C	Stage 2	N/A (the LPA did not refer it to the Mayor as required).	Agreed providing LB Hackney include conditions and s106 securing cycle provision and energy issues.	No		12 (25%) £48,000 to local education, £50,000 to Dalston town centre regeneration; cycle parking of 1 space per unit.	No. The site is built but no open space apart from internal circulation space is proposed. S106 contributions fund town centre improvements in Dalston but it is unclear what types of open space would benefit.		No	Stage 2 report suggests asking LB Hackney to include conditions/s106 terms to include: provision of energy assessment, feasibility work for renewable energy which if positive means renewables should provide a proportion of energy demand. All of these (except renewables) were agreed to by the applicant. Conditions to ensure the development meets BREEM 'Good' rating, and Energy Assessment		No. No mention in the stage 2 report	None	No. The site is within an Area of Deficiency in accessible wildlife habitat, in the Biodiversity Strategy, so any developments should include habitat creation such as green roofs.	None. No mention in the stage 2 report.	Unfortunately the application was not referred at stage 1 so some issues have been left to conditions and obligations. In these circumstances this is a reasonable solution, although an Energy Statement is meant to inform planners to be able to justify requesting more renewables/efficiency measures. However, the development fails to meet the Mayor's policies on renewables, biodiversity and water policies. Given the low level of affordable housing provided, the separation of this from the other housing, and the lack of extant permissions on the site, the Mayor could have directed refusal given these shortcomings.
Mixed use residential and commercial development, incorporating open space, parking, landscaping, community/meeting room and convenience store	Middlesex University, Bounds Green Road	Haringey	1042	13/07/04	1B	Stage 2					130 (50%)	No. It is already developed but there could be an enhanced provision for local open space to provide for the increased number of residents.	None; stage 1 and 2 reports do not mention this.	No. No renewable energy is proposed, and no energy assessment is provided, so the application fails policies 4a.7, 4a.8 and 4a.9.	None; stage 1 and 2 reports do not mention this.	Yes	Unclear; low water use appliances but no rainwater recycling etc; therefore only partially meets policy 4a.11. It is unclear whether or not SuDS are appropriate for this sloping site and therefore whether it meets policy 4c.8.	None; stage 1 and 2 reports do not mention this.	No; some gains may be made in numbers of trees, but there appears to be no assessment and no investigation of whether protected species exist there.	None; stage 1 and 2 reports do not mention this.	This development delivers a high number of affordable homes but the Mayor has not had regard to any environmental policies in the stage 1 or 2 reports; However, it the LPA referred the application at a very late stage and therefore the scope for negotiation on behalf of the Mayor was limited. SuDS and renewables may have been viable.

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)		Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	
Two storey detached building to provide medical facilities, car park and hardsurfacing	Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital	Harrow	0960	31/03/04	3D	Stage 2	Major concerns are raised in the body of the report: poor architectural design, failing all tests for green belt development; no sustainability statement. But the conclusion notes that it is an exceptional circumstance and fast delivery will enable it to be operational sooner, reducing waiting lists	Agreed; car parking level is still high but accept nature of use and low PTAL rating will mean a high need for car parking by patients.	No			No. It is in Green Belt. Most trees are being retained and the proposal is where a building exists, just with a slightly increased footprint. However the building is not sympathetically designed for its surroundings, being of off-white powder coated metal. This does not relate well to the surrounding mature oak trees. The stage 1 report asks for changes to the design, since the RNOH 'Aspire' building by Norman Foster is of a far higher standard.	GLA requested minor design revisions e.g. enlarging windows to improve its human scale. The stage 1 report also said "as the proposal is contrary to Green Belt policies, Harrow Council should enter into a legal agreement with the RNOH to ensure that the increase in floorspace as a result of this proposal would be offset by a similar decrease when the redevelopment plans ... are considered.' However, this proved unworkable since the applicant is not RNOH, instead an informative was used and the GLA are now involved with the long term plans for the whole site.	No. Energy statement is only 5 paragraphs long and essentially states that it meets Building Regulations; LP states that this should be a minimum standard, not a maximum/desirable standard. Whilst there are stated practical requirements for a modern building suited to the proposed use, there are no environmental justifications for demolition of the relatively recent (1970s) buildings made of bricks, with a high embodied energy. Demolition conflicts with a key objective of 4b.6, which is the retention of buildings. There will be reuse of some demolition materials on site, but this is standard practice. The application building has a life span of 40 years, due to the hope of transferring the functions into the RONH redevelopment in 15 years' time.	None taken by GLA.	No	Partially; the applicant "SuDS appropriate to the site will be used, such as soakaways and permeable paving". The soakaways will only be for rainwater run-off from the roof, not from water use in the building, but are a small benefit.	None taken by GLA.	Yes. Tree report and ecology assessment undertaken. Opportunity created for biodiversity; dead trees to be felled then stacked to create a habitat. Limited tree felling is required, of trees judged to be of low value. It cannot be said to relate positively to green spaces, being made of off-white metal. Some planting around car park.	None further taken by GLA.	The stage 1 report noted that 'timescale and budgetary constraints were critical in delivering the ISTC'. The application went through relatively quickly and with few impediments save for minor external design revisions, despite not meeting the Mayor's energy policies. The demolition of the existing building has not been justified in environmental terms nor the replacement with a building with a fraction of the life span. The proposed building is also off-white and more intrusive in this green location. Biodiversity has been well addressed but it may be possible to avoid the felling of as many trees through re-design.
Erection of mixed tenure residential development comprising 624 dwellings incorporating 24 no. 3 bedroom houses, 96 studio flats, 154 one bedroom flats, 249 two bedroom flats and 101 three bedroom flats; Provision of open space including 2 landscaped squares, incidental landscaping, play area, formation of a new access to porters way, associated roads, car, cycle and motorcycle parking	RAF West Drayton	Hillingdon	0692a	09/02/05	1A	N/A	692 was agreed at stage 1 as it fulfilled a number of objectives of the London Plan. Has been negotiated over 2 years with GLA officers hence there are no unresolved issues raised here. However it was refused by the LPA		No - (two applications but both failed.)	35%	In response to concerns raised by the LPA in the previous application, two play spaces have been created.	The original application did not contain a detailed energy statement but the resubmitted application included a sustainability statement. However this skims across all aspects of sustainability. On energy conservation it proposes extremely low ambitions such as 35% of properties meeting Ecohomes 'Good' standard, when all homes could/should meet 'Very Good' or 'Excellent' standards. No renewable energy is proposed. This could apparently change depending upon the land costs, but this is not a material consideration.	The issue was raised informally by the case officer on the original application, and the LPA gave one reason for refusal as the lack of energy conservation measures. No action so far on the resubmitted application.	Yes	No. Only some water-efficient appliances are being included.	None	No. The site has been disused and while has little flora, supports a small variety of wildlife. Bats use the site for feeding, and bat boxes/bricks are proposed. Translocation is recommended for badgers and some smaller species (e.g. slow worms). However this is a far less preferable mitigation measure than accommodating them within the new development. In addition, policy 3d.12 calls for enhancements to habitats and there are few apparent in this application (e.g. green or brown roofs)		This is a recent application not yet reached stage 1 and is for a not insignificant 594 units of housing. The Mayor should require 10% renewables, and much higher standards of energy efficiency than those proposed, which barely go beyond Building Regulations requirements. None of his energy or water policies are met. There are also insufficient guarantees on mitigation/enhancement of biodiversity.		

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	
1-2 STOREY SURGERY facilities (outline)	Mount Vernon Hospital Eastern Corner	Hillingdon	0848	05/04/04	3D	Stage 2	Agrees that it will not affect integrity of green belt; asks for more details of footprint; has repeatedly asked for energy and access statements to no avail; concern at uncoordinated piecemeal development at the hospital	Accepted; conclusion states "The lack of a sustainability assessment is not considered sufficient to warrant refusal of the application."	No	(but two other applications underway on same site)	None	Yes. The development is on green belt land. Applicant has demonstrated lack of alternative sites, that the building will not substantially affect the openness of the green belt being situated behind mature trees, and has chosen to build on the site of an existing building, therefore substantially meeting 4b.6. The building will be of a higher density than present, without being obtrusive. The footprint will increase by circa 22% however, losing a small amount of green belt land.	Stage 1 - further details requested. Conditions will guarantee appropriate screening by trees.	No. No energy assessment or even a brief statement. No renewable energy generation.	Sustainability statement requested at stage 1. The stage 1 report noted that "The proposed application has no commitment to inclusive design, nor is there real commitment to sustainable design and construction". Stage 2 report noted its absence as a significant problem but not one which could lead to refusal being directed.	No	No.	None.	No. Some tree losses; no		Green belt was the main environmental issue in this application, and the Mayor sought and received several clarifications that it would not impact negatively on the openness of green belt or on views, although the development does not appear to offer any enhancements to the green belt (e.g. planting of new trees). However other environmental issues were not dealt with so well by the Mayor. Whilst the development was of a small scale, there may have been scope for the facility to use less energy and water, and for an enhancement to be made to the biodiversity, thereby meeting London Plan policies. The application was received just after the London Plan was published therefore it could have been harder to request full compliance with the policies therein, but there may have been scope for better compliance than that achieved.
Redevelopment of school, involving erection of new building and demolition of existing buildings, to provide a new academy school for 1000 students. Provision of associated sports facilities, hard and soft play areas. Ancillary creche, new access, replacement parking and landscaping	John Penrose School	Hillingdon	0996	07/07/04	3D	Stage 1	The special circumstances justify the inappropriate development in the green belt; design makes best use of the existing site rather than sprawling.	Not yet reached Stage 2	No			Yes. The application is in green belt; the test for alternative sites appears to be limited to sites of 9ha and in the precise current catchment area of the school. However if this is accepted, the application considers green belt issues well. There is to be a reduction in built footprint but an increase in floorspace, achieved through taller buildings, which is unlikely to affect the openness of the green belt due to careful screening and design. The applicant proposes to build on the playing fields then locate replacement space on the site of the old buildings for		Partially. The building fully meets policy 4b.6 as it is designed with long-life sustainable materials. It includes passive solar shading and timber facade in conjunction with high thermal mass concrete components, to maximise night time cooling and passive solar gain as appropriate. Waste management is good with extensive recycling proposed, and construction spoil to be re-used 100%. However no energy assessment appears to have been included and there is no commitment to providing up to 10% of energy from renewable sources. These should have been included with the application. The application does not currently meet policies 4a.7, 4a.8 and the energy hierarchy.		No. The stage 1 report says that a rainwater harvesting system simply that is "has been omitted as part of the Value Engineering Process" i.e. it appears to have cost too much. It is disappointing that it does not appear to have been challenged by in the stage 1 report. There is also no mention in the stage 1 report of water-efficient appliances or other water efficiency measures.		Yes. Full survey undertaken for protected species, and mitigation measures to include safeguarding of certain areas during construction, and creation of two wildlife conservation areas. Therefore there is likely to be an enhancement to biodiversity.		The application had reached stage 2 when assessed. Whilst there has been a good range of design solutions proposed by the applicant which to a good extent address the green belt, biodiversity and sustainable design policies in the London Plan, it would appear that the application does not meet energy policies or water policies.	

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?	
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)		
												operational reasons. They will create new grassed playing fields with an overall greater area, thereby meeting London Plan policy in paragraph 3.252.										
Erection of a mixed-use development comprising five 2-18 storey buildings to provide 998 student study rooms with ancillary accommodation, 232 key-worker residential units, 9707sq.m. of academic floorspace, 676sq.m. of retail/food and drink floorspace; with associated car parking space, pedestrian and vehicular access and associated works to the site.	The Paragon (former Pilot Works site)	Hounslow	871	19/05/04	1B 1C	Stage 2	Principle accepted; revisions to reduce height of tower and change grouping to reduce negative amenity impacts are welcomed.	Agreed; furthers many objectives of the London Plan	Yes (2)	Both could be implemented. One was begun in 1992 and is lawful (granted a CLOPUD); in 2003 permission was granted for 25,000sqm of offices. The stage 1 & 2 reports remind the Mayor that they are both valid and whilst unlikely to be commercially viable, are material considerations and are worse than the latest proposal with regard to sustainability (having 2x and 6x as much car parking) and do not propose low priced student/key worker accommodation.	Not 'affordable housing', but 221 key worker units and 849 student units s106 contributions of £100k to Boston Manor Park improvements; £300k to bus and other local transport; £40k to set up car club; £100k for local Controlled Parking Zone; £72k for local educational facilities; £25k for air quality study.	Yes: amenity space will be created in the central courtyard and a playground is provided. The site is 100m from Boston Manor Park. Policy 3d.7 and 4b.6 are met. However there is insufficient detail in the application documents to know whether 4b.9 is met with regard to "high quality spaces".	s106 contributions will be made towards improving Boston Manor Park. This is more appropriate than on-site provision given the high density.	Partially. No Energy Assessment is provided, failing 4a.8. The applicant intends to gain a 'Very Good' BREEAM Ecohomes assessment on the accommodation portion. 4b.6 is met, with FSC timber, low water/energy use appliances. PV's are proposed for communal lighting needs and would be integrated to form the roofing material. Waste is minimised to approximately 70%, by using off-site modular construction techniques. It is not discussed whether this is energy intensive or not. Each room has electric convector heaters, which do not meet the Mayor's energy hierarchy. At the very least, gas condensing boilers plus radiators should be used.	No. Energy Assessment was not asked for by the Mayor nor provided. There is no indication of the percentage of energy provided by the renewables (PV) and the Mayor does not request that the London Borough secure these through the use of conditions.	Yes but the Mayor deemed it insufficiently detailed; the applicant is funding an air quality study through s106.	Partially. Grey water has been considered but the volumes of storage required would be too large. Rainwater will be collected to use for irrigation, i.e. a small percentage of water use. Permeable paving is planned to be installed but this may be prevented because there is contamination present. It may meet 4a.11 but only in part.	None; the stage 1 report details briefly the proposals made by the applicant, and offers no comment.	No. Whilst the site is built, it contains trees and either 1 or 2 subject to TPO's will be lost, primarily due to the need to remove Japanese Knotweed; they will be replaced by mature specimens. It appears from the application documents that no opportunities have been taken to increase biodiversity, so failing policy 3d.12, 4b.6 and (the building is of 'large scale') 4b.9. Whilst £100,000 of improvements to Boston Manor Park are to be secured through s106, it is not clear if this will result in biodiversity gains/losses.	The issue was not raised in the stage 1 or stage 2 reports.	The development furthered many of the fundamental London Plan policies such as high density development, and was a tall building by the M4, so would be an impressive landmark on entering London. However the proposal does not meet most of the Mayors policies on energy, renewables, water or biodiversity. The Mayor was satisfied with a large university and key worker housing development that has apparently minimal renewables provision.	
Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide a building comprising offices; restaurant/bars/cafes; concert hall; sculpture gallery; art gallery space; publicly accessible amenity space; and ancillary floorspace, car parking and service areas together with other works incidental to the application proposals.	82-96 York Way	Islington	707	31/10/03	1B 1C 3E	Stage 2	Excellent and innovative scheme; further details needed on biodiversity and an Access statement	Agreed; an exemplary scheme			s106 provides for £475,000 towards local environmental improvements. The development incorporates public access to the canal side and other public space. Free use of auditorium/concert hall for 25 years, £475,000 towards local environmental improvements; outreach program; free provision of rooms and		Yes There is an energy demand assessment. The application predates the publication of the London Plan. It intends to achieve an 'Excellent' BREEAM rating, through design measures including passive cooling, 'U' values far in excess of Building Regulations, and high regard to daylight/solar gain. However it will be sealed and mechanically ventilated, stated as due to local air pollution but this was not shown by the air quality assessment.	None	Yes	BREEAM 'Excellent' rating sought therefore it is likely that water-efficient appliances will be installed. Due to it being mechanically ventilated, water measures may be one way of counteracting these low score to gain a high score. However it is unclear whether there will be rainwater recycling or other measures to reduce use of treated water in line with 4a.11. SuDS is mentioned but it appears unlikely to be suitable due to site conditions.		Yes; the development will not cause negative impacts, and the applicants are considering including brown roofs and nesting boxes to enhance provision for biodiversity.	A condition will secure approved artificial nests and bat boxes, and s106 agreement will secure a biodiversity action plan.	This landmark tall building with free cultural facilities undoubtedly is attractive in line with many London Plan policies. The Mayor could have requested an energy assessment and 10% renewables but the application was prior to the London Plan.		

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?	
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)		
												concert hall inside the building for local/cultural use.		They are considering PV's and borehole cooling but have dismissed CHP due to 'lack of heating demand' and solar water heating due to 'excessive demand from bar/restaurant'. However CHP can be scaled to most types of heating/electricity demand and remain more energy-efficient than separate power supplies so it may be viable.								
Demolition of existing pavilion, construction of replacement pavilion, provision of additional car parking, provision of synthetic turf pitch with associated floodlighting and special shelter associated minor works, earthworks and landscaping	Polytechnic Sports Ground	Kingston	0992	11/03/04	3D	Stage 2	Detailed conclusion that while accepting it is not inappropriate development on MOL, it will improve under-utilised facilities. Raises concerns on disabled facilities cycle provision, and guaranteeing community benefits and access.	Agreed; all concerns raised by the Mayor have been mitigated against through use of appropriate conditions	No	There are previous permissions for temporary use of changing rooms and 25 car parking spaces	N/A	Yes; development on MOL is allowed where it is of small scale and necessary for uses that are allowed on MOL, including sports pavilions. The proposal improves the prospects for use of this open space, in terms of accessibility and quality. The building is situated on a slope in a way that is not visually obtrusive, and faced with timber and glass.		Partially. No energy assessment, failing 4a.8. However, the application originally pre-dates the publication of the London Plan. A brief sustainability statement indicates agreement with policy 4b.6; BREEM rating sought, zero upward light to sky; use of sustainable materials e.g. FSC timber; low-energy lighting, management systems; natural ventilation; re-using land. No renewables, failing policy 4a.7. CHP was considered but was ruled out due to intermittent usage, and PV's for cost. In the absence of the required energy assessment it is uncertain what measure could be taken e.g. whether solar hot water could provide 10% of hot water and heating. However it is a small scale and the site is connected to utilities so renewables do not save on connection costs.	Sustainability statement requested, and provided by applicant.	No	No. This is of concern since the development has a flat roof suitable for rainwater harvesting. Much of the water needs of this development (i.e. for showering) could be met by a simple harvesting system. Grey water (from showers) in turn could be recycled. The sustainability statement does not have regard to water usage, e.g. through water-efficient appliances/controls. The development therefore fails 4a.11. The pitch will be drained naturally as most pitches, and there is said to be no increase in surface run-off as a result of the proposal, but with 25 more parking spaces this seems improbable.	Not raised by GLA officers.	No trees affected by the proposal, and the applicant will manage the Site of Important Nature Conservation (SINC) in the north of the site, and provide a new pond, reinstatement of hedgerows and other planting. Therefore there may be gains in biodiversity in line with 3d.12. Floodlighting will be operated only when needed, to minimise effects on nocturnal wildlife.	Stage 1 report requests that conditions secure details of planting and to ensure drainage does not affect SINC.	It is disappointing that greywater/rainwater recycling, nor renewables, were not considered by the applicant or insisted upon by the GLA, although the application is small scale. Biodiversity impacts not confirmed (drainage of car park near SINC).	

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	
Demolition of existing Island Block and erection of a 743 bed hotel, including 2,553 square metres of A3 (restaurant and cafe), 2,398 square metres of conference facilities, 600 square metres of D2 (leisure facilities), access, taxi and coach drop-off area, together with associated hard and soft landscaping and public realm improvements.	Westminster Bridge Roundabout	Lambeth	145e	23/02/04		Stage 2	Principle of the hotel development is accepted, and the external development is no different to a scheme approved in 2002. Concerns on pedestrian access, coach drop-off.	Agreed; s106 not finalised but expected to be at least as favourable as the 2003 permission.	Yes	In November 2002 the Mayor approved a nine-storey, 38,140 sq.m office building on the Island Block site. The application included an eleven-storey office development on the adjacent Addington Street site, which is now the subject of a separate planning application. This has the same building envelope as the 13-storey hotel application.	No housing Likely to be circa £2.6m of s106 contributions towards local building works and other improvements/mitigation works.	Yes; the site is already built and derelict but improvements to surrounding areas are explained in the application - high quality materials and 16 trees. Obligations are agreed to this effect, and also to improve pedestrian access after the applicant responded positively to queries on this by GLA officers.		Partially. The environmental statement is long but omits energy and water usage, so there is no Energy Assessment. The Planning Statement does not make reference to energy policies of the London Plan. However, development will use Gas turbines to generate electricity and provide heating, i.e. CHP. Passive cooling is mentioned under Environmental 'Concept and Aspirations'. Considering the size and amount of glazing, there is insufficient explanation of design to minimise cooling/heating loads. Shading (louvers and low-E glass) is discussed but not passive heating. Recycling bins will be provided for waste during construction, and materials will be selected to reduce the amount of waste created.	At stage 1 an energy assessment was requested.	Yes, comprehensive.	No	None	Yes; environmental statement is detailed and has section on biodiversity. The site is fully built-up and derelict.		The proposal is of high quality in many respects, this is to be expected given its intended luxury use and prime location. An office permission was extant, but the applicant admitted that this was receiving little commercial interest compared to hotel use, re-iterating the need to redevelop the site soon due to its dereliction. The Mayor has been in favour of development at this location since a previous submission in 2002, but it appears that he did not insist on measures to meet more of his energy and water policies. However, the application was made at the LPA prior to the publication of the London Plan.
Demolition of St. Joseph's Academy and part of Our Lady of Lourdes Primary School, Lee Terrace SE3 and construction of a part single/part 2/part 3 storey plus lower ground floor level building to provide primary and secondary school facilities and single storey building to provide nursery school facilities, together with associated landscaping and playing fields, provision of 323 bicycle and 32 car parking spaces and 2 spaces for disabled people, with a vehicular access road from St. Joseph's Vale and pedestrian access from Belmont Hill	St. Joseph's Academy, Lee Terrace	Lewisham		04/05/05		Stage 2	Broadly in agreement, but concerns over SSSI protection, safeguarding of facilities for community use, and above all, sustainable design standards.	Refusal. However the Mayor has stated that he would lift the direction if a commitment to renewable energy was agreed by s106.	No		No housing. S106: sports management plan, school travel plan, community access to sports facilities on site.	It also meets policy 4b.6 and 4b.9 insofar as it states that high quality and green spaces should be integrated into the design. The proposal represents an overall protection of the same area of open space for sports facilities. The policy meets paragraph 3.252 of the London Plan, since an assessment of needs has shown that slightly different facilities are needed, therefore some facilities are being made out of artificial turf or indoors. Floodlighting could represent an increase in quality of the open space	Principle of development was accepted early on by the GLA.	Partially. The application states that the school will aim to meet an Excellent rating in the Schools Environmental Assessment Method. A full energy assessment was eventually submitted (policy 4a.8). It meets policy 4b.6 in most respects. It will include passive heating and cooling, high thermal mass internal components, natural ventilation and lighting, and high thermal performance. This partially meets the energy hierarchy. One aspect missing from this was low-energy appliances, which given the high IT usage, is a concern. It does not meet policy 4a.9 and despite lengthy negotiations no commitment to renewables was forthcoming and the Mayor directed refusal. It also fails	Stage 1 report calls for an energy assessment, and the incorporation of sustainable development measures such as waste management, SuDS, water recycling/harvesting. Condition requires energy assessment to be approved by LPA.	No but the building represents only a small increase in occupant numbers; in addition a travel plan forms part of the s106 agreement and is expected to result in circa 20% reductions in car travel.	Not initially but after recommendations from the GLA, low-water use appliances and some SuDS are being incorporated, meeting policy 4a.11 and 4b.6 to a good extent.	GLA encouraged use of SuDS.	Yes and improved after discussions with GLA and LPA. Ecology assessment is provided, examining the existing biodiversity and it is concluded that there will be no significant losses of biodiversity (though loss of fewer than 10 trees). The 'green corridor' of woodland at the north of the site will be retained and improved. Therefore the application meets policy 3d.12. Concern of LPA that reducing football pitch area will result in less feeding habit for birds, so suggest green/brown roofs.	Condition to secure Environmental management plan	High regard was had to energy, and water, biodiversity and open space issues were also well covered but not always at sufficiently early stages of the referral process. The Mayor may have been concerned that this case would set a precedent that large buildings would not include renewable energy. Through discussions the energy efficiency of the building was confirmed and improved to an excellent level, but renewables were ruled out due to costs and late design stage process, and the Mayor directed refusal. However, if the applicant appealed and won, this could potentially set a worse precedent. If pre-application and pre-stage 1 discussions highlight the importance of renewables it may be more likely that they are designed in.

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?	
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)		
												although the existing pitch is larger and well-established natural turf.		policy 4b.9 for the same reason.								
Comprehensive mixed use development of rail lands comprising B1 offices, residential, retail, commercial leisure uses, hotels and conference facilities, community, health and education facilities, open space, landscaping, parking, transport interchanges, associated infrastructure and a town centre link.	Stratford City	Newham	296	17/12/03	1A 1B 1C 3F	Stage 2	Principle of the development is welcomed; concerns on town centre integration, affordable housing level, energy reductions/renewables, car parking level, bus network funding, ensuring a strong relation between density and transport accessibility, and many other transport issues.	"The proposed outline permission represents the successful resolution to years of consultation and negotiation regarding the regeneration of the Stratford rail lands." The applicant has addressed most issues and also supports Olympic games. Some transport issues are outstanding however.	No	The area is designated a Major Opportunity Zone in the Newham UDP and Supplementary Planning Guidance is being produced to guide development in the area.	30% S106 to include creation of an Environmental Review Panel including GLA representative(s), CCHP, and various energy efficiency/renewables projects phased through 50-year span of development.	Yes. The Open Space strategy is detailed and well-illustrated, and proposes a full range of types of open space, which are fully in line with policy 3d.7. These include 'non-accessible ecological areas', 'multi-use games area' and 'public open space' amongst others. These will connect together physically/visually. Consideration has been had to how the site relates to neighbouring MOL and SNCI's.	LB Newham developed typologies with the applicant. Conditions include minimum open space provision.	Yes, after over a year of negotiations with GLA. An energy assessment is provided. The development addresses the Mayor's energy strategy with a variety of measures across the 50-year time horizon. A s106 will ensure: the creation of an energy company to implement CCHP (district heating and cooling, and electricity) and promote energy efficiency; ensure buildings are designed to reduce carbon emissions to 10% better than building regulations, and to implement significant carbon reductions by 2020 (-50%) and 2050 (-80%); 2% renewable energy across the site, plus exemplar building(s) of 4000sqm floorspace with 10% renewables.	Negotiations over a year resulting in comprehensive s106. Conditions include requirement that all buildings meet the relevant BREEAM assessment at 'very good' or 'excellent'	Yes, and appropriate conditions.	No. There is no commitment to rainwater harvesting or grey water recycling, so does not meet 4a.11. It also does not meet 4a.12: the applicant considered permeable surfaces/SuDS on all external surfaces, but decided against this, it would appear that this was due to the standard instruction of the Environment Agency to not construct soakaways on contaminated areas of land. However the contamination of the entire site will have to be assessed and parts of the site will not be remediated. Therefore the dismissal of SuDS is not wholly justified until site conditions are known in detail.	GLA chose not to express views on hydrology.	Partially. There will be some loss of wasteland which provides a valuable habitat, and it is not clear how these will be preserved in some part. Translocation of lizards could have a significant impact, but the applicant proposes many suitable mitigation measures for other biodiversity issues. Wildlife corridors will be created along with other opportunities to enhance biodiversity, meeting policy 3d.12.	Conditions include an ecological management plan to be agreed with GLA Biodiversity team.	The Mayor had regard to all his environmental policies, although it would appear not some water policies (4a.11 – SuDS, rainwater harvesting). This is unfortunate but this could have been due to the relatively low proportion of water needs of the site could have been provided by such means. The GLA took the opportunity posed by the 50-year lifespan of the development by phasing in renewables and other energy measures across that lifespan through s106. A similar agreement could have been made to ensure SuDS was included if site conditions/contamination turn out to be suitable for SuDS in parts of the site. There were also long negotiations over affordable housing and parking provision, prior to the London Plan becoming statutory, so on balance environmental considerations were dealt with well here.	
Redevelopment of site to provide a mixed use scheme comprising 374 residential units, 1141 sq.m of commercial space together with associated car parking and amenity space including new river access and public realm	14-26 High Street, Stratford	Newham	0809a	11/05/05	1C	0809 was considered by the Mayor on 10 November 2004, who agreed in principle but stated requirements on accessibility and sustainability. The application was re-submitted to the LPA.	0809a (re-submitted) has not yet gone to stage 1; still in pre-application discussions.		Yes	Same land use mix; many revisions through discussions with LB; new applications seeks an increase from 196 flats to 346.	143 (41%)	Para. 3.246: Yes. Open space is being provided where it previously did not exist. 4b.6: Yes; re-using land, and enhances natural environment 4b.9: Yes: private grassed amenity space; public square between road and river with planting, seating, variety of surface treatments, art; detailed landscape statement		Yes. The applicant provided an extensive energy/sustainability assessment with costed appraisals of all renewables, a high regard to the Mayor's energy hierarchy, and assessment against the Mayor's policies. It meets policies 4a.7, 4a.8, 4a.9 and 4b.6: community heating will serve some of the development, A-rated appliances; natural ventilation with heat recovery; Insulation U-values are circa half of Building Regulations requirements. However solar water	Mayor requested sustainability assessment at stage 1 of 0809.	Yes. Concludes that the development will have no impact upon ambient air quality. Some design measures are recommended to mitigate inhabitants' exposure to air pollution from adjacent A11.	4c.7 - Yes full flood assessment. 0.5% risk of flooding (= "1000 year risk") and 10m buffer zone to adjacent canal.		Yes. Assessed; site is currently industrial, no biodiversity of any significance is present. The river has a small degree of biodiversity which may benefit from the buffer zone, with a variety of planting.		The Mayor upheld his energy policies at stage 1 of 0809, so upon resubmission the applicant included an energy/sustainability assessment. Approximately 2.5% of energy will be provided by renewables, plus extensive measures to supply energy efficiently (community heating) and for energy efficient usage (appliances, insulation). The heating of the private residential tower does not meet policy 4b.9 or the energy hierarchy however. Conditions must be in place to secure the proposals and the Mayor could demand CHP, in particular for the residential tower. Biodiversity had few issues and was addressed sufficiently; open space is to	

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?	
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)		
												provided 4c.4: Yes: new riverside walkway with trees, planting and seating; environmental (planted) buffer to river		panels will only be provided subject to government grant scheme which is disappointingly noncommittal. CHP is dismissed due to scale issues, these are not valid reasons as CHP can be to any scale and most electricity/heating demands. Policy 4b.9 and the Mayor's energy hierarchy is not met with regard to the private residential block; the applicant states that communal heating is not feasible due to high pressure required given the tower's height, so electric heating is proposed.								be improved with pedestrian access to the canalside.
Redevelopment to provide 767 Residential Units, 1,269sq.m commercial floorspace and a creche in a series of buildings ranging from 9 to 23 storeys plus underground parking, associate car parking, landscape and provision of riverside walk.	Crown Wharf	Newham	0895a	Application re-referred at stage 1 in October 2004.	1A	Stage 2	Principle is accepted and design is considered good. Level of affordable housing needs justification, and provision should be made for a bridge across the River Lea.	Agreed; the development and associated obligations will deliver many benefits.	No		circa 268 (35%) circa £1m to various local improvements/works	The proposed site layout develops a hierarchy of public and private spaces. After discussion with the GLA the permeability of this high density site has been increased; the public can access the river through the site, as well as walk along the river for the length of the site's river frontage. The S106 agreed to provide local open space, possibly play space. The development is set well back from the river and relates well to it, integrating new wildlife habitat at the rivers edge.	s106 provides £680,000 for open space provision.	Partially. An energy assessment was provided upon request and sustainability was covered in the Environmental Statement. The site poses difficulties that increase the cost of development. However one constraint is the need to upgrade local electrical supply capacity. PV's or further efficiency measures could have reduced the extent of upgrades. The development does not include renewables so fails 4a.7, 4a.9 and ignores the energy hierarchy. 4b.6 is partially met, since a statement of sustainability is provided, there are building management systems, FSC-certified timber, and energy-efficient facades, the applicant aims to score highly on BREEAM Ecohomes, recycling facilities in flats, and it will minimise/recycle construction waste.	Energy assessment requested; the non-feasibility of including renewables was proved to GLA officers to their satisfaction.	Yes	Partially. The ES contains a comprehensive consideration of the different types of SuDS and how appropriate they would be. Attenuation measures such as soakaways would not be suitable due to the site gradients and the large basements covering 60% of the site. However rainwater recycling plus oversized pipework are said to "offer the best applicable options". Low water-use appliances and management systems will also be used. The application meets policy 4a.11 and 4b.6.	GLA made no mention in stage 1 or 2 reports so it is not known if conditions will be imposed by LB Newham to secure such measures.	Yes. Meets policy 3d.12 as whilst the application site contains very little and insignificant biodiversity, the applicant is taking steps to increase biodiversity, given the proximity of a nature reserve and salt marshes with many birds. An 8m buffer zone between river and the development with a fenced-off river walk to provide a corridor along the river through site for species from shoreline. Terracing will run along the waters edge, as used at the Millennium Dome, providing a non-accessible habitat for wildlife. Habitat creation will run 16m from the rivers edge to the central park of the site, with planting also for landscaping and screening purposes, meeting policy 4b.6. Green roofs and bird (peregrine) nest boxes are considered.	GLA have not attempted to secure guarantees/conditions for the biodiversity measures proposed.	The applicant was forthcoming about environmental considerations, particularly water use and biodiversity, in which there will be considerable gains for the site. It is unfortunate that the Mayor did not request conditions to secure SuDS/rainwater recycling, or further measures on renewables or energy efficiency.	

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)		Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	
Construction of a water treatment plant incorporating desalination technology, an intake from the River Thames and an electricity substation, the laying of water distribution pipelines within the sewage treatment works, retention of the pilot plant for operational purposes and the use of land in connection with construction activities.	Jenkins Lane, Beckton Sewage Treatment Works	Newham		14/04/05	3D	Stage 2	The strategic need for the desalination plant needs to be balanced against the need to achieve an appropriately sustainable development, particularly in terms of energy supply, biodiversity and impacts on metropolitan open land. Currently insufficient renewables provision for what is a high-energy process	The Mayor directed refusal, saying that the application does not deliver sustainable and efficient management of water supplies in London and contravenes policy 4a.11. The stage 2 report recommended the Mayor not to direct refusal.	No		None S106 was negotiated at length; applicant offered to trial feasibility of wind power. If successful they must then implement wind power to generate 30% of power; if unsuccessful it will give money equivalent to 30% of their energy cost to a nominated body e.g. London Renewables. It will also reinstate a riverside walk.	The area is designated in the Newham UDP as MOL and the land around the perimeter is designated for its ecological value as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SINC). The location, for stated practical reasons, is the only suitable open but is developed with low-lying buildings and pools, so re-uses land (policy 4b.6). The Newham UDP provides a caveat to allow Thames Water to carry out statutory functions. Reinstatement of the riverside walk will improve recreation facilities. A landscape strategy will provide planting as screening. Officers criticised bland styling and suggested it was sunk lower into ground; these were defended and remained unchanged by applicant.	s106 negotiated re. Riverside walk reinstatement.	Extensively but the applicant fundamentally have a different viewpoint. They considered that they followed the Mayor's energy hierarchy since it is the lowest energy intensity of all potential 'solutions'; however it does represent a big increase over the do-nothing scenario or a fundamentally different business strategy whereby they promote water-saving and rainwater harvesting to their customers to reduce demand and create new supplies of water. An energy assessment was in the application, and a 20-page report/powerpoint after the stage 1 report asked for more details of renewables feasibility, energy intensity, efficiency gain possibilities, and energy use of alternative options.	GLA officers requested full details of the energy consumption of the plant and possibilities for increasing its efficiency; feasibility of renewables; a comparison of the energy intensity of this water treatment method against existing methods operating in London;	No	Yes; policy 4a.11 is not met in that the development is treating water, and does not represent a sustainable resource since it uses high amounts of energy. It also does not accord with policy 4b.6 (conserving energy). However the water resource (the Thames) is renewable and the applicant states that it is the best solution to meeting water demands of a growing population.	Applicant provided further information to GLA regarding energy use and the need for this supply of water against the alternatives, including behavioural change/customer targeting. But these were unable to be completely tested by GLA.	Yes. The planning statement had regard to local ecology impacts (aquatic and terrestrial), and made several mitigation measures, although does not propose habitat improvements so only partially meets policies 3d.12 and 4b.6. Environment Agency opposed the application but withdrew this after applicant made explanations/mitigation on river encroachment, effects on fish and invertebrates, and pipe routing, many of which were also concerns of the GLA.	GLA officers undertook detailed negotiations with the applicant, LB Newham and the Environment Agency, resulting in a set of conditions to ensure the agreed measures were undertaken.	The Mayor decided to uphold his energy policies and that water usage should firstly be made lower by other methods London-wide.
Demolition of existing west stand, construction of a replacement stand with capacity of 3881 with ancillary facilities and construction of a four storey block of 65 flats with basement car parking on the open area behind existing east stand	Harlequin FC, Stoop Memorial Ground	Richmond	1002	01/06/04		Stage 2	Supports in principle; MOL designation is about to be changed and is agreed unsuitable; enabling development is accepted providing that conditions are in place to secure Open Space management and access; affordable housing provision requires justification	Agreed; all concerns raised by the Mayor have been mitigated through use of appropriate conditions	No		36% plus commuted sum meaning equivalent 40%. Grouped together at southern end of building.	Yes - applicant offers to look after adjacent area of land that has been designated as residential but could be redesignated as OOLTI, resulting in no net loss of open space.		A sustainability assessment was submitted with the application. Energy use of the stand is likely to be low owing to usage.							

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	
Demolition of existing boys' boarding house & head's house and relocation of garden sheds, construction of new 2 storey boarding house including staff living quarters & new headteacher's house with garden; new single storey dining hall & new single storey dance studio with below ground swimming pool & changing rooms.	The Royal Ballet School, Richmond Park	Richmond		28/10/04		Stage 2	Inappropriate development on MOL. The significant loss of MOL and the potential impact on badger setts outweigh the primarily local heritage and educational benefits of the scheme. Urged to consider an alternative design solution.	At stage 2 the Mayor directed refusal but this was subsequently lifted and second stage 2 report stated that the revised application has responded to concerns and demonstrates various very special circumstances for the inappropriate development on MOL. It will have a positive influence on London's world city role and planning benefits including educational and cultural outreach work.	No		No housing S106: Museum open to the public including exhibitions on Ballet History. Outreach Partnership with performing arts and sports colleges, access programme for children from maintained schools during holidays, a community programme including open rehearsals, open days and exhibitions	para 1.49 - Yes; the Mayor did rigorously defend the MOL until special circumstances were proven; furthermore the development is within an enclosure within MOL. 3d.7 - Yes - opening museum to public, allowing access to otherwise enclosed area of Richmond Park. 3d.9 - Yes; applicant eventually justified special circumstances para 3.249 - Yes; sensitive design and siting; does not support outdoor uses but is a replacement of a smaller existing building for a specific neighbouring educational building. 3d.10 - Yes, linkages created because public museum and community programmes created. 4b.6 - Partially; not re-using buildings but this is due to inherent design and quality deficiencies; natural landscape possibly benefits from building that while larger is of a style close to that of the main building, rather than the existing 1960s extension.	Extensive negotiation with the applicant and involving Richmond council. The Mayor directed refusal at stage 2, but then	4a.7 - No. The applicant dismissed renewables as it is a "sensitive location" and a "small scale" of development. The former reason does not necessarily meet London Plan para 4.18: "renewable energy technology should not be precluded in areas of heritage, but should be designed sensitively". It also implies that the small scale and heating demands are unsuited to measures other than conventional (gas condensing) boilers, but this is not proved or investigated using the London Renewables toolkit, nor tested by GLA officers. Mayor did not facilitate renewables. 4a.9 - No. para 4.19 - No. Applicant did not demonstrate how it met with the energy hierarchy 4b.6 - No, however the proposal is an extension to an existing building.	None	No. But the development will not generate extra trips. It is providing a replacement building using less energy, for the same number of inhabitants	4c.8 - No	No extra request in stage 1/2 reports.	3d.12 - Yes. Regard has been had at all stages of the application; negotiations resulted in considerably increased measures. 4b.6 - 4b.9- this is not development in a built-up area but nevertheless, the site remains very greened despite a 36% increase in footprint of the new building over the existing. Some new planting.	A mitigation scheme to accommodate the resident badgers - through conditions. This has been negotiated carefully with Richmond council and the applicant; Richmond agree to it.	Upheld policies on biodiversity, resulting in extremely good monitoring and mitigation measures for badgers and retention of most trees. Policies on open space and MOL were also defended strongly. However, while the application was referred to the Mayor because it was development on MOL, the Mayor was required to have regard to all London Plan policies; unfortunately renewables and a good standard of energy efficiency measures were not facilitated or insisted upon. The short energy statement stated that the building life span is 40 years which is highly unsustainable.

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	
Construction of a building comprising a hotel (within Use Class C1), conference facilities (Use Class D1) and retail (Use Classes A1, A2 and A3) together with service and parking areas; works of hard and soft landscaping and other incidental works, including a taxi drop-off facility.	Plot 5, More London	Southwark	134i	07/07/04	1C	Stage 1. (Stage 2 was waived).	Accepted; raises no new strategic issues	Waived	Yes	Slightly smaller hotel with full permission. Operator is no longer interested in this hotel, so a new operator is interested in a higher quality hotel (5* with extensive conferencing facilities).		No. Drawings and design issues were all that was submitted.	None	No. Drawings and design issues were all that was submitted.	None		No. Drawings and design issues were all that was submitted.	None	No. Drawings and design issues were all that was submitted.	None	The application was waived but the Mayor could have taken the opportunity to ensure the hotel meets his environmental policies. Whilst a permission was extant, a 5* hotel could have greater water and energy usage than the previous permission.
Construction of a part 3, part 16 storey building comprising 68 flats with 87 car parking spaces at lower ground and basement levels (including 63 spaces displaced by the development).	Metro Central Heights	Southwark		13/12/04		Stage 2	The Mayor would be minded to direct refusal, due primarily to the low level of affordable housing and that all is shared ownership, with no social rented accommodation; also a lack of design detail submitted, and lack of wheelchair access to lifetime home standards.	The Mayor directed refusal for the same reasons.	Yes	In 2002, the applicant made a similar application. The Mayor made representations to LB Southwark that the level and range of affordable housing, density and level of cycle parking were unacceptable against his draft London Plan. The application was refused by LB Southwark. Upon appeal, the Secretary of State accepted the level and range of affordable housing and ruled in the applicants favour. From the Inspector's report, it was apparent that no consideration was had of the Mayor's draft affordable housing policy. However, the applicant found an engineering constraint prevents its construction. This application seeks approval to a form that could be built, and represents a new application. In the intervening time, the London Plan has become statutory.	20 (25.5%). All intermediate housing (shared ownership), not a split with social rented housing.	No. The building represents a net loss of not only car parking spaces but a number of young trees which were open space for the residents of the remainder of the private development, which was built circa 1997.	None	No. No energy assessment or sustainability statement supplied	None taken	No.	No	None.	No	None	There is no mention of environmental policies in the stage 1 and 2 reports but the Mayor opposed it after Feb 2004, due to the level and range of affordable housing; the low quality of the application may also have played its part. While the Mayor strongly opposed the application and directed refusal, if this was subsequently appealed, a development could go ahead on which a very low environmental standard had been allowed, with conditions the only method by which the GLA could ensure the development met their environmental policies.

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	
Demolition of existing buildings and erection of mixed use development comprising commercial, retail and 179 housing units within new buildings on lower ground and part 3 storey and a part 5/6/7/8 storey building. Includes basement car parking with vehicular access from Webber Street and cycle store, refuse store and landscaping	Southwark Bridge Road	Southwark	1059	02/09/04	3E	Stage 1	This is a well designed development which successfully integrates family housing into a high-density urban environment. Whilst the affordable housing provision does not meet the London Plan target of 50%, due to viability the potential provision of family homes in this central London location, is supported.	N/A. Was refused by LPA. It was then re-submitted and so is also re-referred to the Mayor.	Yes	In June 2003: the three storey building at the northern end of the site for a part 5 and part 6 storey building comprising retail on the ground floor and 14 flats on the upper levels. This represents lower density housing than the latest application proposes so would be far less desirable.	66 (38%)	Partially. The site is mostly built, and an internal courtyard will provide communal open space and daylighting to the apartments.		No. There is an aspiration to meet BREEAM 'Very Good' rating but otherwise a lack of energy assessment or regard to the Mayor's energy hierarchy.	the stage 1 report requested an Energy assessment from the applicant to be submitted prior to the stage 2 referral.	No	No water reduction measures or SuDS are mentioned, so failing 4a.11 and 4b.6.	No mention of water policies in the stage 1 report.	No. Whilst the site is built and the development would not result in any adverse biodiversity impact, it is in an area of biodiversity deficiency and opportunities could be taken to increase opportunities for biodiversity. However biodiversity was not raised in the stage 1 report. Thereby the application currently fails some key objectives of policies 3d.12, 4b.6 and (the building is probably of 'large scale') 4b.9.	None	Water policies are not mentioned in the stage 1 report nor are opportunities for increasing biodiversity, e.g. green/brown roofs. There was a strong request for an energy assessment. This application was refused once by Southwark Council on issues of massing/daylight
Mixed redevelopment comprising 104 residential units, including 56 one-bedroom units and 8 one/two-bedroom units 34 two bedroom units, 6 three bedroom units (including 98 affordable housing units) and 1,350 square metres of B1 office floorspace in one 9-storey and one 12-storey building, together with basement car and cycle parking, plant refuse and amenity facilities and alterations to access.	2 Sutton Park Road	Sutton	0615a	22/12/04		Stage 2	N/A. The LPA submitted the application too late for the Mayor to provide comments at Stage 1.	Directed refusal due to lack of detail of the mix and type of affordable housing; he would be prepared to reconsider upon satisfactory resolution of this issue. This direction was subsequently lifted.	Yes	A far lower proportion of affordable housing (29%) of a slightly lower number of flats (85), in a mixed use scheme. The conclusion notes "the proposal results in an increase by 19 units from a previous approval supported by the Mayor in 2002".	98 (94%)	4b.6: Yes; the application site includes no open space, but a redevelopment of an existing building. 4b.9: Unclear whether high quality spaces are provided by the proposal.	Not discussed in reports.	No energy assessment or sustainability statement supplied	Mayor recommends that these should be required via condition, and that they cover all issues laid out in policies 4a.7 and 4a.8. No word on policies 4a.9, 4b.6 or 4b.9.	Unclear; not addressed in report	Unclear	None; the Mayor did not include these policies in the list of recommendations for conditions.	N/A	N/A	Unfortunately the application was submitted to the Mayor late; he would find it difficult to direct refusal on anything but the most concrete of grounds. The increase in affordable housing in relation to the extant permission was undoubtedly a material consideration.
Redevelopment and refurbishment of the Royal London Hospital, comprising demolition of 21 buildings and construction of five buildings, including two towers of 97 and 101m, a 322-space multi storey car park and a nursery, with a total proposed gross floor area of 225,229 sq.m.	Royal London Hospital, Whitechapel	Tower Hamlets	242a	17/05/04	1B 1C	Stage 2	The Mayor advised the LPA that the proposal was unacceptable in principle. The spatial integration of the hospital campus in the wider area was ill-considered and subsidiary to the clinical adjacencies. The Mayor considered that the spatial solutions offered were wholly inadequate.		No		None	Yes. The site is highly developed and density is being massively increased. However there is an increase in the overall amount and quality (4b.6, 4b.9) of open space on the site, achieved through increasing the building densities. No green open space has been created and this type of space is lacking in this area; such an enhancement would mean the	None	No. There is an energy demand assessment (policy 4a.8) as well as a detailed statement of intent. However there is no guarantee of the inclusion of measures that would meet London Plan policies, and no related conditions of s106 terms were included. The Facilities Management contract is to be for 35 years on the part of the applicant, who state that they are consequently committed to high standards of sustainable design. They have not finalised CHP plus	Stage 1 and 2 reports did not mention. Should have raised issue at stage 1 and at the very least could have made suggestions for appropriate s106 heads of terms.	Yes	No. No rainwater recycling or SuDS. Possibility of a 'NEAT' assessment but this may not include extensive measures on water.	Stage 1 and 2 reports did not mention. Should have raised issue at stage 1 and at the very least could have made suggestions for appropriate s106 heads of terms.	Partially. Little existing habitat, so few losses. However there is a loss of an area of established green space including mature trees for the period of development (10 years) after which it will be reinstated. However it is not possible Conditions are securing provision of bat roosting sites although bat roosts have been assessed as very unlikely to exist.	Conditions are securing provision of bat roosting sites and bird nesting boxes plus suitable habitat for black redstarts.	It is disappointing that while the Mayor took a stand on the design of the hospital, with a very real threat of directing refusal, he did not raise the lack of compliance with his energy and water policies anywhere in the stage 1 or 2 reports. The applicant makes encouraging statements about its feasibility studies and commitment to acknowledged high levels of sustainable design, and there is no reason to disbelieve this since they are responsible for the first 35 years of energy provision. A small amount of consideration from the Mayor could have guaranteed commitments yet without appropriate conditions or s106 terms the development cannot be said to meet any of the Mayor's

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?	
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)		
												application had a higher regard to policy in paragraph 3.246. There is a 10-year period of the development during which an area of established green space including mature trees will be used for storage and other uses, after which it will be reinstated. Since the reinstated open space may not be of the same quality (it will not be as mature) the application may not fully meet policy in paragraph 3.252.		district heating, geothermal cooling and heating. This is unacceptable against London Plan policies 4a.7, 4a.8, 4a.9, 4b.6 and particularly 4b.9 relating to 'exemplary' tall buildings.								energy or water policies. The requirements of policy 4b.9 for 'exemplary' tall buildings are not met.
Demolition of London Arena and redevelopment by erection of 8 buildings ranging from 43 to 7 storeys in height with a total of 142,180 sq.m of floor space over a podium. Comprises 1047 residential units, office space, a hotel, community facility, range of retail uses, new health and fitness club, associated landscaping including new public open spaces and a dockside walkway, new internal road and parking for 541 cars	Crossharbour site, former London Arena	Tower Hamlets	0511b	30/06/04	1B 1C	Stage 1	To refuse due to lack of information about renewable energy. However this direction was subsequently lifted.	Not yet reached Stage 2	Yes	A similar application had been made and refused.	293 (30%) Hoped for: £2.5m towards the Crossharbour DLR station as part of the Capacity Enhancement (3 car) Project; £400,000 for bus improvements, unspecified sum to mitigate effects of the development on radio reception for the DLR system.	Yes. There are two main squares, one commercial/offices and the other for the residential community with a children's playground, organised 5-a-side playspace and a community facility. There is public access through the site to the waterside. Therefore many types/uses of open spaces are provided, meeting policy 3d.7 and 4b.6. Mudchute Park is located 300m away.		Partially. ES is provided but does not provide enough detail to be in line with policy 4a.7. The proportion of renewables appears to be tiny, providing for only the communal lighting. Building designs may allow integration of renewables in the future when more commercially viable. Policy 4b.6 is met in part; BREEM 'Very Good' ratings is expected. Using water from the dock to cool the hotel development is proposed. Mass thermal storage plus natural ventilation to provide all cooling for the office portion. Green roofs are proposed that offer insulation benefits. 85% of construction waste will be recycled.	Energy has been a feature of discussions with the applicant and LB Tower Hamlets since the application was originally lodged in 2003. The Mayor in the stage 1 report stated that the carbon reductions provided by the renewables provision would have to be proven and justified before approval would be forthcoming.	Yes	Rainwater harvesting is proposed but only for irrigation of planting which is likely to represent a very low proportion of the water use of the site. However due to the very high density (over 1100hr/h) there is very little roof coverage to provide for the inhabitants. The site is not suitable for SuDS due to the site sloping 3m down to the water. Green roofs will also attenuate run-off. Low water use appliances will be fitted throughout. Policy 4a.11 is therefore met to a good extent.	Conditions have not been suggested to secure the green roofs or the other details of design features.	Green roofs are proposed, to provide a habitat not previously existing; these will provide habitats for black redstarts, and was requested by the Environment Agency; the applicant also has experience of installing them. There is insufficient detail about the open spaces at ground level to know the biodiversity contributions. However it may meet policy 3d.12 to a good extent.	Conditions have not been suggested to secure the green roofs.	Water, biodiversity and open space are well addressed given the limitations of the site. Given the discussions at stage 1 energy issues may be satisfactorily resolved as well, to include 10% renewables.	

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	
Construction of new mosque and multi-cultural community centre and relocation of existing mosque onto adjoining public open space for a temporary period during construction works.	Shandy Park, Stepney	Tower Hamlets	1121	07/01/05	1C	Stage 2	Timing of referral to Mayor left insufficient time for the Mayor to comment application. Stage 1 and 2 considered at Stage 2 referral stage.	Mayor did not wish to direct refusal – content for borough to determine case itself subject to action by Secretary of State.	Yes	2000 - mosque application approved. 208sqm less footprint than that proposed in this case.	None	There is a loss of open space, however there is no difference between this application and the 2000 approved application in the amount of publicly accessible open space being lost. The s106 agreed for the 2000 application, to create an equivalent area of open space elsewhere, will remain for this application.	Public open space must be provided elsewhere in the borough in exchange for the loss of open space in Shandy Park. The site for the temporary mosque should be reinstated as open space after removal of the building	No. No energy assessment provided, failing 4a.8. The building will be used almost all hours of the day, every day and includes many high energy features (heating, lifts) and so should apply the energy hierarchy. Energy and sustainability statements are to be provided to the LPA by condition.	The stage 1 report made a detailed request for an energy assessment. The stage 2 report stated that the LPA must secure an energy assessment from the applicant by condition, and this is included.	No but will not result in any significant increases in traffic or other emissions..	No.	None.	No biodiversity assessment created. While open space is being created elsewhere there is no commitment to biodiversity measures or in particular enhancements to meet policy 3d.12. There would be ample opportunity to do this.	Replacement tree planting and soft landscaping is being secured by condition.	While the site had permission for a mosque already, it is disappointing that biodiversity and water measures were not satisfactorily addressed. The mosque could, like many places of worship in Britain, stand for centuries so an opportunity has been missed to incorporate water measures here.
The proposal involves redevelopment of an existing outdoor car park into six buildings of 11 to 29 storeys, comprising 708 residential units and a potential mix of leisure, non-residential institution, business and retail uses, open space, access and car parking. An Environment Statement accompanies the application. The proposal also involves work to a listed dock structure.	Reuters, Blackwall Yard	Tower Hamlets	837		1A 1C	Stage 2	Accepted in principal with regard to strategic planning policy, particularly regarding maximising development potential of a brownfield site in an Opportunity Area with a well-designed high-density, mixed-use scheme	Mayor did not wish to direct refusal – content for borough to determine case subject to action by Secretary of State.	Yes	1997 - office buildings totalling 83,000sqm. Permission implemented (I.e. works begun). Not clear if there is a CLOPUD on it.	No housing £935,000 for transport, £731,000 for education and library facilities, £1,667,000 for open space and recreation and amenity, £753,000 for health facilities.	Public open space is being created at the riverside, which relates to the ground floor uses (café etc). A condition is securing a new riverside walk. £1.67m towards this open space provision, including recreation and amenity.	No; energy statement was provided but this stated the applicants intentions, with a view to submitting a detailed assessment later. The latter is secured by a detailed condition including demonstrating the feasibility of renewables and including them. Residential portion will meet Ecohomes standards, but the rating sought is not stated. Electric panel or underfloor heating is proposed, which does not comply with the Mayor's energy hierarchy at all. Natural ventilation with heat exchangers will be provided only to penthouse apartments. The stage 1 report states the applicant "has illustrated development layouts that take account of solar orientation and other non-technical mechanisms to promote energy efficiently [sic] and light airy spaces".	Full sustainability statement asked for in stage 1 report, with details of what it should include.	No; 4a.11 and 4c.8 may be met but it is not guaranteed at this stage. Energy statement says rainwater recycling and low water use appliances will probably be included, and a condition requires that an energy assessment is submitted that is concordant with the statement. Similarly it cannot be said if 4b.6 and 4b.9 will be met.		Yes. No significant habitat exists but conditions are in place to secure enhancements; the provision of timber cladding to river walls, and green roofs as habitats for black redstarts; and submission of a detailed scheme of other ecological enhancements across the site.		The energy statement is non-committal but with conditions in place to secure an assessment that is in line with policy. There are good prospects for an energy-efficient design although it may not ultimately include 10% renewables. However it must be remembered that there is no good reason why energy was not assessed at stage Biodiversity has been well addressed, as has open space.		

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	
Redevelopment of the former Morganite factory, and refurbishment and extension of the existing warehouse building, fronting Point Pleasant for mixed-use purposes containing 128 apartments and 4,420 sq. m. commercial accommodation for A2, B1 or D1 uses, basement parking, hard and soft landscaping and pedestrian link from Point Pleasant towards Osiers Road.	Former Morganite factory	Wandsworth	1109	13/12/2004	1B	Stage 2	No stage 1 report/comments made - was not referred to the Mayor	Accepted. High standard of design and good use of the currently under-utilised site.	Yes	2002; would provide 52 private residential units, with no affordable housing units.	38 (circa 30%)	Yes. There is no loss of open space as it is previously developed land (a factory); a new through pedestrian and cycle link is proposed and a small area of landscaped garden as public open space is located in the centre of the site. Trees will front the development on one street, improving the public realm. The applicant states that the local open space provision is very extensive with a full range of open space types, and the development would not cause it to reach capacity.		No. Only minimal energy efficiency measures have been proposed in the sustainability report. However the applicant will be providing an energy assessment by condition.	After negotiation with GLA officers, a commitment has been made to the production of an Energy Assessment. The stage 2 report states that it has been too late to get the required measures agreed with the applicant, but they offer to assist the LPA informally; furthermore they make specific demands for the contents of the energy assessment.		Partially. The applicant proposes water-efficient appliances, meeting policy 4b.6. It has had regard to sustainable drainage only insofar as the development does not result in an increase in impermeable ground cover, and the open space incorporates soft landscaping. The application can not be said to fully meet policies 4a.11 and 4a.12.		Partially. There does not appear to be a biodiversity assessment, so it is not known whether the derelict factory site provides habitat e.g. to bats. The proposals probably represent an enhancement in biodiversity terms since a garden area and other soft landscaping is proposed in the centre and the perimeter of the site. policy 3d.12 appears to be met.		Despite the short time in which the Mayor had to consider the application, he took a proactive approach with regard to energy policy. After discussions, the applicant agreed to provide a comprehensive energy and renewables assessment, meeting a wide range of criteria set by the GLA to meet all the London Plan policies. Open space is well resolved given that it is a previously developed site. However water policies do not appear to have been upheld by the Mayor.
Imperial College: demolition of Southside and Linstead halls of residence and development of the site to provide new student accommodation with ancillary facilities including doctor's surgery, dentist's surgery, creche, convenience store, licensed cafe and associated landscaping, including Prince's Gardens Square.	Imperial College, Princes Garden	Westminster	1036	16/08/04	1B	Stage 2	That the LPA determine the case itself. Tfl was dissatisfied with cycle provision but this was not noted in the conclusion of the report. Relevant policies state that there should be 439 spaces provided, but the applicant is proposing 190.	For the LPA to determine itself. The applicant improved architectural detailing but not CABE's access or Tfl's cycle parking concerns. Tfl reiterated its expectation of 1 space per 2 inhabitants. The applicant had stated that the requirement in the UDP and the London Cycle Network Design Manual was 1 per 8; Tfl stated that 1:8 is for D1 use whereas the application is C2, for which the LCN Design Manual states 1:2. The conclusion notes 'cycle provision remains unsatisfactory'.	No		N/A - student accommodation. No off-site contribution or commuted sum. No other obligations suggested by applicant or Mayor.	3d.7: Partially; the square is open to the public but the fairly low levels of use may not be increased by the proposal. While it will improve the aesthetics and accessibility (benches, lighting, and paths along desire lines), it offers nothing to improve play, sport, or culture. 4b.6: Partially; measures are proposed to reduce noise to residents in mews behind, including windows of limited opening, and the building being set back by a new private garden; Prince's Gardens are retained/'re-used' as open space. 4b.9: Partially; building has one piece of green	Applicant has led on this and is fully expected to deliver; unclear what conditions are being made to ensure this.	4a.7: Partially; the new building has reasonably high standards of energy efficiency according to the sustainability appraisal, but is nowhere near its potential. 4a.8 and para 4.19: No. The Mayor did not request an energy assessment; the sustainability report submitted was written, 'in accordance with' the Westminster UDP, not the London Plan Energy strategy and its 'energy hierarchy'. 4a.9: Partially; the Mayor did not require the development to show that it would use renewables, and the sustainability appraisal dismisses most renewables as inappropriate. 4b.6: Partially; it is of high quality but could be far better. CHP is dismissed with insufficient explanation, and solar panels are deemed unsuitable in the Conservation Area, unlikely given that the roof is no lower than	The stage 1 & 2 reports do not mention energy of the new buildings, except insofar as they replace less efficient, older buildings. Of concern is that no attempt has been made by the Mayor to increase renewables/energy efficiency. The applicant could have been receptive to negotiation; they have a great desire to replace the accommodation here, and are not building speculatively; they will be paying for energy supplies so can recoup the capital expenditure on renewables or efficiency measures.	Yes	4a.11: Yes. The proposal represents an increase in student numbers but overall water demand is predicted to be 'unchanged' due to efficiency gains; 'all water fittings and appliances will be low water use types'. 4b.6: Yes. Statement included. 4b.9: No. The water requirements do not represent 'exemplary standards' in efficiency or reduced demand. 4c.8: Partially; the reason given for not having SuDS as "the central London location", is unclear, and "the potentially high water table levels" is not substantiated or explained as a reason. Run-off is being managed through increasing the amount of, and re-grading, soft areas.	No word on any of these issues in either stage 1 or 2 referrals.	Yes; although there will be felling of non-native species (e.g. eucalyptus), and the restoration will result in a better environment for plants, with more light. An area of wild grasses and native plants will be created.	left to L.B.	This application is apparently lacking in any negotiation on matters of energy and water. This is of great concern given the scale of development and the potential owing to the type of building and the applicant. The gains in energy efficiency were central to justifying demolition of the Grade II listed building but even greater gains would be possible. The university is world-leading in many fields and is a key member of London Renewables, linked with the GLA to increase uptake of renewables in London. The operation is such that the high capital cost of any renewable or energy efficiency measures would be directly recoupable by the applicant well within the lifespan of the building.

Proposal description	Proposal title	LPA	GLA case no.	First GLA date	Referral category (GLA Act 2000)	Reached Stage 1 or Stage 2?	Stage 1 recommendation	Stage 2 recommendation	Is there a valid existing permission on this site?		Number of affordable housing units (and as a % of all units) plus other obligations	Open Space		Energy & Waste		Air Quality	Water		Biodiversity		Overall judgement - how important were the Mayor's environmental policies?			
									Yes or No	If Yes, how similar to latest application; how may it limit negotiations on improvements		Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Assessment provided?	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)	Satisfactorily addressed in application?	Action taken (e.g. decision left to LB; made a condition; s.106 sought)				
												roof, but as it attempts to blend with surrounding buildings, this is said to "preclude brown and green roofs" elsewhere. Restoration of the square is high quality and sensitive, yet modern in its access arrangements. The application notes that it is one of few open private squares in this area. CABE noted as their only concern to the proposal, that for it to be actively used by the public it would need some public uses and active frontages within the proposed buildings, but this is not addressed by the applicants.		its neighbours and is 9 floors high; in any case it is contrary to government PPG15 para. 4.19 and the Mayor's Energy Strategy para. 5.52. It will meet Part L of Building Regulations, not BREEAM or other assessments. 4b.9: No. Whilst of a large scale, with 880 beds, and surpassing Building Regulations minimum standards, they do not 'illustrate exemplary standards' across most aspects of sustainable construction.										
Demolition and redevelopment of existing office building, with retained facades to Marconi House to provide a building of basement plus 10 storeys. All in connection with use of site as a hotel, with upper floors of former Marconi House as self contained residential flats and 2 new restaurant units at ground floor level	Citibank House	Westminster	1045	27/08/04	1B 1C	Stage 2	Principle is acceptable; commuted sum for affordable housing is sufficient. Transport contributions needed. Applicant should prepare an Access statement, and improve architectural detailing. "The contribution that the development makes towards sustainable development is unacceptable. The applicant should be required to produce an energy assessment that complies with the Mayor's energy hierarchy."	Applicant responded to issues raised by the Mayor, including submission of a sustainability report. This highlights energy efficient measures beyond Building Regulations, including a CHP plant providing 40% of the heating requirements of the hotel and apartments. The applicant has considered renewable energy and trigeneration (CCHP). However, for practical and financial reasons, examined by GLA officers, these were rejected.	Yes	Is commercially developable; offices including façade retention. Report accords this some weight in that the proposed change of use to hotel is considered desirable.	32 (off-site) s106: Public art, environmental improvements.		Partially. Energy statement was provided, after the stage 1 report requested it. There is no commitment to renewables. It states that PV's and solar water panels cannot be located on the roof. However various CO2 reduction/energy efficiency measures are included and "consideration is being given" to CHP plant, which would provide 40% of heating. The applicant has considered renewables and CCHP, but the report states that for practical and financial reasons, examined by GLA officers, these have been rejected. It is unclear what these are. Concerns over the visual impact of PV/Solar panels on slate roofs was mentioned in the application, but the Energy Strategy states that this need not be a reason not to install such panels.	Discussions between GLA and applicant; request at stage 1 for energy statement but none provided.		Partially. No measures are suggested beyond what Building Regulations would require.	The stage 1 report suggests water-saving equipment should be considered. The energy statement subsequently introduces these measures (spray taps, A-rated white goods, etc).	N/A	N/a	The main focus of the application was addressing heritage issues. Sustainability was repeatedly mentioned but only insofar as it was high density uses in a very accessible location. The issues raised by GLA in stage 1 report were comprehensively acted upon by the applicant which indicates both a willing applicant and good GLA procedures. CHP went from being a consideration to being proposed. It is disappointing that both Westminster and the applicant considered renewables unsuitable due to heritage reasons.				

