

The Dash for Homes?

A report on the environmental aspects of the Mayor's planning decisions
March 2006



The Dash for Homes?

A report on the environmental aspects of the Mayor's planning decisions

March 2006

copyright

Greater London Authority
March 2006

Published by

Greater London Authority
City Hall

The Queen's Walk

More London

London SE1 2AA

www.london.gov.uk

enquiries **020 7983 4100**

minicom **020 7983 4458**

ISBN 1 85261 856 6

This publication is printed on recycled paper

Chair's Foreword



When the Mayor sought re-election in 2004, he committed to prioritising environmental protection and sustainability, and careful planning to develop a clean, green and sustainable city. Clearly as London's population grows and our economy develops a more extensive and intensive use of land is required to meet those needs. The Mayor has therefore to strike a balance between "new build" and establishing high environmental standards, and there will be times when not all of his environmental objectives are achieved.

Our research indicates that there appears to have been a noticeable improvement in the consideration of environmental issues as part of the strategic planning decisions referred to the Mayor. However, we also found some planning decisions proceed despite not meeting all of the Mayor's environmental objectives. We therefore call for the Mayor to make it clear when he judges it is necessary to make a planning decision that forgoes environmental policy considerations in favour of others, for example social policy, and the basis for his decision.

Our work is focused particularly at influencing the Mayor's London Plan. This document is the main vehicle through which his planning commitments can be made. It is undergoing review and our work seeks to help create the framework necessary to deliver the right balance between protecting the environment with accommodating the demand for new build.

I would like to give thanks to the rest of the Committee and to everyone who contributed their views and comments to this inquiry.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Darren Johnson". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Darren Johnson AM
Chair, Environment Committee

Terms of Reference

The Environment Committee is a cross-party committee of London Assembly Members, with the following terms of reference.

To examine and report from time to time on -

- the strategies, policies and actions of the Mayor and the Functional Bodies
- matters of importance to Greater London

To examine and report to the Assembly from time to time on the Mayor's Air Quality, Biodiversity, Energy, Noise and Waste Strategies, in particular their implementation and revision.

To consider environmental matters on request from another standing committee and report its opinion to that standing committee.

To take into account in its deliberations the cross cutting themes of: the health of persons in Greater London; and the promotion of opportunity.

To respond on behalf of the Assembly to consultations and similar processes when within its terms of reference.

Committee members

Darren Johnson (Chair)	Green
Murad Qureshi (Deputy Chair)	Labour
Roger Evans	Conservative
Bob Neill	Conservative
Mike Tuffrey	Liberal Democrat
Peter Hulme Cross	One London

Committee Contacts

Carmen Musonda, Scrutiny Manager
020 7983 6542 carmen.musonda@london.gov.uk

Sue Riley, Committee Co-ordinator
020 7983 4425 sue.riley@london.gov.uk

Kelly Flynn, Senior Media Officer
020 7983 4067 kelly.flynn@london.gov.uk

Contents

Chair's Foreword

The Environment Committee

Executive Summary

Chapter 1 Planning and the environment

Chapter 2 Strategic planning in London

Chapter 3 The right balance

Appendices

Appendix 1 The recommendations

Appendix 2 The analysis

Appendix 3 Environmental policies selected for the analysis
of the Mayor's planning decisions

Appendix 4 Orders and translations

Appendix 5 Scrutiny Principles

Executive Summary

The Mayor's Spatial Development Strategy, more commonly known as the London Plan, sets out a strategic framework for spatial development in London over the next 15-20 years. It is the main vehicle through which the Mayor's environmental policies can be integrated into planning decisions affecting existing and future developments.

Striking a balance between meeting housing and other development demands and the need to protect London's environment is a difficult challenge the Mayor must meet in order to create a growing but green and sustainable city. The London Assembly's Environment Committee is concerned that at present, the right balance has not yet been reached, and that some environmental considerations are being undermined in the haste to meet challenging development targets.

This report examines the current process for assessing environmental considerations in the Mayor's decisions in strategic planning applications¹, and the adequacy of the framework in which these decisions are made.

It highlights the need for complete openness in how decisions are arrived at. It also highlights apparent weaknesses in the decision making process, including a lack of consistency in the decisions reached, and the need for a more robust framework setting out the Mayor's policies in a more explicit and decisive manner.

The Environment Committee recommends:

- The need for clarity and openness about decisions requiring the Mayor to compromise on environmental considerations in favour of other policy requirements
- The creation of comprehensive checklist to help develop a more systematic approach to initial assessment of environmental considerations in strategic planning applications,
- Regular and extensive training for officers responsible for making these assessments and,
- The inclusion of example cases in the London Plan, where environmental considerations have been successfully incorporated in development, along with explicit and decisive wording of the Mayor's environmental policies.

The review of the London Plan over the next two years is presents an invaluable opportunity to revisit and revise policy wording in light of past experience, and to create the right platform on which to develop future precedent that will place London in the forefront of sustainable development.

¹ These are defined by the Secretary of State as planning applications likely to be for large scale development, major infrastructure, or development which may affect key strategic policies, London's strategic views or protected Thames wharves, or which is a departure from the borough's local development document.

Chapter 1 – Planning and the environment

- 1.1 London is one of the largest cities in the developed world in terms of its total land area of 1,584 square kilometres, and is by a considerable margin the most populous city in the European Union, with 7.4 million residents. It is also one of the European Union's most densely settled areas at nearly 4,700 persons per square kilometre. Only Brussels and Paris are more densely populated.²
- 1.2 London's population is set to rise to eight million by 2016. Land will be needed to provide the additional homes, places of employment, areas for recreation, and other infrastructure needed to create and maintain sustainable communities. Effective land use is therefore vital. The challenge is to meet these essential needs in ways that enhances rather than detracts from our environment.
- 1.3 Planning is about securing the most efficient and effective use of land to delivering what people want: need - jobs, homes, transport, directing new development in an environmentally responsible way and providing protection for existing green spaces. The planning system therefore plays an important role in our lives.

Purpose of our inquiry

- 1.4 When the Mayor sought re-election in 2004, he committed to prioritising environmental protection and sustainability, and careful planning to develop a clean, green and sustainable city. The main vehicle through which his planning commitment can be met is the Spatial Development Strategy, otherwise known as the London Plan. The London Plan, published in February 2004, is the strategic planning instrument for London, and sets out an integrated social, economic and environmental framework for the future development for London over a 15 – 20 year span.
- 1.5 The Mayor has in the past, referred to the wide range of issues that he considers in making planning decisions, for example in response to a question from an Assembly Member, he said *"The policies in the London Plan ... must be judged and appraised alongside all the other policies. In some cases this may mean that not all of the policy objectives in one particular area are achieved."*³
- 1.6 The London Assembly's Environment Committee's would wish to see that the policies set out in the Mayor's environmental strategies and environmental policies set out in the Spatial Development Strategy, otherwise known as the London Plan, are **fully** integrated into planning decisions to deliver the right balance of development and sustainability.
- 1.7 Our main concern is that the Mayor may be undermining environmental considerations in a haste to meet housing or other development demands.

² London's changing population, Diversity of a world city in the 21st century, Greater London Authority Data Management and Analysis Group Briefing 2005/39, November 2005

³ Mayor's Question Time, 2005

London Thames Gateway is one example of the existence of immense pressure for speedy large-scale development.

- 1.8 The London Thames Gateway Development & Investment Framework, published in April 2004, argues that the Thames Gateway area of East London could accommodate at least 91,000 new homes compared with the Government's target of 60,000; but recognises that this can only be achieved with the right planning and investment.
- 1.9 The Framework also recognises that again, without proper planning, growth in the London Thames Gateway area will put a heavy strain on physical infrastructure such as energy and water supply, and that the river Thames, though an asset, must be carefully managed to protect new and existing communities from the risk of flooding.⁴ The need for strong planning policy to reduce the impacts of flooding and risk in the Thames Gateway was one of several main findings from our investigation into flooding risk in London last year.⁵
- 1.10 We accept that growth in London's population is inevitable, but would argue that it should be managed in a way that is sustainable. We appreciate the need to carefully balance protecting the environment with accommodating the demand for new build; and appreciate that difficult decisions will sometimes need to be made. We would however wish to see the right balance achieved in those decisions. Evidence from our research would seem to suggest that for a variety of reasons, as outlined in paragraph 1.12 below, the desired equilibrium has not been reached.
- 1.11 We welcome the Mayor's commitment to seek to redress the imbalance. During the Greater London Authority budget-setting process earlier this year, we were heartened to hear the Mayor confirm he was confident that the staff changes made and budget set allowed for "...a proper environmental assessment of *every* planning application...during this financial year."⁶

Our inquiry

- 1.12 Our inquiry examined the extent to which the Mayor's environmental policies and objectives are reflected in his planning decisions and how he goes about deciding which environmental factors need to be included. We set the following terms of reference:

To investigate and report, with recommendations, on environmental aspects of the Mayor's planning decisions, with particular reference to the following questions:

- Are the Mayor's existing policies and strategies effective in ensuring that issues relating to energy, water use, flooding, waste, loss of open/green space and biodiversity fully taken into account in planning decisions?

⁴ A copy of the Framework and further information on London Thames Gateway is available at www.lda.gov.uk

⁵ London Under Threat, Flooding risk in the Thames Gateway, London Assembly, October 2005

⁶ Mayor's Question Time, 2006

- To what extent do the Mayor’s planning decisions (*nb edited out over the past year because of time lapse*) show that the Mayor is giving appropriate weight in his environmental strategies and policies?
- 1.13 We did not set out to carry out a detailed case-by-case analysis of the Mayor’s planning decisions. The Assembly’s Planning and Spatial Development Committee recently completed a wider review of the Mayor’s decisions on strategic planning applications, as they are applied to the broader spectrum of the Mayor’s policies and proposals set out in the London Plan.
- 1.14 Our inquiry sought to identify patterns and trends in the Mayor’s planning decisions from an environmental perspective, and uncover any opportunities for improvement in the decision-making process to ensure that the Mayor’s environmental strategies and policies are fully reflected in his planning decisions.
- 1.15 Our research identified some apparent weaknesses in the process for assessing environmental considerations, including a need for greater consistency in decision-making to provide the base on which to develop precedent, and a need for more explicit and firm wording in policies set out in the London Plan.
- 1.16 We appreciate that our analysis covered a relatively limited proportion of planning applications submitted for consideration by the Mayor’s Planning Decisions Unit and Environment Team. Some time has elapsed since the initial analysis was completed. However, we believe that there is value in addressing the issues our inquiry raised, at this point in time given the impending review of the London Plan. GLA officers have provided additional input during our deliberations and we are grateful for the time and effort they have given to our work.

Report structure

- 1.17 This report sets out:
- The Mayor’s role in planning and the current process for environmental considerations and application of the Mayor’s environmental policies and objectives (Chapter 2).
 - Our concerns about any weak links in the process for applying the Mayor’s policies, and our recommendations on how they might be improved (Chapter 3).

Chapter 2 – Strategic planning in London

Planning in London

- 2.1 Broadly speaking, there are three tiers to the planning system in London. Local planning authorities operate at the local level. Each local planning authority is responsible for planning in their areas, including consideration of planning applications and the preparation of development plans. In London each of the 32 boroughs and the City Corporation are local planning authorities for their areas.
- 2.2 At national level, Government Ministers have specific statutory functions under planning legislation. They are responsible for issuing policy statements which guide the decisions made by local planning authorities, for example, Planning Policy Statement 1 which sets out the Government's overarching planning policies on the delivery of sustainable development through the planning system.⁷
- 2.3 The third tier of the planning system is where national planning policies interface with regional level policies. The Government Office for London (GOL) acts on behalf of the First Secretary of State on land use planning matters in London.⁸ GOL represents central Government in London and works with partner organisations to deliver the Government's policies and programmes on the ground. GOL also represents London's interests within the Government.

The Mayor's role in planning

- 2.4 The Mayor is responsible for strategic planning in London. His main responsibilities are to provide a strategic planning overview for London, the London Plan, and ensure that local planning frameworks generally conform to it. The Mayor is also responsible for monitoring and collecting information on the implementation of the London Plan and representing London's planning interests in the wider South East.
- 2.5 The Mayor must be consulted on planning applications that are considered to be of potential strategic importance.⁹ He can comment on and support these applications or if he considers it necessary on strategic planning grounds, direct a local planning authority, that is, the borough to refuse planning permission.
- 2.6 The Mayor is not currently able to direct approval of applications, only the boroughs can do this.¹⁰ However, in a recently published statement responding to the Office of the Deputy Prime Ministers' review of the Greater London Authority's powers, the Mayor has called for his existing power to direct refusal of strategic planning applications to be extended to direct approval. He has also

⁷ Published February 2005. This replaces PPG Note 1: General Policies and Principles (published February 1997).

⁸ GOL is one of nine regional government offices with the dual responsibility of representing central Government in the regions and regional interests within Government on the wide range of government policies delivered in the English regions. For more information see <http://www.gos.gov.uk/gol/>

⁹ Greater London Authority Act 1999, S344; Strategic Planning in London, GOL Circular 1/2000, une 2000; Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2000, SI no 1493.

¹⁰ *ibid*

called for the power to direct a local planning authority not to adopt a Local Plan if it is not in general conformity with the London Plan.¹¹

Strategic applications

- 2.7 The Secretary of State has defined the main features of a potentially strategically important planning application. The applications are likely to be for:
- large scale development
 - major infrastructure
 - development which may affect key strategic policies
 - development which may affect key strategic views of London, or protected Thames wharves
 - development which is a departure from the borough's Local development document
- 2.8 We were told that the number of planning applications that the Mayor is required to be consulted on makes up less than half a per cent of the total number of applications dealt with in London. Of the 87,000 planning applications in London, between 250 to 300 are referred to the Mayor.¹² Although it is only a small percentage of all applications they are the largest and most significant and set the standard for other decisions. It is therefore vital to ensure that a robust system is in place for fully integrating environmental aspects in the Mayor's planning decisions.

The process

- 2.9 The Mayor reviews a strategic application at two crucial stages of the application process; these are known as Stage 1 and Stage 2 statutory referrals. At the first stage, a round of discussions take place, involving officers primarily from the Mayor's Planning Decisions Unit (PDU), officers from other sections of the Greater London Authority and its group of organisations¹³, usually the applicants, the boroughs and ultimately the Mayor, before a response to the borough is prepared. The Mayor is given 21 days in which to respond to the borough.
- 2.10 The response to the borough, known as a Stage 1 report, can contain one of three submissions, that the application meets the Mayor's strategic policy tests, to indicate that he would be minded to direct refusal because the application fails to meet his policy tests, or to suggest amendments to improve an application that falls short of his policy tests but could meet them provided the improvements are adopted. The Mayor is only likely to get involved at the second stage of the application in the latter scenario.
- 2.11 It is worth noting that applications referred at Stage 1 are only referred back to the Mayor if the local authority resolves to grant planning permission

¹¹ GLA review of powers reference

¹² Transcript of the London Assembly Environment Committee meeting, dated 26 July 2005, p 15. Minutes and transcripts of Environment Committee meetings are available at www.london.gov.uk/assembly or on request from the London Assembly Secretariat.

¹³ The Greater London Authority Group is made up of the Greater London Authority, the London Development Agency, Transport for London, the Metropolitan Police Authority and the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority.

(applications that are refused, withdrawn or never determined would not be seen again by the Mayor). At Stage 2, the Mayor is given 14 days within which to decide whether to direct refusal of an application. The applicant has a right of appeal against a decision to refuse their application, and the Mayor may be liable for costs should the inquiry conclude that his powers of direction had been used unreasonably.

Incorporating environmental considerations

- 2.12 We were told that lists of new planning applications are circulated to officers in the Mayor's Environment team (ET), for their perusal on a weekly basis. Any available environmental statements are supplied with the applications and these are reviewed at the same time. Issues or concerns identified at this stage may be raised and discussed between officers in the PDU and ET.
- 2.13 Where there are noticeable apparent weaknesses on environmental policies, officers attempt to engage with applicants and negotiate with them to improve the application. ET officers may be drafted in on these discussions if the issue is particularly technical, for example on air quality or noise.¹⁴ The report prepared for submission to the Mayor at the end of the first stage will draw to the Mayor's attention any environmental issues the officer has concerns about.
- 2.14 PDU officers are also encouraging applicants to engage in discussions prior to making a planning application, as they believe that a much better solution from the process can be arrived at, at this early stage, before the applicant has already committed large sums of money to preparing the application.¹⁵

¹⁴ Transcript of Environment Committee meeting, 26 July 2005, pages 7 and 8.

¹⁵ Transcript of Environment Committee meeting, 26 July 2005, page 8.

Chapter 3 – The right balance

- 3.1 In the previous chapter, we set out the process for considering strategic planning applications and the environmental aspects of them, as gathered from previous scrutiny work,¹⁶ and as explained to us by officers from the Mayor's Planning Decision Unit (PDU) and Environment Team (ET).
- 3.2 Our concern throughout this inquiry has been to see that considerations of the Mayor's environmental policies are comprehensively and systematically integrated into the planning decision process. And where there are weak points to make constructive recommendations on how they might be improved.
- 3.3 The research we commissioned in support of our inquiry, as well as the more detailed content of our discussions with officers from the PDU and ET suggest that there are some process and policy weaknesses, that must be improved on if the Mayor is to achieve his strategic outcome for London's environment.¹⁷

Our research

- 3.4 We commissioned desk-based research to analyse a selection of the Mayor's planning decisions over a 12 month period, from May 2004 to April 2005. Approximately 40 cases were selected. The criteria for selecting these cases along with the type of information we were looking to extract from the research, and a matrix of the results on a case-by-case basis, are set out in Appendix 2. The cases were assessed against environmental policies in the London Plan on, open space, biodiversity, energy, waste, water usage, drainage and flooding. Appendix 3 sets out the full list of the policies considered.

What our research found

The positives

- 3.5 On a positive note, our research found that there appeared to have been a noticeable improvement in the consideration of environmental issues. It is also true that a minority of applications were subject to direction of refusal until certain environmental issues were addressed, and it was apparent that environmental issues were considered earlier in the planning control process including at the design phase.
- 3.6 One example is the case of St. Joseph's Academy, where the Mayor undertook lengthy negotiations on energy policy. This resulted in improved energy efficiency and BREEAM (Buildings Research Establishment Environmental

¹⁶ Behind Closed Doors, Scrutiny of the Mayor's Planning Decisions Planning Advisory Committee, London Assembly June 2002.

Mayoral decisions on strategic planning applications, London Assembly, Jan 2006.

¹⁷ The Greater London Authority Corporate Plan 2005/08 sets out the Mayor's vision and strategic outcomes over the next few years. Making London a clean, green and exemplary city environment is one of the five strategic outcomes listed. The Mayor has committed to delivering on this outcome by using planning powers to promote and implement his environmental policies.

Assessment Method) ratings, but renewables¹⁸ were not incorporated. The Mayor directed refusal of the application, but indicated that he would amend his decision if and when the scheme incorporated renewable energy provision. We have more recently been informed that there are more positive outcomes from this application, with the applicant agreeing to incorporate £100,000 worth of renewables. Furthermore, this case has resulted in changes to the Department of Education and Skills schools program, so that the requirement for renewables is highlighted right from the start.

- 3.7 In another case (Lea Valley High School), the applicant re-submitted its application after the Mayor originally raised concerns about the loss of playing fields during Stage 1 of the application. The original application proposed to site new buildings on the playing fields for operational reasons while undergoing redevelopment. The resubmitted application proposed to retain all the playing fields.

The negatives

- 3.8 Our research also highlighted that:
- environmental considerations were not effectively included in the Mayor's planning decisions.
 - the full range of environmental policies were not implemented through planning control.
 - the Mayor has not always directed refusal when an application failed to meet relevant environment policies.

Table 1 on the following page lists a few of the sample cases demonstrating the above points.

- 3.9 The table shows clear examples where environmental policy considerations appear not to have been raised at either stages of the of application process, (Middlesex University), or appear to have been sidelined in favour of other policy considerations (The Paragon, former Pilot Works Site), or where opportunities to send clear messages about their importance and on what the Mayor is trying to achieve have been missed (15 Ramsgate Street).

Improving the decision-making process

- 3.10 We are concerned that the apparent lack of an obvious systematic approach to considering the environmental policy aspects of a planning application is contributing to inconsistency in the decisions arrived at. We appreciate that officers will be required to make judgement calls, and that these judgements will be driven by a variety of factors including the need to balance competing work priorities against the level of resources available.¹⁹ But remain unclear, about the underlying criteria and reasoning for the judgements made.
- 3.11 We were told that while lists of new planning applications are circulated to officers in the ET, there is no expectation that they will comment on them all, and there is no system in place for checking whether officers would have

¹⁸ A collective term used to describe renewable sources of energy, such as wind, wave, sun, water and energy from plant material, but not fossil fuels or nuclear energy.

¹⁹ Transcript of Environment Committee meeting, 26 July 2005, pages 9 and 10.

considered them.²⁰ Neither is a set process in place to ensure that environmental considerations do not slip through the net; we were told that its non-existence is partly due to lack of time.²¹

- 3.12 We are concerned that the apparent lack of a definitive process is likely to result in an assessment of the environmental implications of applications that are somewhat patchy and inconsistent. This in turn could have a fundamental impact in terms of creating a reliable body of cases to develop precedent that can be relied on in the future to help achieve the Mayor's vision for London's environment.

Staffing and work load

- 3.13 Ensuring environment policy is taken into account in planning decisions relies on close working between officers within the PDU and ET. This can be disrupted by staff turnover and shortages as well as pressure of other work priorities. We were told that current staffing levels are below minimum estimations of what it was anticipated would be needed to effectively deliver on the Mayor's environmental policies.²²
- 3.14 With the considerable increase in workloads ET officers are placed in the uncomfortable position of having to prioritise work, to the extent that they focus only on what they consider to be "...*the most strategic ones and the really key ones we think there is likely to be an environmental problem.*"²³ This may mean that other cases of relative importance but which do not fall within the criteria of 'most strategic', 'really key' or a potential 'environmental problem' may well slip through the net.
- 3.15 While we accept that work priorities are inevitable, we cannot condone prioritisation on the basis of the above statement. All applications referred to the Mayor will have been done so because they fall within the criteria of what is deemed to be of strategic importance. To simply overlook some on the basis of individual, subjective judgement is not good enough. Such an approach, can at best leave the process open to the criticism of lack of transparency, and at worst create an uneasy trend of assumptions that in the long run may hamper progress or change.
- 3.16 We would suggest that the PDU and ET devise a **checklist** to aid officers in making their initial assessment of environmental policy issues, and provide appropriate prompts as to whether referral and discussions between the teams is needed. The checklist will provide clear systematic approach to environmental considerations of planning applications and help develop consistency between officers in the way they address them.

²⁰ Transcript of Environment Committee meeting, 26 July 2005, page 10.

²¹ Transcript of Environment Committee meeting, 26 July 2005, page 12.

²² Transcript of Environment Committee meeting, 26 July 2005, pages 9 and 14

²³ Transcript of Environment Committee meeting, 26 July 2005, page 13

Table 1 Bracketed figures refer to the page numbers each case may be found on in the analysis set out in Appendix 1.

Environmental considerations not effectively included in the Mayor’s planning decisions	Full range of environmental policies not implemented through planning control	Mayor has not always directed refusal when an application failed to meet relevant environmental policies
<p>Middlesex University, Bounds Green Road (p4) The development delivers a high number of affordable homes but there is no evidence of regard to any environmental policies in the Stage 1 or Stage 2 reports.</p>	<p>The Paragon, former Pilot Works Site (p4) The proposal failed to meet most of the Mayor’s policies on energy, renewables, water or biodiversity. The Mayor appeared to be satisfied with a large university and key worker housing development with apparently minimal renewables provision.</p>	<p>Abbey Wood Secondary School (p3) The Mayor could have directed refusal until and unless energy and water policies were met, as in the case of St Joseph’s Academy, mentioned earlier in the report.</p>
<p>Royal London Hospital, Whitechapel (p8) It is disappointing that while the Mayor took a stand on the design of the hospital, with a very real possibility of directing refusal, he did not raise the lack of compliance with his energy and water policies</p>	<p>Crown Wharf (p6) It is unfortunate that the Mayor did not request conditions to secure sustainable urban drainage system/rainwater recycling, or further measures on renewables or energy efficiency.</p>	<p>St Bartholemew Hospital (p2) The Mayor could have supported the local planning authority’s strong request for Combined Heat and Power (CHP),²⁴ by directing refusal on energy policy grounds until and unless CHP was included.</p>
<p>105 Clifton Street (p3) The Stage 1 and Stage 2 reports did not raise any environmental issues beyond daylighting/amenity issues for local residents who lodged objections. (We have subsequently been informed that there was an extant permission for a similar scale of development which pre-dated the creation of the GLA)</p>	<p>The Warren, Woolwich Arsenal (p3) Renewables, water/rainwater recycling and sustainable urban drainage system were not considered by the applicant nor insisted on by the Mayor.</p>	<p>15 Ramsgate Street (p3) The development failed 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 other housing and the lack of existing permissions on the site, the Mayor could have directed refusal on the basis of these shortcomings.</p>

²⁴ Combined heat and power – The combined production of electricity and usable heat. Steam or hot water, which would otherwise be rejected when electricity alone is produced, is used for space or process heating.

Recommendation 1

We recommend that officers in the Mayor’s Planning Decisions Unit and Environment Team devise a checklist to aid officers in making their initial assessment of environmental policy issues on planning applications, and provide appropriate prompts as to whether referral and discussions between the teams is needed. The checklist will provide a clear systematic approach to environmental considerations of planning applications and help develop consistency between officers in the way they address them. In line with the spirit of open government we would recommend that the checklist be published.

Capacity and expertise issues

- 3.17 Consistency in decision-making is in part reliant on systems and methods, but also critical is having the right capacity and expertise in place. The lack of capacity and expertise in the planning sector are issues that have previously been brought to the Committee’s attention. During our inquiry on the Mayor’s draft Supplementary Planning Guidance on Design and Construction in June 2005²⁵, we were told that the “... *very high turnover in planning staff...across London...*” and high reliance on temporary staff has made training a real issue and highlighted the “...*very real need for continuous training.*”²⁶
- 3.18 It is clear that staff turnover will have a negative impact on capacity and expertise; however this can be mitigated by well focused, ongoing training. Training that is repeated at regular intervals and appropriately adjusted, will help address lost knowledge and expertise as a result of staff turnover. It will also enable remaining staff to keep abreast of the ever-increasing changes in technology and law, and get to grips with the tensions that can arise from trying to meet different environmental objectives.
- 3.19 As was highlighted in our discussions, while staff receive some training, it is not necessarily sufficient to enable them to challenge applicants as robustly as they would like.²⁷ One way in which this situation can be addressed is to develop closer and more frequent dialogue with the main players and stakeholders in the development system. We realise that there will be financial implications, however if the Mayor’s strategic objective to make London a clean, green and exemplary city environment, by using planning powers to promote and implement his environmental policies, then priority needs to be given to improving officer training.

²⁵ The Mayor published the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance on Sustainable Design and Construction in March 2005. It was produced to provide additional information to support the implementation of the London Plan.

²⁶ Transcript of Environment Committee meeting, 1 June 2005, pages 12 and 13

²⁷ Transcript of Environment Committee meeting, 26 July 2005, page 9

Recommendation 2

With the ever increasing changes in technology and law, training will be crucial to maintaining staffing capacity, and developing and retaining expertise. We recommend that officers in the Mayor's Planning Decision Unit and Environment Team receive training on a regular basis. The training should involve developing closer and more frequent dialogue with the main players and stakeholders in the development system, and address the full range of strategic environmental policy, including resolving tensions between different environmental objectives.

Pre-application discussions

- 3.20 Other cases from the wider analysis also demonstrate the importance of discussions at the pre-application stage. Earlier we referred to St Joseph's Academy as a success story, where extensive discussions resulted in energy improvements. A similar success story could have been told for renewables at the same stage had discussions taken place before the application had been made. The applicant ruled out renewables on the basis of costs and the late design stage process. We are pleased to hear of the more positive outcome on this front.
- 3.21 Officers from the Mayor's PDU told us that they view pre-application discussions as a worthwhile step in the process and are encouraging applicants to engage them. (See paragraph 2.14 above). This move does however have staffing and training implications. It is resource intensive and will require more in-depth training to enable officers from the PDU to provide more creative input to discussions.

Bringing clarity to the process

- 3.22 We appreciate that the Mayor has a range of potentially conflicting priorities to address, and that inevitably tensions will arise in trying to balance them. Our research showed that there were instances where some environmental policies seemed to be implemented more effectively than others. Officers agreed with us that biodiversity, open spaces and more recently energy policies have been implemented more effectively as compared to reuse of buildings, reducing water usage and incorporating sustainable drainage.²⁸
- 3.23 We recognise that there will be occasions when such decisions may come down in favour of social needs, for example affordable housing as opposed to environmental requirements, such as sustainable drainage. We believe that it should be made clear when such decisions are required and the basis for making them, and that this information should be clearly stated on the Stage 1 and Stage 2 reports.

²⁸ Transcript of Environment Committee, 26 July 2005, page 18

Recommendation 3

We believe that the Mayor should be clear about when it is necessary to make a decision to forgo environmental policy considerations in favour of others, for example social policy, and the basis for his decision. This information should be clearly stated on the Stage 1 and Stage 2 reports.

Developing precedent

- 3.24 The Mayor's Energy strategy states that "Many of the planning policies that are in the London Plan...are unprecedented in the UK and introduce a new approach to planning for a more sustainable future."²⁹ Making solid recommendations and decisions that are not easily challenged is therefore crucial to advancing the Mayor's environmental agenda for London.
- 3.25 It became clear from our discussions with officers that there could be reluctance by them to recommend to the Mayor to direct refusal of a planning application which is deficient overall. Officers are mindful that a refusal can often go to public inquiry and of the need to be able to robustly defend the decision made.³⁰ We appreciate the dilemma faced by officers, the consequent staffing and budgetary implications of a public inquiry, and the need to identify potential landmark cases that will help secure the Mayor's environment agenda.
- 3.26 However developing precedent is not exclusively about the end product, that is successfully defending an appeal; it is also about creating the right setting for gathering supporting evidence to help develop precedent, for example, creating a clear and consistent process for making environmental assessments, making consistent decisions that help shape the applicants perspective of what will, or will not be acceptable to the Mayor, and sharing those decisions with other applicants to encourage best practice.
- 3.27 We have already spoken about the need for a systematic approach to environmental considerations. Decisions need to be consistent. Table 1 – page 14 - highlights the case of Abbey Wood Secondary School, where our research showed that the Mayor could have directed refusal until and unless energy and water policies were met, as was done in the case of St Joseph's Academy, mentioned earlier in the report (Paragraph 3.6).
- 3.28 One relevant case can set the precedent for what the Mayor would wish to see in subsequent developments by way of environmental improvements. The concept of precedent could be used much more openly, to improve the possibilities for incorporating a variety of environmental policies, and improve officers' negotiating position. Considerations and responses to applicants could cite in detail similar cases where the policies have been met.

²⁹ Mayor of London, Energy Strategy, Green Light to clean power, Greater London Authority, 2004 Para 5.18

³⁰ Transcript of Environment Committee meeting, 26 July 2005, page 8

- 3.29 The London Plan will be subject to review over the next couple of years.³¹ The London Plan when updated could include more clear examples of cases where environmental considerations have been successfully incorporated in development. Such examples will help to create a stronger legal basis on which to require developers to meet the Mayor's environmental expectations for future developments.
- 3.30 We look forward to the publication of the final version of the Mayor's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Sustainable Design and Construction this Spring. The SPG will offer much-needed guidance on meeting the requirements of the Mayor's policies, as well as providing material weight for planning applications and the exercise of the Mayor's planning powers.

Providing the right framework

- 3.31 PDU and ET officers are further challenged in applying environmental considerations because of the way some of the policies in the London Plan are worded. We were told that policies prefaced with phrases such as 'wherever possible', 'where appropriate', 'give consideration to', 'have proper regard to'³² provide some room for negotiation in discussions with applicants, but do not provide sufficient backing for directing the Mayor to refuse an application.
- 3.32 Policies in the London Plan need to be more robustly worded, and further strengthened by the use of precedent. What is 'feasible' or 'appropriate' becomes defined through precedent, and if a development has previously met the Mayor's policies on water, energy or biodiversity use, then it should be feasible to meet them in subsequent developments. Officers have advised us that they will be giving careful consideration to policy wording as part of the London Plan review. We commend this and look forward to seeing a revised version of the Plan that will give the Mayor much firmer ground on which to challenge planning applications on environmental grounds.

Recommendation 4

We recommend that the London Plan when updated should include more explicit and decisive wording of the Mayor's environmental policies. Clear examples of cases of best practice where environmental considerations have been successfully incorporated in development should be included in Best Practice Guidance Notes and other appropriate documents. These examples will help create the legal basis to underpin the Mayor's expectations for environmental considerations in future developments.

³¹ The Mayor published a Statement of Intent in December 2005. The statement sets out the Mayor's intentions for this first review of the London Plan, identifies ten main policy areas for review and provides a guide to the review process. The Statement and key milestones for the review is available at <http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor/strategies/sds/review.jsp>

³² Transcript of Environment Committee meeting, 26 July 2005, page 9

Looking forward

- 3.33 London is a world-class city in many ways. Over the next ten years, London will experience phenomenal growth in its resident and working population. New houses, schools, workplaces, transport and other infrastructure will be needed to accommodate the growth. We need to ensure that growth is managed in a sustainable way; developing the right framework in which to truly creating a green and sustainable city is key.
- 3.34 We believe that the London Plan provides the framework, for developing the precedent needed to take forward the Mayor's pioneering policies. The review of the London Plan is an opportune time to review and revise policy wording in light of past experience, and to create the right platform on which to develop future precedent that will place London in the forefront of sustainable development.

Appendix 1 The recommendations

Recommendation 1

We recommend that officers in the Mayor’s Planning Decisions Unit and Environment Team devise a checklist to aid officers in making their initial assessment of environmental policy issues on planning applications, and provide appropriate prompts as to whether referral and discussions between the teams is needed. The checklist will provide a clear systematic approach to environmental considerations of planning applications and help develop consistency between officers in the way they address them. In line with the spirit of open government we would recommend that the checklist be published.

Recommendation 2

With the ever increasing changes in technology and law, training will be crucial to maintaining staffing capacity, and developing and retaining expertise. We recommend that officers in the Mayor’s Planning Decision Unit and Environment Team receive training on a regular basis. The training should involve developing closer and more frequent dialogue with the main players and stakeholders in the development system, and address the full range of strategic environmental policy, including resolving tensions between different environmental objectives.

Recommendation 3

We believe that the Mayor should be clear about when it is necessary to make a decision to forgo environmental policy considerations in favour of others, for example social policy, and the basis for his decision. This information should be clearly stated on the Stage 1 and Stage 2 reports.

Recommendation 4

We recommend that the London Plan when updated should include more explicit and decisive wording of the Mayor’s environmental policies. Clear examples of cases of best practice where environmental considerations have been successfully incorporated in development should be included in Best Practice Guidance Notes and other appropriate documents. These examples will help create the legal basis to underpin the Mayor’s expectations for environmental considerations in future developments.

Appendix 2 The research

The environmental aspects of planning decisions considered during the analysis policies in the London Plan on open space, biodiversity, energy, waste, water usage, drainage and flooding. A full list of the policies considered is given in Appendix 2.

Purpose of the research

The purpose of the desk-based research was to provide the following information:

- To what extent are environmental considerations effectively built in to the Mayor's planning decisions processes?
- How many times, on what basis, and to what effect, has the Mayor requested at the consultation stage of a planning application that the application be revised so as to reflect his environmental policies and strategies?
- On how many occasions, and on what grounds, has the Mayor directed refusal of a planning application due to failure to comply with his environmental policies and strategies?
- Are there instances where relevant environmental considerations appear not to have been taken fully into account, or where the Mayor has decided not to direct refusal of a planning application despite a breach of his environmental policies and strategies?
- What weight is given to environmental considerations in the Mayor's planning decisions?

Criteria for selecting cases for analysis

There were a total of 166 statutory referrals from February 2004 to July 2005. Of these approximately 40 cases were chosen for assessment using the following criteria.

- Only applications whose stage 1 referral was on or after 1 February 2004 were assessed. As a first step 20 applications were removed that were not considered appropriate for assessing across a range of environmental issues e.g. phone masts, applications were for temporary uses such as mobile school buildings or theatre performances. For the same reason the majority of outline applications were also excluded at this stage.
- All applications involving development on Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land were considered even if these were outline applications, because of London Plan policies 3D.8 and 3D.9 which create a presumption against development in such cases. Nine applications were for development on Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land.
- All applications where the Mayor directed refusal were assessed. The Mayor directed refusal on five applications, although the direction was subsequently lifted on some of these after further negotiations.
- Of the remaining applications only those that have been through stage 1 and 2 were considered. This was to ensure that a more complete picture could be gained of the issues that the Mayor considers during the application process and his response.
- Approximately 30 cases were chosen, which represent the majority of all stage 2 cases between February 2004 and early May 2005. These were selected such that they were a mixture of types of development and fitted the distribution of cases by London Borough of all referrals.

Abbreviations used in the analysis

BREEAM	Buildings Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method
CHP	Combined Heat and Power
CLOPUD	Certificate of Lawfulness Of Proposed Use or Development
CPZ	controlled parking zone
ES	Environmental Statement
FSC	Forestry Stewardship Council
LB	London Borough (which are the LPA)
LPA	Local Planning Authority
MOL	Metropolitan Open Land
PV	photovoltaic
S106	Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
SNCI	Site of Nature Conservation Importance
SuDS	Sustainable Urban Drainage System
TPO	Tree Protection Order

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 landscaped 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 issues 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 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 despite not meeting London Plan policies on water use and in particular energy efficiency and 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)	
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 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.		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 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.	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 special circumstances. The circumstances are not robust but in the absence of further proof to the contrary the Mayor's strong argument was accepted as valid by the Mayor, namely that it was 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 priorities and followed 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	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	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	Yes. MOL designation is being reviewed by LB Bromley on an Inspector's recommendation, since the site is already partially developed. Therefore much	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	Report states "The scheme is in relatively early design stages therefore, the applicant has a significant opportunity to include renewable	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	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,	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 include the provision of an energy assessment and renewables feasibility study to be provided prior to the

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)	
purposes. Approximately 251 residential dwellings, amended vehicular access, landscaping and open space.							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.				£25,000 to environmental improvements.	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).		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.	energy technologies, where feasible."		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.		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.		reserved matters stage of granting full permission. disappointing that the stage report does not refer to policies 4a.11 and 4c.8 since it locates the development on a site which is not suitable for development and 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 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	Euston, Osnauburgh 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 will contribute to the objectives of the London Plan. Some issues raised in relation to urban design.	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 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,	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 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	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' BREEAM 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 4c.8. It does also not represent "exemplary standards or sustainable construction and resource management" as expected in tall buildings under policy 4b.9.	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 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.	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 exemption 'sustainable construction and resource management' 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)		
												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.		for the residential. It does not represent "exemplary standards or sustainable construction and resource management" as expected in tall buildings under policy 4b.9.								
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	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, but 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 full assessment for hospitals is not required, 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. All should aim for 'Very Good'/'Excellent'; their policies states CHP is required to secure their intended energy savings. CHP has not been properly considered, yet it is entirely viable e.g. via trigeneration system. PPC and the London Plan state that it should be included 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	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. BREEM 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 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 it is too soon to reach any conclusions on this scheme. However, the Stage I report demonstrates a strong will to secure good energy standards from the applicant

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)		
												4b.6 and 3d.7.										
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 reinstated to its previous condition after the works.		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 to 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 which often build anew on the playing fields then relocate sports facilities onto the site of the old building.	
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 (AAU), 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.		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	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 AAU 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.			

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)			
												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.		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.									
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 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	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 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.	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 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 run-off could result; the application fails 4c.8.	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, 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. '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)		
												be created on the replacement space.										
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 conditions provide an energy assessment may not be worded appropriately to secure 10% renewables provision,	

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 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 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	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 evaluated by an independent valuer, and satisfactory to the Mayor.	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 improvements in the local area.	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 not raise any environmental issues beyond daylighting/amenity issues for local residents who lodged objections. However there was an extant permission for a similar scheme of development, which predated the London Plan.
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 BREEAM '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 2. Some issues have been left conditions and obligations. In these circumstances there 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 Mayor's policies on renewables, biodiversity and water policies. Given the 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.

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)	
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 delivered a high number of affordable homes but the Mayor has had regard to any environmental policies in stage 1 or 2 reports; However, it the LPA refused 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.
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 RNOH 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 '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 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 felling of as many trees through re-design.

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 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 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 openness of green belt or views, although the development does not appear to offer any enhancement 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 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		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		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 sustainability design policies in the London Plan, it would appear that 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)			
												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 operational reasons. They will create new grassed playing fields with an overall greater area, thereby meeting London Plan policy in paragraph 3.252.		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.									
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	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	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 furthers many of the fundamental London Plan policies such as high density development and was a tall building by M4, so would be an impressive landmark on entering London. However the proposal does not meet most of the Mayor's policies on energy, renewables, water or biodiversity. The Mayor was satisfied with a large university and key worker housing development that apparently minimal renewables provision.		

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 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 canalside 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 concert hall inside the building for local/cultural use.		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. 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.	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)	
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; BREEAM 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 the GLA, although the application is small scale. Biodiversity impacts not confirmed (drainage of car park near SINC).
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	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	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		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	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, 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, reiterating 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 did not insist on measures	

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)	
and soft landscaping and public realm improvements.																					meet more of his energy and water policies. However, 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	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 the energy efficiency of the building was confirmed as 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 sufficient early stages of the referral process. The Mayor may have been concerned that case would set a precedent that large buildings would not include renewable energy. Through discussion the energy efficiency of the building was confirmed as improved to an excellent level, but renewables were ruled out due to costs and design stage process, and 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)		
												open space 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 SNCT'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 contaminated or will 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 his environmental policies although it would appear some water policies (4a.1 SuDS, rainwater harvesting) This is unfortunate but this could have been due to the relatively low proportion water needs of the site could have been provided by such means. The GLA took the opportunity posed by the year lifespan of the development by phasing 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	

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 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 provided 4c.4: Yes: new riverside walkway with trees, planting and seating; environmental (planted) buffer to river		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 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.	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 environmental policies at stage 1 of 0809. Upon resubmission the applicant included an energy/sustainability assessment. Approximately 2.5% of energy will be provided by renewables, extensive measures to support energy efficiency (community heating) and 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 be improved with pedestrian access to the canalside.

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 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, which there will be considerable gains for the site. It is unfortunate that Mayor did not request conditions to secure SuDS/rainwater recycling further measures on renewables or energy efficiency.
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	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	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	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	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 different business strategy whereby	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	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.	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	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	The Mayor decided to uphold his energy policies and that water usage should firstly be made lower by other methods London-wide.

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)		
use of land in connection with construction activities.							insufficient renewables provision for what is a high-energy process				30% of their energy cost to a nominated body e.g. London Renewables. It will also reinstate a riverside walk.	site. It is fairly 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.		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.		methods operating in London;			But these were unable to be completely tested by GLA.	invertebrates, and pipe routing, many of which were also concerns of the GLA.	undertaken.	
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	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 trees. Policies on open spaces and MOL were also deferred strongly. However, while 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 4 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)	
												the main building, rather than the existing 1960s extension.									
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	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 stage 1 and 2 reports but 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 has 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/daylighting.

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)	
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 application had a higher regard to policy in paragraph 3.246. There is a 10-year period of the development during which an	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 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	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 when the Mayor took a stand on design of the hospital, with 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 reports. The applicant made encouraging statements about its feasibility studies and commitment to acknowledged high levels sustainable design, and there is no reason to disbelieve since they are responsible for the first 35 years of energy provision. A small amount consideration from the Mayor could have guaranteed appropriate conditions or s106 terms the development cannot be said to meet any of the Mayor's energy or water policies. The requirement policy 4b.9 for 'exemplary' tall buildings are not met.

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)		
												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.			buildings.							
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; BREEAM '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 discussion stage I 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	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 may not ultimately include 10% renewables. However 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, I 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	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	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	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	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	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	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	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 matters of energy and water. This is of great concern given the scale of development the potential owing to the type of building and the applicant. The gains in energy efficiency were central to justifying demolition of the Grade I

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)		
facilities including doctor's surgery, dentist's surgery, creche, convenience store, licensed cafe and associated landscaping, including Prince's Gardens Square.							policies state that there should be 439 spaces provided, but the applicant is proposing 190.	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'.				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 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		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 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.	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.		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.					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 of any renewable or energy efficiency measures would 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)	
												some public uses and active frontages within the proposed buildings, but this is not addressed by the applicants.									
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 s.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.

Appendix 3 Environmental policies selected for assessment of the Mayor’s planning decisions

Policies and paragraphs from the London Plan were chosen which

- Contain specific aims and requirements against which planning decisions can be assessed with a degree of certainty
- Constitute all policies within the London Plan across all the environmental aspects that the scrutiny was to have regard to

Where a specific policy has a variety of objectives in addition to those relevant to this inquiry, green text highlights the part that is relevant to the inquiry, and the planning decisions are only assessed against this part of the policy.

OPEN SPACE

Paragraph 1.49

includes “This plan closes off easy but unsustainable options such as greenfield development and rigorously protects open spaces and environmental assets.

Policy 3D.7 Realising the value of open space

The Mayor will work with strategic partners to protect and promote London's network of open spaces, to realise the current and potential value of open space to communities, and to protect the many benefits of open space, including those associated with health, sport and recreation, children’s play, regeneration, the economy, culture, biodiversity and the environment.

Paragraph 3.246

As London becomes more compact and intensive in its built form, the value of these open spaces will increase. The Mayor will plan for a range of different types of open space to meet a variety of needs, and work with others to realise the full potential of those spaces that are currently undervalued. Poor quality is not reason in itself to justify the loss of open space. This includes both spaces that are private and those that are accessible to the public.

Policy 3D.8 Green Belt

The Mayor will and boroughs should maintain the protection of London’s Green Belt and proposals for alterations to Green Belt boundaries should be considered through the UDP process in accordance with government guidance in PPG2. There is a general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and such development should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

Policy 3D.9 Metropolitan Open Land

The Mayor will and boroughs should maintain the protection of Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) from inappropriate development. Any alterations to the boundary of MOL should be undertaken by boroughs through the UDP process, in consultation with the Mayor and adjoining authorities.

Paragraph 3.249

MOL will be protected as a permanent feature, and afforded the same level of protection as the Green Belt. Appropriate development should minimise any adverse impact on the open character of MOL through sensitive design and siting and be limited to small scale structures to support outdoor open space uses. The boundary of MOL should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and should be undertaken through the UDP process in consultation with the Mayor. **Development that involves the loss of MOL in return for the creation of new open space elsewhere will not be considered appropriate.**

Policy 3D.10 Open space provision in UDPs

UDP policies should:

- identify broad areas of public open space deficiency and priorities for addressing them on the basis of audits carried out as part of an open space strategy, and using the open space hierarchy set out in Table 3D.1 as a starting point
- ensure that future open space needs are considered in planning policies for Opportunity Areas and other areas of growth and change in their area
- encourage functional and physical linkages within the network of open spaces and to the wider public realm, improve accessibility for all throughout the network and create new links based on local and strategic need
- identify, promote and protect Green Corridors and Green Chains and include appropriate designations and policies for the protection of local open spaces that are of value, or have the potential to be of value, to local communities. The Mayor will assist in co-ordinating this process across borough boundaries, and in identifying the need for new or improved Regional or Metropolitan Parks.

Paragraph 3.252

London also has a wealth of locally important open spaces. **Development on local open spaces will not be acceptable where they have been designated for protection in a UDP or where there is a demonstrable need for that open space,** unless that need can be met elsewhere within the local catchment area, or a new or replacement open space can be created within the local catchment area. The provision of replacement open space will not be appropriate where English Heritage advises that the open space is of historic significance or where the open space is in (or its loss would create) an area of open space deficiency. The replacement of open spaces with nature conservation value is covered in Policy 3D.12. Replacement open space should be of equivalent or better size and quality. Unless an assessment of needs demonstrates otherwise, **replacement open space should be for the same type of open space and facilities.**

Policy 4B.6 Sustainable design and construction

The Mayor will, and boroughs should, **ensure future developments meet the highest standards of sustainable design and construction and reflect this principle in UDP policies.**

These will include measures to:

- re-use land and buildings
- ensure designs make the most of natural systems both within and around the building
- reduce the impacts of noise, pollution, flooding and micro-climatic effects
- ensure developments are comfortable and secure for users

- conserve and enhance the natural environment, particularly in relation to biodiversity. Applications for strategic developments should include a statement showing how sustainability principles will be met in terms of demolition, construction and long-term management. Boroughs should ensure that, where appropriate, the same sustainability principles are used to assess planning applications.

Policy 4B.9 Large-scale buildings – design and impact

All large-scale buildings including tall buildings should be of the highest quality design and in particular:

- **provide high quality spaces**, capitalise on opportunities to integrate green spaces and planting and support vibrant communities both around and within the building
- **relate positively to water spaces** taking into account the particular needs and characteristics of such spaces.

Policy 4C.4 Natural landscape

The Mayor will, and boroughs should, recognise the Blue Ribbon Network as contributing to the open space network of London. **Where appropriate natural landscapes should be protected and enhanced.** As part of Open Space Strategies, boroughs should identify potential opportunities alongside waterways for the creation and enhancement of open spaces.

ENERGY inc RENEWABLES AND SUSTAINABLE BUILDING DESIGN AND WASTE

Paragraph 1.49

includes “**This plan closes off easy but unsustainable options such as greenfield development and rigorously protects open spaces and environmental assets. It contains policies to ensure that buildings are designed to use energy and other resources more efficiently, both during and after their construction.**”

Policy 4A.7 Energy efficiency and renewable energy

The Mayor will and boroughs should support the Mayor’s Energy Strategy and its objectives of reducing carbon dioxide emissions, improving energy efficiency and increasing the proportion of energy used generated from renewable sources by:

- improving the integration of land use and transport policy and reducing the need to travel by car (see Chapter 3, Part C)
- **requiring the inclusion of energy efficient and renewable energy technology and design**, including passive solar design, natural ventilation, borehole cooling, combined heat and power, community heating, photovoltaics, solar water heating, wind, fuel cells, biomass fuelled electricity and heat generating plant in new developments wherever feasible
- facilitating and encouraging the use of all forms of renewable energy where appropriate including giving consideration to the impact of new development on existing renewable energy schemes
- minimising light lost to the sky, particularly from street lights.

Policy 4A.8 Energy assessment

The Mayor will and boroughs should request an assessment of the energy demand of proposed major developments, which should also demonstrate the steps taken to apply the Mayor's energy hierarchy. The Mayor will expect all strategic referrals of commercial and residential schemes to demonstrate that the proposed heating and cooling systems have been selected in accordance with the following order of preference: passive design; solar water heating; combined heat and power, for heating and cooling, preferably fuelled by renewables; community heating for heating and cooling; heat pumps; gas condensing boilers and gas central heating. Boroughs should apply the same criteria to major developments.

4.19 The Energy Strategy sets out and explains how to apply a hierarchy to guide decision-making and the consideration of development proposals. The hierarchy states that essential energy needs should be met through applying in sequence the following factors: using less energy, using renewable energy and supplying energy efficiently.

Policy 4A.9 Providing for renewable energy

The Mayor will and boroughs should require major developments to show how the development would generate a proportion of the site's electricity or heat needs from renewables, wherever feasible.

Policy 4A.10 Supporting the provision of renewable energy

UDP policies should identify suitable sites for wind turbines and other renewable energy provision

Policy 4B.6 Sustainable design and construction

The Mayor will, and boroughs should, ensure future developments meet the highest standards of sustainable design and construction and reflect this principle in UDP policies.

These will include measures to:

- re-use land and buildings
- conserve energy, materials, water and other resources
- ensure designs make the most of natural systems both within and around the building
- reduce the impacts of noise, pollution, flooding and micro-climatic effects
- promote sustainable waste behaviour in new and existing developments, including support for local integrated recycling schemes, CHP schemes and other treatment options (subject to Policy 4A.1 and 4A.2).

Applications for strategic developments should include a statement showing how sustainability principles will be met in terms of demolition, construction and long-term management. Boroughs should ensure that, where appropriate, the same sustainability principles are used to assess planning applications.

Policy 4B.9 Large-scale buildings – design and impact

All large-scale buildings including tall buildings should be of the highest quality design and in particular:

- illustrate exemplary standards of sustainable construction and resource management and potential for renewable energy generation and recycling

WATER USE, DRAINAGE AND FLOODING

Policy 4A.11 Water supplies

The Mayor will work in partnership with appropriate agencies within London and neighbouring regions to protect and conserve water supplies in order to secure London's long term needs by:

- ensuring that adequate sustainable water resources are available for major new development
- minimising the use of treated water
- maximising rainwater harvesting opportunities
- using grey water recycling systems

In determining planning applications, the Mayor will and boroughs should have proper regard to the impact of those proposals on water demand and existing capacity.

Policy 4A.12 Water quality

The Mayor will and boroughs should seek to protect and improve water quality to ensure that the Blue Ribbon Network is healthy, attractive and offers a valuable series of habitats by:

- ensuring that adequate sewerage infrastructure capacity is available for major new development
- refusing, or directing refusal of proposals that are likely to lead to a reduction in water quality
- using sustainable urban drainage systems to reduce the amount and intensity of urban run-off and pollution (see also Policy 4C.8).

Policy 4B.6 Sustainable design and construction

The Mayor will, and boroughs should, ensure future developments meet the highest standards of sustainable design and construction and reflect this principle in UDP policies.

These will include measures to:

- conserve energy, materials, water and other resources
- ensure designs make the most of natural systems both within and around the building
- reduce the impacts of noise, pollution, flooding and micro-climatic effects
- promote sustainable waste behaviour in new and existing developments, including support for local integrated recycling schemes, CHP schemes and other treatment options (subject to Policy 4A.1 and 4A.2).

Applications for strategic developments should include a statement showing how sustainability principles will be met in terms of demolition, construction and long-term management. Boroughs should ensure that, where appropriate, the same sustainability principles are used to assess planning applications.

Policy 4B.9 Large-scale buildings – design and impact

All large-scale buildings including tall buildings should be of the highest quality design and in particular:

- illustrate exemplary standards of sustainable construction and resource management and potential for renewable energy generation and recycling
- be sensitive to their impact on micro-climates in terms of wind, sun, reflection and overshadowing
- relate positively to water spaces taking into account the particular needs and characteristics of such spaces.

Policy 4C.5 Impounding of rivers

The Mayor will, and boroughs should, resist proposals for the impounding or partial impounding of any rivers unless they are clearly in the wider interest of London. Proposals that include the removal of such impounding structures should generally be welcomed.

Policy 4C.6 Flood plains

In reviewing their UDPs, boroughs should identify areas at risk from flooding (flood zones). Within these areas the assessment of development proposals should be carried out in line with PPG25. In particular, boroughs should avoid permitting built development in functional flood plains.

Policy 4C.7 Flood defences

For locations adjacent to flood defences, permanent built development should be set back from those defences to allow for the replacement/repair of the defences and any future raising to be done in a sustainable and cost-effective way. The Mayor will, and boroughs should, ensure that development does not undermine or breach flood defences in any way. Development associated with buildings and structures already within the statutory defence line should not increase the risk to occupiers of these buildings or inhibit the raising of future flood defences.

Policy 4C.8 Sustainable drainage

The Mayor will, and boroughs should, seek to ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible. The use of sustainable urban drainage systems should be promoted for development unless there are practical reasons for not doing so. Such reasons may include the local ground conditions or density of development. In such cases, the developer should seek to manage as much run-off as possible on site and explore sustainable methods of managing the remainder as close as possible to the site.

Policy 4C.9 Rising groundwater

In considering major planning applications in areas where rising groundwater is an existing or potential problem, the Mayor will, and boroughs should, expect reasonable steps to be taken to abstract and use that groundwater.

BIODIVERSITY

Policy 3D.12 Biodiversity and nature conservation

The Mayor will work with partners to ensure a proactive approach to the protection, promotion and management of biodiversity in support of the Mayor's Biodiversity Strategy. The planning of new development and regeneration should have regard to nature conservation and biodiversity, and opportunities should be taken to achieve positive gains for conservation through the form and design of development. Where appropriate, measures may include creating, enhancing and managing wildlife habitat and natural landscape. Priority for habitat creation should be given to sites which assist

in achieving the targets in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs) and sites within or near to areas deficient in accessible wildlife sites. Boroughs, in reviewing UDPs and in considering proposals for development should accord the highest protection to internationally designated and proposed sites (SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites), and to nationally designated sites (SSSIs) in accordance with government guidance and the Habitat Regulations, 1994.

The Mayor will identify Sites of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation (SMIs), which, in addition to internationally and nationally designated sites, includes land of strategic importance for nature conservation and biodiversity across London. Boroughs should give strong protection to these sites in their UDPs. Boroughs should use the procedures adopted by the Mayor in his Biodiversity Strategy to identify sites of Borough or Local Importance for nature conservation and should accord them a level of protection commensurate with their borough or local significance.

The Mayor will and boroughs should resist development that would have a significant adverse impact on the population or conservation status of protected species or priority species identified in the London Biodiversity Action Plan and borough BAPs.

Appropriate policies for their protection and enhancement and to achieve the targets set out in BAPs, should be included in UDPs. Where development is proposed which would affect a site of importance for nature conservation, the approach should be to seek to avoid adverse impact on the nature conservation value of the site, and if that is not possible, to minimise such impact and seek mitigation of any residual impacts. Where, exceptionally, development is to be permitted because the reasons for it are judged to outweigh significant harm to nature conservation, appropriate compensation should be sought.

Policy 4B.6 Sustainable design and construction

The Mayor will, and boroughs should, ensure future developments meet the highest standards of sustainable design and construction and reflect this principle in UDP policies.

These will include measures to:

- ensure designs make the most of natural systems both within and around the building
- reduce the impacts of noise, pollution, flooding and micro-climatic effects
- conserve and enhance the natural environment, particularly in relation to biodiversity

Applications for strategic developments should include a statement showing how sustainability principles will be met in terms of demolition, construction and long-term management. Boroughs should ensure that, where appropriate, the same sustainability principles are used to assess planning applications

Policy 4B.9 Large-scale buildings – design and impact

All large-scale buildings including tall buildings should be of the highest quality design and in particular:

- be sensitive to their impact on micro-climates in terms of wind, sun, reflection and overshadowing
- provide high quality spaces, capitalise on opportunities to integrate green spaces and planting and support vibrant communities both around and within the building

- relate positively to water spaces taking into account the particular needs and characteristics of such spaces

Appendix 4 Orders and translations

How to order

For further information on this report or to order a copy, please contact Carmen Musonda, Scrutiny Manager, on 020 7983 6542 or email to carmen.musonda@london.gov.uk

See it for free on our website - You can also view and download a copy of this report at: <http://www.london.gov.uk/assembly/reports/environment.jsp>

Large print, Braille or translations

If you or someone you know need a copy of this report in large print or Braille, a copy of the summary and main findings in another language, then please call 020 7983 4100

আপনি বা আপনার পরিচিত কেউ এ রিপোর্টের সারসর্ম ও প্রস্তাবের কপি বিনামূল্যে বড়ছাপা বা ব্রেইল, অথবা তাদের নিজের ভাষায় চাইলে 020 7983 4100 এ নাম্বারে ফোন করুন বা ই মেইল করুন এ ঠিকানায়: assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

ਜੇ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਕੇ ਤਮੇ ਜ਼ਾਗ਼ਤਾ ਕੀ ਨੇਵੀ ਕੋਰੋ ਘੋੜਿਤਨੇ, ਆ ਅਭੇਵਾਲਮਾਥੀ ਕਾਰਯਕਾਰੀ ਸੰਬੰਧ ਅਨੇ ਖੇਲਮਘੋੜਿਨੀ ਨਕਲ ਮੋਟਾ ਅਭਰੀਮਾਂ ਭਯਾਥੇਠੀ, ਘੋੜਿਲਮਾਂ ਕੇ ਨੇਮਨੀ ਘੋਟਾਨੀ ਘੋਠਾਮਾਂ ਘਿਨਾ ਮੂਠੇ ਘੋੜਿਲੀ ਘੋਠ, ਤੀ ਕੁਘਾ ਕਰੀਨੇ ਘੋਨ ਘਰਾ 020 7983 4100 ਘੋਘਰ ਅਮਾਰੀ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰੀ ਅਥਵਾ ਆ ਸਰਨਾਮੇ ਈ-ਮੇਠਿਲ ਕਰੀ assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

Se você, ou alguém de seu conhecimento, gostaria de ter uma cópia do sumario executivo e recomendações desse relatório em imprensa grande ou Braille, ou na sua língua, sem custo, favor nos contatar por telefone no número 020 7983 4100 ou email em assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

ਜੇ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਜਾਂ ਕੋਈ ਤੁਹਾਡਾ ਜਾਣ-ਪਛਾਣ ਵਾਲਾ ਇਸ ਰਿਪੋਰਟ ਦਾ ਅਗਨੈਕਟਿਵ ਖੁਲਾਸਾ ਅਤੇ ਸੁਝਾਵਾਂ ਦੀ ਨਕਲ ਵੱਡੇ ਅੱਖਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ, ਬ੍ਰੇਅਲ ਵਿਚ ਜਾਂ ਅਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਵਿਚ ਮੁਫਤ ਪ੍ਰਧਤ ਕਰਨਾ ਚਹੁੰਦਾ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਕ੍ਰਿਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਸਾਡੇ ਨਾਲ 020 7983 4100 ਤੇ ਟੈਲੀਫੋਨ ਰਾਹੀਂ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ assembly.translations@london.gov.uk ਤੇ ਸਾਠੂੰ ਈ-ਮੇਲ ਕਰੋ।

Si usted, o algún conocido, quiere recibir copia del resumen ejecutivo y las recomendaciones relativos a este informe en forma de Braille, en su propia idioma, y gratis, no duden en ponerse en contacto con nosotros marcando 020 7983 4100 o por correo electrónico: assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

Ta ba ri eniken ti o ba ni ife lati ni eda ewe nla ti igbimo awon asoju tabi papa julo ni ede ti abinibi won, ki o kanswa lori ero ibanisoro. Nomba wa ni 020 7983 4100 tabi ki e kan si wa lori ero assembly.translations@london.gov.uk. Ako ni gbowo lowo yin fun eto yi.

Haddii adiga, ama qof aad taqaanid, uu doonaayo inuu ku helo koobi ah warbixinta oo kooban iyo talooyinka far waaweyn ama farta qofka indhaha la' loogu talagalay, ama luuqadooda, oo bilaash u ah, fadlan nagala soo xiriir telefoonkan 020 7983 4100 ama email-ka cinwaanku yahay assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

اگر آپ یا آپ کا کوئی جاننے والا اس ایگزیکٹو سمری اور اس رپورٹ میں سے سفارشات کی ایک کاپی بڑے پرنٹ میں یا بریل پر یا اپنی زبان میں بلا معاوضہ حاصل کرنا چاہیں تو براہ کرم ہم سے فون 020 7983 4100 پر رابطہ کریں یا assembly.translations@london.gov.uk پر ای میل کریں۔

Appendix 5 Principles of Scrutiny

The powers of the London Assembly include power to investigate and report on decisions and actions of the Mayor, or on matters relating to the principal purposes of the Greater London Authority, and on any other matters which the Assembly considers to be of importance to Londoners. In the conduct of scrutiny and investigation the Assembly abides by a number of principles.

Scrutinies:

- aim to recommend action to achieve improvements;
- are conducted with objectivity and independence;
- examine all aspects of the Mayor's strategies;
- consult widely, having regard to issues of timeliness and cost;
- are conducted in a constructive and positive manner; and
- are conducted with an awareness of the need to spend taxpayers money wisely and well.

More information about scrutiny work of the London Assembly, including published reports, details of committee meetings and contact information, can be found on the London Assembly web page at www.london.gov.uk/assembly.

Greater London Authority

City Hall

The Queen's Walk

More London

London SE1 2AA

www.london.gov.uk

Enquiries **020 7983 4100**

Minicom **020 7983 4458**