

Proposal Title:	Grahame Park Estate, Colindale, LB Barnet	Decision Date:	27 October 2004	GLA ref:	PDU/0543a/04 PDU/0543a/01	
Description:	Large-scale residential development. Demolition of 1314 existing residential units, retention of 463 units and construction of 2977 new residential units providing a total of 3440 units on the Estate. Provision of approximately 9074 sqm retail A1, food and drink A3 and social and community D1 uses with associated public and private open space, car parking and access arrangement.	Mayor's decision	Not directed refusal	STAGE I / II	II	
Planning History:	20 May 2004: STAGE I consultation; 8 Sept 2004: LB Barnet minded to grant planning permission; 6 October 2004: LB Barnet advised the Mayor of this decision, leading to STAGE II report.	Strategic Area:	Area for intensification: Colindale / Site of Local Importance for Nature Conservation		Planning App. Type	OUTLINE
		Use Class Order:	A1, A3, C3, D1	Departure fr. Plan?	NO	
		% of Aff Housing	36	GLA referral cat:	1A	
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?	YES			

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations	
Categories	Policy content	Reference			
1. Housing	Housing choice	Policy 3A.4	Affordable housing: The scheme has 36 % affordable housing, short of the 50 % target and more affordable housing would render the scheme unviable. However, the proposed scheme has more affordable housing than existing estate. Access statement: no statement was submitted in the outline application stage. A good range of housing types to accommodate different life stages. A range of social & community elements (library, one stop shop, community centre and more) were included and satisfied Mayor's vision for an equal society.	Did not require Section 106 contribution to bridge the gap of affordable housing. Said the tenure mixture is acceptable to the community.	
	Affordable housing target	Policy 3A.7			
	Negotiating affordable housing in individual scheme	Policy 3A.8			
	Large scale residential development	Policy 3A.5			
	Social infrastructure and community facilities	Policy 3A.15			
2. Office & Retail	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3	The incorporation of a supermarket, 5 x Shops, 1 x Food n Drink and community facilities would clearly provide employment opportunities on site, thus satisfying the mixed use principle.	NHS expressed concerns that large increase in population would put strain on PCT services and the designated "community facilities" might not meet NHS' design standard. PDU noted that the unit for health services was not established.	
	Town centre development	Policy 3D.1 & 3D.2			
	Mixed use development	Policy 3B.4			
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	Transport impact was briefly mentioned. There was no indication of number of parking spaces (93%) and the resultant demand on buses was being studied. TfL forecasted rise in traffic on A41 (TLRN). Current car park provision is fairly informal with a mixture of open and off road parking.	Further studies were needed to investigate the cumulative impact of Grahame Estate Park and adjoining development. TfL suggested a mitigation program for A41	
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22			
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	Density of proposed scheme has exceeded London Plan's matrix, maximising use of the site. The masterplan indicated superior street layout to existing scheme. Proposed buildings replaced large void car park area, which was seen as a breeding ground for antisocial behaviour.	The urban design was warmly received by PDU which noted many positive interventions were made in the scheme. (Legibility, improvement in movement, infill development to fill gap). Variations in street layout (grid and curvilinear) provide intricate urban framework. The path across the twin oval shaped open space mimics pedestrians' desired lines.	
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3			
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6			
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Green Belt & Metropolitan Open Space	Policy 3D.8 & 3D.9	The development would lead to reduction of open space, which is clearly resisted in the London Plan. However, this is offset by the improvement and addition of open space elsewhere on the site. Waste separation, door to door collection and recycling receptacles should be installed and accord with policy 4A.1-3. No reference was made to renewable energy but "non technical mechanisms to promote energy efficiently" were included. Further investigation from LB Barnet's committee report stated that sustainable schemes would be explored in reserved matters stage.	The pond, the main interest of this scheme, should have soft edges (plants) to facilitate the movement of amphibians. This is an outline application but plans for sustainable development were included to some extent. A full evaluation at this stage is not appropriate.	
	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6			
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9			
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14			
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3			
Analyst's overall judgement	(1) The large number of community / social facilities should be commended. However, the provision of NHS GP office should be negotiated, given that the large influx of resident can sustain a GP operation and might cause a demand issue for NHS. (2) While previous scheme has informal parking, the increase in population from Grahame Park Estate as well as from neighbouring scheme, would likely cause an acute parking shortage. Spill over into adjoining area is very likely and it is unfortunate that TfL did not raise this issue. (3) Given the cost dilution effect across large numbers of units, more energy efficient schemes should be introduced. PDU officer stated that at that time, SPG / energy toolkit was not available at that time and refusal on this basis would have been weak and could not withstand appeal. (4) Planning gain for A41 improvement and enhancement on public transport is appropriate.			Section 106 & conditions	£670,000 A41 junction, £150,000 bus service, £150,000 Colindale Tube, £50,000 pedestrian improvement. No reference for affordable housing.
Priorities: High on providing housing units and mixed use communities. Low on Sustainable construction.					

Proposal Title:	Land at Stonegrove, Edgware, LB Barnet	Decision Date:	10 November 2004	GLA ref:	PDU/0546/02 PDU/0546/01
Description:	Large scale residential redevelopment. Demolition of 603 existing residential units, school and all other existing buildings on site. 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 access onto Stonegrove and Spur Road and retention of existing accesses at Green Lane and Kings Drive	Mayor's decision	Not directed refusal	STAGE I / II	II with previous I
Planning History:	No relevant history. Oct 2004: LB Barnet advised the Mayor for development; 14 April 2004: STAGE I initial representation was made; 22 Sept 2004: LB Barnet was minded to grant planning permission, leading to this STAGE II report.	Strategic Area:	None. Strategic areas are within walking distance: Green Belt to the north and Site of Met. Importance for Nature Conservation to the East.		
		Use Class Order:		Departure fr. Plan?	
		% of Aff Housing	47 %	GLA referral cat:	1a, 1b and 3a
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?	YES		

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference		
1. Housing	Housing choice	Policy 3A.4	Affordable housing: The scheme provides a net increase of 752 units (from 603 to 1355). Provision for affordable housing increases from 476 to 638 units, 47 % of total unit. Tenure split: 74% social rented and 18 % shared ownership or intermediate housing. The scheme would provide existing social / community facilities on a like for like basis. There is also a net increase of other social space: church, hall and rectory. Access / lifetime homes standard: only 2.7 % of affordable units are wheelchair accessible. Not all units are lifetime homes standard. Increased from 88 to 149 units following PDU request at stage 1 but still not demanding requirement.	Because this is an outline application, case officer assumed that the proportion of affordable habitable rooms would exceed the recommended guideline.
	Affordable housing target	Policy 3A.7		
	Negotiating affordable housing in individual scheme	Policy 3A.8		
	Large scale residential development	Policy 3A.5		
	Social infrastructure and community facilities	Policy 3A.15		
2. Office & Retail	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3	There are few employment opportunities on site, such as community centres and health centres.	PDU did not comment on this issue.
	Town centre development	Policy 3D.1 & 3D.2		
	Mixed use development	Policy 3B.4		
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	1541 parking spaces represents 1.108/unit -- consistent with Table 4B.1. The site is not well served by public transport.	Did not comment on parking and failed to mention the likely demand on existing infrastructure. Figures in Barnet Committee report and supporting statement that car ownership is already high (0.77 cars/household in ward, 0.6-0.88 on these estates). TfL points on public transport still to be resolved.
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22		
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	Height / layout / elevation treatment would be submitted in separate planning applications so cannot presently be evaluated. However PDU approved of the 'character zones' approach in the master plan. Density Proposal is for 112 compared to existing 50 units/ha -- above the suburban guideline at PTAL level 2.	PDU justification for this level of density is weak (with some mis-reporting of the SRQ matrix), given the scale of local opposition, objections from LB Harrow, and the fact that Barnet relied on the Mayor's response on this issue. The proposed transport improvements are unlikely to significantly affect the PTAL rating.
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3		
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6		
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Green Belt & Metropolitan Open Space	Policy 3D.8 & 3D.9	New addition of open space at 0.52ha Applicant relies on open space being more usable within the development, with community access to the new City Academy playing fields north of Spur Road. Sus Dev: proposed scheme demonstrated little commitment towards sus design. There was no reference towards renewable energy, with the exception of household recycling programs. Application material did include a Sustainability Strategy . Planning Statement states that housing will be designed to an Ecohomes "good" standard -- not very demanding.	Noted commitment by the applicant to consider high energy efficiency homes at the earliest planning stage.
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9		
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3		
	Water conservation	Policy 4A.8		

(Continued)

Analyst's overall judgement	<p>(1) While the scheme has exceeded density matrix and would provide more affordable units than existing scheme, the site might not be appropriate for such high density by virtue of its low public transport accessibility. TfL gave the site a PTAL score of 2. Therefore, it gives the impression of over development of the site. (2) High number of parking spaces is also problematic. Close proximity to M1 and A410, combined with low level of public transport provision, would likely to increase dependency of private transport. (3) Given the site occupies a large area and has high number of units, it would be highly feasible for endorsing sustainable design and construction. Large open space could be used for grey water retention. There are plenty of opportunities for green roofs.</p>	Section 106	<p>£100,000 towards public transport improvements. Highways contribution at £225,000 (<i>Barnet Committee report</i>) Section 278 agreement between TfL and applicants for highway improvement proposals on A41 Spur Road roundabout.</p>
Priorities: High on housing (provision of affordable housing). Low on Sus Design and Construction.			
Senior analyst's comments	<p>1 Agree that potential over development, given the low public transport accessibility and surrounding low rise suburban development, is the key issue here. 2 Agree the scheme will lead to a high level of car use, but note the high levels of car ownership on the existing estates, and within the surrounding areas. 3 Green and brown roofs to be considered at detailed stage (PDU report, para 60). Grey water retention difficult when open space at a premium with a high level of families. A higher Ecohomes rating should be encouraged -- may be a requirement of Housing Corporation funding in any event. 4 Agree could represent over development in this suburban location with relatively poor access to the tube or rail system (over 1km).</p>		

Proposal Title:	Telstar House, Eastbourne Terrace, City of Westminster	Decision Date:	10 November 2004	GLA ref:	PDU/0905a/02
		Mayor's decision	Not directed refusal		PDU/0905a/01
Description:	Office redevelopment of 12593 sqm. Redevelopment to provide a new (36 meter tall) building of part five / part seven stories, comprising B1 offices, car parking, hard and soft landscaping and associated works.	STAGE I / II	II, with STAGE I	Planning App. Type	FULL
		Strategic Area:	Central Activities Zone, Opportunity Area: Paddington Basin Westminster: Bayswater Conservation Area / Grade I Listed		
		Use Class Order:	B1	Departure fr. Plan?	NO
Planning History:	Planning permission granted in April 2004 and further amendments were made.	% of Aff Housing	N/A	GLA referral cat:	1c
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?			

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference		
	1. Housing		Given that there was no uplift in office floorspace provision there was no London Plan policy basis for seeking a mix of uses, particularly affordable housing provision.	A taller building would be supported in this location particularly given the site's proximity to Paddington Station. The proposal does not maximise site development potential and this is regrettable.
2. Office & Retail	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3	Not a net increase in office space but a net improvement in office quality to meet modern businesses' requirements.	PDU was supportive of renovating burnt out office space and said that the addition of modern office space would be consistent with London Plan policy 3B.2 and would support London's world city status. Even though the quantity of office space did not increase, the improvement in quality made this application attractive.
	Town centre development	Policy 3D.1 & 3D.2		
	Mixed use development	Policy 3B.4		
	Job creation in emerging sectors	Policy 3B.6 – 11		
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	Proposed development would not generate adverse impact on road network. The area is well served by public transport and the number of proposed parking spaces is below London Plan's requirements.	Indication to suggest that a more intensive development would be acceptable.
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22		
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	The proposed building's profile and footprint is smaller than existing structure, therefore, it is difficult to suggest whether the site's potential has been maximised. The most attractive feature is a series of stepped terrace gardens on the upper levels. Outdoor space would provide a unique amenity to the occupiers. Access statement: an statement has been submitted after stage 1 consultation.	As the area is not designated within Strategic View Management Corridor (See SPG / Map 203), a taller building would be acceptable in principle. Access statement: the statement was adequate and the applicant demonstrated that inclusive design has been incorporated into the design.
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3		
	Guidelines for tall buildings	Policy 4B.8 & 4B.9		
	View corridor protection	Policy 4B.15, 4B.16 & 4B.17		
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6		
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9	The application included a sustainable development statement outlining how demolition of the building would be managed. A BREEAM assessment was also undertaken. No energy statement was submitted with the original application but was requested at the initial consultation phase. No net loss of open space / biodiversity.	The fire damaged, structurally unsound condition of the building rendered demolition the only viable option. Redevelopment of the site provided an opportunity to provide flexible new office accommodation. A condition was imposed by Westminster Council to ensure the overall sustainability of the scheme in accordance with the BREEAM assessment, (refer condition 17) An energy statement (prepared by ARUP) was submitted and committed to using renewable energy technologies (bore hole cooling or a combination of solar panels/photovoltaics) to deliver against the Mayor's 10% renewables target. This commitment was not secured by condition.
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14		
	Water conservation	Policy 4A.8		
Analyst's overall judgement	(1) The main consideration is replacing an outdated, burnt out building with modern, flexible office floorspace. It was regrettable that the opportunity to deliver a taller building was not taken but the scheme still delivered high quality building. (2) There was no evidence of compromise but sustainability issues could have been explored in greater detail. Section 106 terms should have been negotiated to ensure that the commitment to 10% renewable energy was delivered.			Section 106 & Conditions
Priorities: High on replacing office space. Low on Sus Design & Construction.				

Proposal Title:	Charing Cross Hospital, Fulham Palace Road, LB Hammersmith & Fulham	Decision Date:	10 November 2004	GLA ref:	PDU/1029/02
		Mayor's decision	Not directed refusal.		PDU/1029/01
Description:	New Health Facilities New education centre for healthcare research and academic purposes, comprising part seven storey research building and part four storey administration wing.	STAGE I / II	I and II	Planning App. Type	OUTLINE
		Strategic Area:	None		
		Use Class Order:	B1	Departure fr. Plan?	To some degree
Planning History:	No previous planning application.	% of Aff Housing	N/A	GLA referral cat:	1C
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?			YES

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations	
Categories	Policy content	Reference	No housing units provided (see Overall Judgement below).	PDU did not comment on this issue.	
	1. Housing				
2. Office & Retail	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3	Proposed scheme consists of increasing research and development facility for the medical research. It complements with Mayor's vision of a World City Status in which medical research / biotechnology is one significant area for development. The application suggests an increase of 88 full time employees	PDU report: "The proposal is entirely consistent with Policies 3A.18 and 19 of the London Plan which promote the continued role of London as a national and international centre of medical excellence and specialised facilities."	
	Health Facilities	Policy 3A.18 & 3A.19			
Job creation in emerging sectors	Policy 3B.6 – 11				
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	The site is close to 2 underground stations (Hammersmith and Barons Court) and served by a number of bus routes. The proposal includes 50 car parks for staff use.	TfL did not raise objection to the principle of the development.	
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22			
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	The site is not within any View Corridor Management Plan, therefore, a tall building of 46m is acceptable in principle. Access: statement has been submitted to demonstrate inclusive design.	Report stated that a tall building is appropriate on this site and adjacent buildings are even taller. Access: The building will be fully accessible to person with disabilities. Corridors widths and door widths will all ensure accessibility. Overall, the accessibility should be commended.	
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3			
	Inclusive design	Policy 4B.5			
	Guidelines for tall buildings	Policy 4B.8 & 4B.9			
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6			
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6	Energy statement: The application did not refer to any sustainable techniques.	Energy statement: Because the application is an outline, there were emerging ideas in regards to the use of sustainable techniques. PDU advised local planning authority to pursue planning condition requiring "the initiative that are selected to reflect the energy consumption of the building as required by the London Plan."	
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9			
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14	PDU officer advises that during stage 1 consultation (mid 2004), PDU did not have in house expertise for evaluating sustainable construction and design.		
Analyst's overall judgement	(1) Overall, gives the impression that some crucial aspects of sustainable development / construction were glossed over. (2) Two PDU officers dealt with this case separately during stage 1 and stage 2 proposals. If concerns were not addressed in stage 1, it is very difficult to reincorporate issues into discussion at stage 2 report unless there is a change in material consideration. Given this application is seeking OUTLINE permission, most aspects are sketchy and applicants could very well delay negotiations into future applications.		Section 106 & Conditions	Energy assessment	
Priorities: Provision of health / R&D facilities.					

Proposal Title:	Former Middlesex University Campus, Bounds Green, LB Haringey	Decision Date:	24 November 2004	GLA ref:	PDU/1024/02
		Mayor's decision	Not directed refusal.		PDU/1024/01
Description:	Residential of 260 units / Mixed use scheme Redevelopment to provide 260 flats and 19 units for Class B1 and or B8 purposes; community / meeting room; convenience store; parking and open space.	STAGE I / II	I and II	Planning App. Type	FULL
		Strategic Area:	None		
		Use Class Order:	B1, B8, C3	Departure fr. Plan?	No
Planning History:	No planning history.	% of Aff Housing	50	GLA referral cat:	1B
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?			Yes

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference		
1. Housing	Housing choice	Policy 3A.4	Affordable housing: The scheme is in line with policy 3A.7, 130 out of 260 units would be affordable, meeting the 50 % target. A limited range of accommodation is also provided (77 x 1 br and 183 x 2br) and the applicant said the site could not accommodate 3 / 4 br units. Tenure mixture: 50 % social rented; 20 % shared equity; 30 % key worker	Affordable housing: PDU said the residential proportion is acceptable in principle, given that the surrounding areas have large number of houses of 3 / 4 x br. The mix of affordable units (70/30) does not accord with policy 3A.7 but is line with LB Haringey's UDP. Tenure mixture: does not accord with London Plan's policy of 70:30 split but the applicant argued this percentage is in tune with local characteristics.
	Affordable housing target	Policy 3A.7		
	Negotiating affordable housing in individual scheme	Policy 3A.8		
	Social infrastructure and community facilities	Policy 3A.15		
2. Office & Retail	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3	19 units of B1 or B8 would be provided, a total of 4201 sqm. Units provide a diverse range of commercial space from 141 sqm to 472 sqm, giving potential for micro / small / startup businesses.	PDU did not comment on this aspect.
	Town centre development	Policy 3D.1 & 3D.2		
	Mixed use development	Policy 3B.4		
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	Density of 407 hrh. Initial discussion was intended to provide 260 at 1:1 ratio.	Tfl recommended the reduction of car parks and raise of cycle parks from 260 to 400.
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22		
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	Based on building footprint, it is evident that the site's potential is being maximised, yet with a good mixture of hard and soft landscaping. The design statement incorporated a rational street layout to ensure pedestrians' access across the site. The inclusion of semi-public square could be an attractive focal point in courtyards. Maximising the southern exposure and surrounding layout involved compromise - some buildings have unconventional L shape. Elevations and architectural features are average, but they are well hidden by trees. B1 B2 and B8 buildings are located to the rear of the site and are unlikely to cause any incompatibility with residential usage.	PDU report did not comment on urban design extensively. General observation was that proposed scheme is an improvement to existing buildings which are semi-abandoned.
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3		
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6		
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Green Belt & Metropolitan Open Space	Policy 3D.8 & 3D.9	Noise and air quality assessments were included in the report and suggested that the proximity to the North Circular Road does not undermine this residential scheme.	PDU did not request any assessment of the energy demand of proposed developments.
	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6		
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9	Large number of units are south facing, so theoretically would benefit from passive solar heating.	
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14		
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3		
Water conservation	Policy 4A.8			
Analyst's overall judgement	(1) The reduction of car parking spaces and addition of cycle parks are appropriate to minimise carbon emissions. (2) The proposal meets the affordable housing target. While it misses the mixture of 70/30 mixture, the overall contribution to affordable housing is welcomed. (3) Planning decision report did not mention any issue in relation to biodiversity and open space, however, £500,000 was secured via Section 106 for environment improvements in LB Haringey. Therefore, it could be held that open space / biodiversity had been dealt with. (4) The reduction of car parks from 260 to 258 is largely symbolic but nevertheless, it satisfied Table 4B.1 This scheme is exemplary in meeting affordable housing objectives and reducing reliance on private vehicles. The use of Section 106 has satisfactorily addresses environmental aspects, which were not part of the application.			Section 106 & Conditions
Priorities: Housing supply, affordable housing.				

Proposal Title:	2 Sutton Park Road, Sutton, LB Sutton	Decision Date:	22 December 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/0615a/02
		Mayor's decision	Withdrew refusal		
Description:	Mixed development of 104 residential units (56 1xbr, 34, 2xbr, 6 3xbr and inclusive of 98 affordable units) 1350 sqm of B1 in a part 9 storey / part 12 storey building with basement car and cycle parking, plant refuse and amenity facilities and alterations to access.	STAGE I / II	II	Planning App. Type	FULL
		Strategic Area:	Town Centre: Metropolitan Town Centre of Sutton. Metropolitan Town Centre is only 1 step below intl centres (West End)		
		Use Class Order:	B1 / C3	Departure fr. Plan?	
Planning History:	PDU ref: 0615/01 in which the Mayor supported.	% of Aff Housing	94 %	GLA referral cat:	1C
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?			NO

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference	Affordable housing: All units, except 6, are to be affordable. There is a good mixture of residential units. Tenure: 30% social rented; 70 % intermediate housing, contrary to London Plan mix of 70 % intermediate housing: 30 % social rented.	The proposed breakdown of housing types and the proportion of affordable units is consistent with the London Plan. LB Sutton should determine the split of social housing and the inadequate information resulted in earlier refusal. The refusal was withdrew when the council confirmed the allocation of social rented / intermediate housing and the actual number of affordable housing provided on site. Inclusive design: PDU advised the applicant to submit an accessibility statement to show that at least 10 % of units would be wheelchair accessible.
1. Housing	Housing choice	Policy 3A.4		
	Affordable housing target	Policy 3A.7		
	Social infrastructure and community facilities	Policy 3A.15		
2. Office & Retail	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3	The scheme has a net loss of office space and there would be a qualitative improvement.	PDU stated that the net loss of office space is acceptable given that "the proposal will ensure that a considerable amount of office space is retained and modernised due to the additional provision of residential, the reduction in employment generating floorspace is not of strategic concern." PDU/0615a/02
	Town centre development	Policy 3D.1 & 3D.2		
	Mixed use development	Policy 3B.4		
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	The site is in Sutton Town Centre and well served by public transport.	The scheme / density is appropriate in this location. TfL has some reservations in terms of access road arrangements.
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22		
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	Consultant did not have access to drawings.	"the scheme is an improvement to the building currently on site. The architectural standard is acceptable and will improve the quality of the surrounding townscape."
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3		
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6		
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6	The applicant did not address sustainable design and construction as required by London Plan Policies 4A.7-9 and 4A.1-3.	Advised LB Sutton that planning condition should require the submission of an energy assessment.
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9		
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14		
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3		
Analyst's overall judgement	(1) LB Sutton did not initially submit the application for Mayor's initial representation at STAGE 1. The Mayor's advice was sought the day after the council decided on the outcome, and it took 40 days for the associated documents to be submitted to the GLA. (2) It is unfortunate that the quality of the application could not be improved, mainly in terms of sustainable development. PDU circumvented the absence of sustainable statement by recommending LB Sutton to issue planning conditions. Hopefully, the applicant can submit these statements prior to the commencement of any construction. Timely referral of the application would have offered the Mayor more opportunity to seek improvements. (3) The high density, with almost 100% affordable housing, is particularly suitable in the Metropolitan Town Centre of Sutton. (4) Considering the procedural problems encountered, the planning outcome is acceptable.			Section 106 & Conditions A full sustainability statement should be submitted covering the energy assessment (Policy 4A.7 and 4A.8) Access statement, ensuring that at least some units would be wheelchair accessible.
Priorities: High percentage of affordable housing.				

Proposal Title:	3 – 25 Payne Road, E3, LB Tower Hamlets	Decision Date:	12 January 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/0956/02 PDU/0956/01
Description:	Residential led mixed use scheme Redevelopment and refurbishment to provide 158 flats, 12 commercial units, Class D1 and 2 units for A1/A2/B1	Mayor's decision	NOT Directed Refusal	STAGE I / II	II and I
Planning History:	None.	Strategic Area:	London Plan: Area for Regeneration LB Tower Hamlets: Air Quality Management Area / Air Quality Hotspot		
		Use Class Order:	C3	Departure fr. Plan?	No
		% of Aff Housing	61	GLA referral cat:	1C
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?	YES		

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference	Affordable housing: 158 units - 61 for private sale and 97 units for affordable housing. The scheme offers a good mixture of flats from studio to 3 br, satisfying policy 3A.4 & 7. Tenure split: 52 % social housing and 48 % intermediate provision. Access: adequate statement has been submitted following PDU's request.	The emphasis is towards smaller units but is acceptable / aligned with LB Tower Hamlets UDP. Tenure split: this proportion is acceptable given the proposal mirrors the predominate tenure mixture in the area.
1. Housing	Housing choice Affordable housing target Social infrastructure and community facilities	Policy 3A.4 Policy 3A.7 Policy 3A.15		
2. Office & Retail	Office supply Mixed use development	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3 Policy 3B.4	There are 14 commercial units, which either be B1 or A1/A2. The total provision of commercial units and community space is 2195 sqm and 540 sqm respectively.	The scheme will generate a number of jobs during the construction and post built phase. Section 106 agreements consist terms for employing local workers. PDU did not comment on A1/A2/B1 floorspace in the scheme.
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation Parking provision	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2 Policy 3C.22	The area is well served by a number of bus routes but its proximity to the Blackwall Tunnel Approach A12 requires TfL's comment.	Satisfied with car park but need to add more cycle parking to promote sustainable travel. TfL requested traffic demand and impact on TRLN, but concluded that the development would not have detrimental impact on the TRLN. Travel plan should be secured via condition.
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles Density and maximising site potential Guidelines for tall buildings View corridor protection Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.1 Policy 4B.3 Policy 4B.8 & 4B.9 Policy 4B.15, 4B.16 & 4B.17 Policy 4B.6	The design is ambitious in that it introduces a landmark building 60m high, and smaller buildings are sympathetic to the existing environment. It also preserves and enhances a building in a conservation area. Basement parking maximises the potential use of the site and the water feature in the private courtyard would provide an interesting focal point.	Generally, the response in the PDU report is very positive. However, the PDU did not mention that there were many local objections (close to 100) in relation to the building's height and design. The site is excluded from View Management Plan and there was no discussion in relation to the building's height.
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Improvement of air quality Endorsement of renewable energy Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development Minimisation of household waste Water conservation	Policy 4A.6 Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9 Policy 4A.14 Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3 Policy 4A.8	Traffic noise from Blackwall Tunnel Approach and Bow Road is an issue and might adversely impact living conditions. Acoustic consultants have mitigation measure to tackle this issue (double glazed windows)	Noise: acknowledged the issue but did not comment further. A noise assessment was included and said noise level would be below World Health Organisation's standard. Nitrogen Dioxide could possibly be a nuisance for residents, however, the entire borough suffers from this pollutant. The applicant did not submit air quality assessment either after stage 1 or stage 2 reports and PDU suggested a planning condition to secure this.
6. Blue Ribbon Network			The site is less than 20m away from River Lea, however, it was not evident that the Blue Ribbon Network was a planning consideration.	PDU did not comment on this.
Analyst's overall judgement	(1) The high number of affordable units has exceeded the London Plan target and would provide a significant housing supply in an area for regeneration. (2) The close proximity to River Lea (across A12) should trigger discussion in enhancing River Lea via section 106 agreement, however, this was not evident in the report. Nevertheless, contribution has been made for "Bow Road Gateway Improvement". (3) The discussion of air quality and noise was justified, however, they did not amount to a planning refusal as there are other existing residential schemes. The applicant has appropriately addressed noise mitigation measures. (4) Furthermore, the accessibility issues have been resolved at Stage 2 and have demonstrated the design principle of including people of different backgrounds.			Section 106 & Conditions
Priorities: Housing, transport, design and natural resources.				£30,000 towards Bow Road Gateway Improvement (GLA/AUU 100 squares project) Local Labour Construction Agreement – use of local workers during construction. Condition for Nitrogen Dioxide assessment and mitigation for reducing its effect.

Proposal Title:	31 – 39 Millharbour, Isle of Dogs, LB Tower Hamlets	Decision Date:	25 January 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/0483a/02 PDU/0483a/01	
Description:	Residential Scheme A provision of 512 units (151 of which are affordable, 66 x 1 br, 63 x 2 br, 22 x 3 br) in a linked development that rises from 14 to 22 storeys in height and provides ancillary retail and leisure uses at ground and podium levels.	Mayor's decision	Not directed refusal	STAGE I / II	II and I	
Planning History:	Very important. An OUTLINE planning application (LBTH: PA/010/01514) approved in 2002 for a redevelopment to provide 240 flats (68 of which are affordable) in 4 blocks from 6 to 22 storeys.	Strategic Area:	Opportunity Area (Isle of Dogs); Area for Regeneration; LBTH: Millennium Quarter Master Plan		Planning App. Type	FULL
		Use Class Order:	A1-3 and C3	Departure fr. Plan?	NO	
		% of Aff Housing	30	GLA referral cat:	1A and 1C	
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?	YES			

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference	<p>Access: statement was submitted and all units can be built to meet lifetime homes standard. Wheelchair users could access all levels of the complex via lifts and parking spaces for disabled people will be sited near the lift cores. Affordable housing: Density (1089 dwellings / hect) exceeds the London Plan guidelines, however, the Isle of Dogs is specifically designated as a densely populated area. Affordable housing is below 50 % target, however, the level of provision is more than previous scheme. Tenure mixture: 80 % social rented and 20 % shared equity / key worker accommodation.</p> <p>3 commercial units are located at the ground floor; the applicant did not clarify on their usage.</p> <p>Parking numbers is set at 266.</p> <p>The applicant has maximised the potential of the site as demonstrated from the differences between outline and full app. Internal layout: While the London Plan does not refer to internal layout, observation should be made here for the low number of lifts serving 22 storeys.</p> <p>The site is not located in any view corridor management plan. Canary Wharf and surrounding vicinity has a collection of tall buildings. There is no reference to sustainable design and construction.</p> <p>The site is next to the west of Millwall Dock, therefore, it should trigger the Blue Ribbon Network policies. However, it was not named as a strategic planning issue and relevant policy in STAGE 1 report. From the planning application folder: British Waterway has not responded to LBTH during statutory consultation period.</p>	<p>Access: PDU is satisfactory with the access statement and draft conditions, agreed by the council, demanding the submission of full particulars of access for disabled people.</p> <p>Affordable housing: After LBTH / GLA's intervention, the affordable housing target has been revised upward to 151 from 130. To meet the demands, the mixture of housing units has also been modified to provide substantially more 2 / 3 br. The layout of flats could be better utilised and some rooms appeared to be too small / narrow for habitable purposes.</p> <p>PDU did not comment on this, however, the Canary Wharf / Isle of Dogs Area is highly mixed use in nature.</p> <p>Tfl said the site is appropriate for this intensive residential scheme but would like a green travel plan as a planning condition. Parking space is acceptable and is less than 1 space per unit.</p> <p>The scale, elevation and architectural features are problematic. The building looks bulky by having identical twin towers blocks, rendered by repetitive windows and architectural features.</p> <p>The building height of 69 m is consistent with the Tower Hamlet's guidance of 64 to 68 m. PDU suggested the applicant should include a report on sustainable design and construction.</p> <p>The Millwall Dock already has full / public access.</p>
1. Housing	Housing choice	Policy 3A.4		
	Affordable housing target	Policy 3A.7		
	Negotiating affordable housing in individual scheme	Policy 3A.8		
	Large scale residential development	Policy 3A.5		
	Social infrastructure and community facilities	Policy 3A.15		
2. Office & Retail	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3		
	Mixed use development	Policy 3B.4		
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2		
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22		
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1		
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3		
	Guidelines for tall buildings	Policy 4B.8 & 4B.9		
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6		
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9		
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14		
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3		
	Tall Building	Policy		
	Water conservation	Policy 4A.8		
6. Blue Ribbon Network	Leisure use, access and activities alongside / in / on the Blue Ribbon Network	Policy 4C.16, 4C.17 & 4C.18		
	Urban design for schemes alongside Blue Ribbon Network	Policy 4C.20, 4C.21		
	Developments near canal and canal restoration	Policy 4C.28, 4C.30		
	The protection of moorings and docks	Policy 4C.19, 4C.32		
Analyst's overall judgement	(1) While the planning considerations rely to some extent on the London Plan, Tower Hamlets' Millennium Quarter Master Plan and the valid outline application also had a significant influence on the outcome. In a twin tracked applications condition, like this case, it appears that in some instances the decision process is selecting the best out of two options. (2) Clearly, this application by virtue of more affordable and private units is the preferred option. The applicant has consistently declined to submit financial appraisal to justify the affordable provision. (3) PDU report clearly stated that if there were no planning history, a refusal would be recommended by virtue of missing the affordable housing target. (4) Having said that, PDU reports have clearly demonstrated the rationale leading to the planning decision and have applied the appropriate strategic planning policies.		Section 106 & Conditions	<p>£850,000 contribution for infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>Note: LBTH granted approval with 25 conditions, in which sound insulation, design details, landscaping, parking details, disabled access and limits to the dock were included.</p>
Priorities: the need for more housing units.				

Proposal Title:	Former Morganite Factory, Osiers Road, LB Wandsworth		Decision Date:	09 February 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/1109/02 PDU/1109/01
Description:	Residential / Brownfield Development Redevelopment of the former Morganite Facotry, and refurbishment and extension of the existing warehouse building, fronting Point Pleasant for mixed use purposes, containing 128 apartments and 4,420 sqm commercial accommodation for A2, B1 or D1 uses, basement parking, hard and soft landscaping and pedestrian link from Point Pleasant towards Osiers Road.		Mayor's decision	NOT directed refusal	STAGE I / II	1 and 2
Planning History:	The Mayor did not have time to comment on this application prior to Wandsworth Council's resolution to grant permission. Extant planning permission in 2002 for a 52 residential units scheme with no provision of affordable housing.		Strategic Area:	London Plan: Town Centres – Major Centre: Wandsworth		
			Use Class Order:	A1, B1, C3 and D1	Departure fr. Plan?	NO
			% of Aff Housing	30 % or 50 %	GLA referral cat:	1B
			Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?			NO
Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan		PDU comments / recommendations	
Categories	Policy content	Reference	Access: no statement has been submitted but the applicant confirmed that all units would meet 100 % lifetime homes' standard and 10 % units would be wheelchair accessible. Affordable housing: The scheme offers either 30 or 50 % of affordable units, depending on calculation. The proposal also has a range of housing unit types from 1x br to 3 x br. Tenure mixture: 100 % shared equity. Layout: most units are rectangular shaped and thus have high usable space. Some units have 2 balconies, leading to greater amenity. Vertical stacking of habitable rooms is acceptable and does not generate conflict of uses.			Access: did not request the submission of an access statement but said that these requirements would "form part of the application by way of a letter" Affordable housing: The applicant has provided a detailed financial appraisal and demonstrated that an upward revision of affordable units would be unfeasible. PDU also said the new application represented a 50 % increase of affordable housing when considering the extant permission for 52 units. (128 – 52 = 76) / 2 = 38 units. Therefore, the scheme is consistent with Policy 3A.7 and 3A.4
1. Housing	Housing choice	Policy 3A.4	Highly mixed use with A2 (Financial and professional services), B1 (office) and D1 (Community) uses. Commercial space is flexible in that some units could be combined to create a larger floorspace. The site has low public accessibility with PTAL of 2. The most accessible railway station is Wandsworth Town. The design is highly responsive to the environment. A new public path through the site would encourage pedestrian movement. Buildings' various heights are sympathetic to the adjacent properties and the variation would create an interesting skyline and avoid excessive overshadowing. Open Space: There is no loss of open space but there is the addition of a new public realm and cycle route. Neither sustainable design / construction, nor energy assessment was included in the application. Design statement: there is no ecological significance on existing site and the enhanced public realm would provide habitat for invertebrates and birds. The site could be contaminated from factory use and recycling brownfield land into new uses is consistent with Policy 4A.16			Commercial units on the ground floor do not cause conflict with residential units above. D1 units could be used for variety of purposes and provide social infrastructure. The development is intensive and satisfies Policy 4B.3 for maximising the potential of the site. The public path is consistent with policy 4B.4 for improving public realm and 3C.21 for improving conditions for walking and cycling. PDU said that the scheme is well designed and presents innovative urban design solution to a derelict industrial space. PDU stated that an energy assessment should be a planning condition, however, energy assessment was not part of any planning condition on the planning decision notice (LB Wandsworth: 2004/4607). PDU advise that it assisted in the preparation of a Unilateral Undertaking, requiring the applicant to prepare and implement an energy statement and strategy for the site.
	Affordable housing target	Policy 3A.7				
	Negotiating affordable housing in individual scheme	Policy 3A.8				
	Social infrastructure and community facilities	Policy 3A.15				
2. Office & Retail	Mixed use development	Policy 3B.4				
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2				
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22				
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1				
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3				
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6				
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6				
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9				
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14				
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3				
	Water conservation	Policy 4A.8				
	Bringing contaminated land into beneficial use	Policy 4A.16				
6. Blue Ribbon Network			The site is 150 m south of the Thames and Wandsworth Park. The application did not address this issue.			
Analyst's overall judgement	(1) LB Wandsworth withdrew the application in Dec 2004, claiming that the scheme is not referable to the Mayor. 2 months later, LB Wandsworth agreed to submit the application for Mayor's consultation. (2) Given the circumstances leading to this application were not conducive for discussion, the overall delivery is acceptable in principle with the London Plan. (3) Several issues should be addressed and could be interpreted as contrary to the London Plan. The low PTAL score gives the impression that the scheme would represent an over development of the area and create a mismatch of transport provision with development. Despite these shortcomings, this proposal is still better than previous approved scheme, which did not maximum the site's potential and delivered no affordable units. (4) The site's close proximity to the Thames should trigger discussion of the Blue Ribbon Network. (5) The applicant provided neither a sustainable appraisal nor an energy assessment.			Section 106 & conditions	LB Wandsworth has issued a number of conditions: restricting the use of ground floor to A2, B1 and D1, to safeguard the amenity of occupiers.	
Priorities: Provision of housing and affordable housing, open and public space.						

Proposal Title:	The Royal Ballet School, Richmond Park, LB Richmond Upon Thames		Decision Date:	2 March 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/1089/03-01
Description:	Metropolitan Open Land / Educational Facility Demolition of existing boys' boarding house and head's house, erection of 2-storey boarding house and head teacher's house, single storey dining hall and dance studio, below ground swimming pool, refurbishment of existing buildings for school use, and associated works.		Mayor's decision	Withdrew REFUSAL	STAGE I / II	1 and 2
Planning History:	The main building is built between 1727 and 1729 and the main building has been extended in the 1960s. It appears that no other major works undertaken since 1970.		Strategic Area:	Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) / LB Richmond: Conservation Area / Listed Building Grade 1 / Metro Importance for Nature Conservation.		
			Use Class Order:	C2	Departure fr. Plan?	YES
			% of Aff Housing	N/A	GLA referral cat:	3d and 3b
			Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?	YES		
Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan		PDU comments / recommendations	
Categories	Policy content	Reference	The site is located in a Metropolitan Open Land and the scheme would result in a net loss of open space, contrary to national planning policy and strategic planning policy. There is a presumption against the development on open space and the applicant needs to demonstrate why planning permission should be granted, based on very special circumstances, alternative sites and redevelopment within the existing footprint. The main consideration for this case is whether the proposed education facility would enhance London's world city status in areas of education, culture and heritage.			
	1. Main strategic issues					
2. Cultural, Education Community	Social infrastructure and community facilities	Policy 3A.15	The applicant clearly passed the necessity test and has demonstrated the loss of MOL is reduced to a minimum.			
	Education facilities	Policy 3A.21				
	Addressing the needs of London's diverse population	Policy 3A.14				
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	N/A			
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22				
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	The scheme is highly sympathetic and coherent to existing structures and attempt to replicate the historical fabric. The graded I listed building would be restored and would guarantee continued educational and cultural use.			
	Historic conservation led regeneration	Policy 4B.12				
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6				
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Realising the value of open space	Policy 3D.7	(1) The proposal suggests an increased building footprint of 36 % upon MOL contrary to the London Plan and national policies. (2) Restoration of important views from Penn Ponds. (3) Richmond Park is an ideal habitat for badgers and setts (underground tunnels) have been identified near or around the site. SusDev: The applicant has not included any energy assessment or plan for renewable energy.			
	Green Belt & Metropolitan Open Space	Policy 3D.8 & 3D.9				
	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6				
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9				
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14				
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3				
Water conservation	Policy 4A.8					
Analyst's overall judgement	(1) This is a complex planning application due to rigid framework for conserving green belt and metropolitan open land. PDU reports have successfully presented strategic planning issues impartially to the Mayor. (2) Throughout all 3 reports, there was clearly a presumption against the loss of MOL. The Mayor has first directed refusal as the applicant failed to demonstrate special circumstances and biodiversity mitigation. (3) The applicant has then submitted evidence on the grounds of necessity and undertaken biodiversity mitigation schemes. Furthermore, the applicant spearheaded a range of social inclusion policies for widening the outreach program to change its elitist image. (4) Despite these modifications, PDU has insisted that, "the position in relation to inappropriate development on Metropolitan Open Land remains unchanged." (5) PDU has successfully added value to this application by requiring inclusive development and programs addressing to diversity, which are key issues addressed in the London Plan. (6) It was regrettable not to include any renewable energy yet refusing on this basis would be unreasonable.				Section 106	Museum open to the public. Outreach partnership with performing arts and sport colleges, access programme for children from maintained schools during holidays, a community programme including open rehearsals, open days and exhibitions.
Priorities: Inclusive development over MOL development.						

Proposal Title:	Crown Wharf, Canning Town, LB Newham	Decision Date:	2 February 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/0895/01-02
		Mayor's decision	NOT directed refusal		
Description:	Change of use from Strategic Employment Location to residential Redevelopment to provide 767 residential units, 1269 sqm commercial floorspace and a crèche in a series of buildings ranging from 9 to 23 storeys plus underground parking, associated car parking, landscape and a riverside walk.	STAGE I / II	2	Planning App. Type	FULL
		Strategic Area:	Area for regeneration, Opportunity Area: Canning Town, Thames Gateway; Strategic Employment Location:		
		Use Class Order:	C3	Departure fr. Plan?	NO
Planning History:		% of Aff Housing	34 %	GLA referral cat:	1A
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?	YES		

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference		
1. Housing	Housing choice	Policy 3A.4	Accessibility: Only 7.5 % of units are wheelchairs accessible. Affordable housing: The proposed scheme has only 35 % affordable housing and the applicant has demonstrated through a full financial assessment (open book) that 50 % target could not be reached. 35 % is presumably the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing. Tenure mixture: 50 % intermediate and 50 % social rented provision.	Access: there is a commitment towards wheelchair units target but the applicant has not clarified its position on lifetime homes standard. PDU recommended planning condition to secure this. Affordable housing: PDU report did not explicitly recommend / disapprove the scheme in light of only 35 % affordable housing units. Tenure mixture: not supported by London Plan.
	Affordable housing target	Policy 3A.7		
	Negotiating affordable housing in individual scheme	Policy 3A.8		
	Large scale residential development	Policy 3A.5		
	Social infrastructure and community facilities	Policy 3A.15		
2. Office & Retail	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3	The site is located in a Strategic Employment Location and the change of use from Class B (Business) to Class C (Residential) would result in the net loss of employment / industrial space. London Plan policies resist the net loss of employment / industrial space. However, the applicant has provided convincing argument for the proposed change of use.	PDU and LB Newham were satisfied with the change of use. LDA said that residential development should not restrict the use for Lea River for freight and navigation purposes.
	Town centre development	Policy 3D.1 & 3D.2		
	Mixed use development	Policy 3B.4		
	Job creation in emerging sectors	Policy 3B.6 – 11		
	Strategic employment locations (SEL)	Policy 3B.5		
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	350 m from Canning Town underground station. Parking of 333	There are no strategic issues on TLRN but an increase in traffic on A13 is expected and a traffic assessment should be submitted.
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22		
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	Consultant did not have access to drawings.	Tall buildings are acceptable in that location and the clustering of tall structures would create a striking visual entrance into London. Strategic View Management Plan does not cover this location and Canning Town, being proximate to Canary Wharf, makes an ideal location for tall buildings.
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3		
	Guidelines for tall buildings	Policy 4B.8 & 4B.9		
	View corridor protection	Policy 4B.15, 4B.16 & 4B.17		
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6		
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6	The applicant has submitted a sustainability statement and has made no reference to recycling program. Noise: Noise abatement is resolved via planning conditions.	Renewable energy: "The applicant has at the request of the GLA provided a full sustainability statement, this shows that given the site constraints the provision of Combined Heat and Power is not viable. GLA officers have tested this and consider the conclusions to be robust." Noise: PDU appeared to be satisfied with planning conditions but have also made further recommendations to refine terms in order to protect residents' amenity.
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9		
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14		
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3		
	Water conservation	Policy 4A.8		

(continued)

6. Blue Ribbon Network	Leisure use, access and activities alongside / in / on the Blue Ribbon Network	Policy 4C.16, 4C.17 & 4C.18	The site is highly constrained for expanding riverside walk in that to the north is a recycling industrial site with operating docks. Site across the River Lea is also an industrial operation, therefore, might not be the most attractive place for river walk.	PDU report (ref:PDU/0895/01) said a pedestrian bridge across the River Lea (East – West) would make great addition to the viability of the scheme, and enhance leisure and recreation for residents.	
	Urban design for schemes alongside Blue Ribbon Network	Policy 4C.20, 4C.21			
Analyst's overall judgement	<p>(1) The site being next to a recycling facility and very close to A13 might not be the most desirable location for an intensive residential development, however, the applicant has demonstrated the scheme would not adversely impact on Strategic Employment Location. (2) It makes good strategic terms to have a cluster of tall building as the site is prominent and visible from Blackwall Tunnel and Canary Wharf. (3) It is disappointing that the provision of affordable housing could not be raised to 50 %, however, PDU report presented to the Mayor clearly stated this. (4) PDU report recommended improvements to the scheme in relation to the access over River Lea and pedestrian enhancement for crossing the A13. It is unfortunate that LB Newham perceived these changes as unnecessary. (5) The applicant did not include any household recycling program (ie recycling receptacles) and is ironic in that the site is immediate next to a recycling facility. (6) Efforts have been made to raise the quality of this application (renewable energy/ pedestrian link) meeting numerous objectives of the London Plan but financial limitation was an overriding factor.</p>			Section 106	£1.2 Million for: Signal prioritisation for buses / open space / education provision / enlarged pedestrian route over railways / public art / construction training.
Priorities: The outcome is well balanced and has no evidence of preferred policies.					

Proposal Title:	Cannon Place, Cannon Street Station, Corporation of London	Decision Date:	9 February 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/0836
		Mayor's decision	NOT directed refusal		
Description:	Office development New office building of eight storeys above station concourse with retail uses at lower ground, ground and upper ground levels.	STAGE I / II	II	Planning App. Type	FULL
		Strategic Area:	Central Activities Zone; St's Paul Strategic View Corridor for Greenwich Park and Blackheath Point; Blue Ribbon Network. Conservation Areas		
		Use Class Order:	83 % B1 : 2 % A1, A2	Departure fr. Plan?	NO
Planning History:	March 1997: approval for redevelopment of station + 8 storeys and retail on LG, G, UG levels, alteration to mainline railway station, with associated parking and servicing. Permission was renewed in 2001.	% of Aff Housing	N/A	GLA referral cat:	3e, 4
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?	YES		

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference		
1. Housing			Intensification of the site did not trigger the discussion of affordable housing, however, there is an extant planning permission.	Did not address this issue but there is already an extant planning permission.
2. Office & Retail	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3	A1-3: 1757 sqm from 1697 sqm B1: Office space: 49749 sqm from 24804 sqm.	PDU report said that the addition of new modern office space would meet the projected growth of corporate HQ in London. It would raise the competitiveness in London for its global status. Did not say whether the ratio of mixed use is appropriate, however, the City of London is extremely compact and there is plenty of existing amenity within walking distance.
	Town centre development	Policy 3D.1 & 3D.2		
	Mixed use development	Policy 3B.4		
	Job creation in emerging sectors	Policy 3B.6 – 11		
	Strategic employment locations (SEL)	Policy 3B.5		
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	The site is highly accessible by public transport and has large catchments area. Proposed car parking of 32.	TfL welcomed the scheme and said it would bring wider benefit to London Transport's system. 32 car parks exceed the guideline and should be reduced to 23. Other issues concern with legal issues and land ownership.
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22		
4. Urban Design	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3	Consultant did not have access to drawings and could not comment on design aspects.	PDU officer advises that the main thrust in this case is the design / architect of the building. The proposal represents a desirable office redevelopment in the city.
	Guidelines for tall buildings	Policy 4B.8 & 4B.9		
	View corridor protection	Policy 4B.15, 4B.16 & 4B.17		
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6		
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9		
	5. Blue Ribbon Network		Did not trigger any Blue Ribbon Network policies	PDU officer advises that the building is fronting on Cannon Street and does not build over the River.
Analyst's overall judgement	(1) There is already an approved application dated 1997, 7 years before the implementation of the London Plan and the new proposal is similar to extant proposal in terms of office allocation and also offers substantial financial contribution towards transport improvements. Therefore, there is little scope for expanded negotiations for housing, Blue Ribbon Network and sustainable development. (2) The benefits of this scheme would renovate the under capacity mainline and underground stations of Cannon Street.			Section 106
Priorities: Additional office supply into the market.				

Proposal Title:	Former British Gas Site, Stepney Green, LB Tower Hamlets	Decision Date:	23 February 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/0883/01 PDU/0883/02
Description:	Change of use from industrial to Large residential scheme Redevelopment to provide two 6 storey buildings comprising 532 residential units, 2110 sqm of B1 use and community use with associated access, open space, landscaping and car parking.	Mayor's decision	NOT directed refusal	STAGE I / II	I and II
Planning History:	Planning history dated from 1998 for full planning permission, then referred to Secretary of State for non determination. SoS allowed the appeal and granted planning permission for: "Redevelopment to provide 406 residential units, including affordable housing, 65 key worker cluster units providing 250 bed spaces, 630 sqm of community health centre D1, 805 sqm community employment training accomdation B1, with associated access road, open space, landscaping and car parking" 2002: High court appeal lodged by local resident on the ground that SoS did not require Environmental Impact Assessment. 2003: High court quashed permission made by SoS 2003: Government Office for London: further representation.	Strategic Area:	London Plan: Area for Regeneration LBTH: Grade II Importance for Nature Conservation		
		Use Class Order:	B1, C3 and D1	Departure fr. Plan?	NO
		% of Aff Housing	56	GLA referral cat:	1A
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?	YES		

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference		
1. Housing	Housing choice	Policy 3A.4	<p>Access: applicant did not initially submit an access statement. Supporting information was submitted after PDU's request at stage 1. It is unclear whether 10 % of units will be wheelchair accessible and whether all units meet lifetime homes standard.</p> <p>Affordable housing: 532 units of which 215 are affordable and 85 units would be transferred to Newlon Housing Trust. The overall delivery is 56 %, exceeding London Plan's target.</p> <p>Diversity of housing units: The scheme has a number of housing unit type of flats and houses. However, flats representing 91 % of total units, are the predominate form. And 2 bedrooms flat consist of the highest number (64 % of total unit)</p> <p>Social infrastructure is evident, however, it is inconclusive as the applicant stated D1 use only.</p> <p>Tenure mixture: 45 % social rented and 55 % key worker.</p>	<p>PDU report did not comment on the emphasis on 2 bedroom flats. It is likely that a revision towards more houses would render the scheme unviable.</p> <p>Tenure mixture: the departure from London Plan is deemed as acceptable as the proposal is following pattern in surrounding housing association.</p> <p>Access: PDU report states that " the applicant has submitted an access statement that confirms that the scheme not only satisfies the provisions of part M of the Building Regulations, but also meets the Scheme Development Standards of the Housing Association Partners."</p>
	Affordable housing target	Policy 3A.7		
	Negotiating affordable housing in individual scheme	Policy 3A.8		
	Large scale residential development	Policy 3A.5		
	Social infrastructure and community facilities	Policy 3A.15		
2. Office & Retail	Mixed use development	Policy 3B.4	The scheme has elements of mixed-use development but this is largely symbolic. The scheme has 2110 sqm of B1 and D1, located at southwest corner of the complex.	The conversion of an industrial site into a residential scheme would not adversely impact on employment opportunities as the site been disused for quite a long time.
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	Car parking provision / unit is less than 1, therefore, it meet with Table 4B.1 Car park provision is delivered in piece meal approach as opposed to a single large parking area.	PTAL score was not provided in the report, however, the site benefits from close proximity to Mile End underground station (Central and District Line). The parking level is consistent with Table 4B.1, however the split between commercial and residential is unclear.
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22		

(Continued)

4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	<p>Proposed density is 158 units / hectare, consistent with Table 4B.1</p> <p>Pedestrian: The proposed scheme would improve the circulation of pedestrian (East West route) by creating new access towards Regent Canal. Accesses into the buildings are located on street as opposed to the courtyard, thereby, creating more lively movement on public path. Vehicle circulation: Vehicle circulation adopts a cul de sac typology, in which access to the car park is gained through the internal courtyards. This would effectively draw activities away from public street into internal courtyard. A better solution would relocate car park access on Ben Jonson, Harford and the new access road, increasing the amount of internal courtyard for residents.</p> <p>Rhythms: Recessed buildings punctuate street rhythm and might diminish the quality of townscape. Elevation of Block C fronting to Ben Jonson Road is problematic in that rhythm of ground floor unit (retail / community) does not accord with the rhythm of units above. The large shop windows are visually too assertive and make residential units appear to “float” from the ground. Architect details: Architectural element is predominately modern with little historical reference to the Victorian age canal and East End communities. Semi Public / Private Space: Some ground floor flat units have private courtyard facing vehicle access road. These spaces, by virtue of their minimal depth, might not offer much amenity value to the occupiers. This transient semi public / private space might lower the sense of security as it reduces the informal monitoring upon the public realm. Open Space: This proposal has a good mixture of hard and soft surface. Internal Layout / Stacking: The internal stacking of habitable room is acceptable, however, the provision of lift is minimal and restricted to Block C only. The western portion of block C has a long corridor, which might not be appropriate in a residential block as the corridor enables the spread of smell, odour and noise. Access: Access to car park is unclear. From the drawings, it appears that car park can only be reached from vehicle down ramps in Block A, D and B.</p>	<p>PDU (ref:PDU/0883/01) states that “ a better arrangement would be for a deeper basement level car park that would be more attractive, and would lead to flats on the ground floor which in turn would be capable of wheelchairs units.”</p> <p>The design might not be appropriate for this site and “ a more bold contemporary design should have been developed for this site and the current proposals are disappointing.” PDU/0883/01, page 6.</p> <p>The applicant has agreed to provide detailed drawings in regards to the canalside elevation.</p>
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3		
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6		
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9	<p>Consultant did not have access to the application folder and therefore could not comment on these issues.</p>	<p>As the gas site been disused, it is possible to become a valuable habitat for invertebrates, plants and insects.</p> <p>The site is expected to be heavily contaminated from previous use, therefore “protective measures are needed to ensure that the development does not allow contaminates to leach into the canal.”</p>
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3		
	Water conservation	Policy 4A.8		
6. Blue Ribbon Network	Leisure use, access and activities alongside / in / on the Blue Ribbon Network	Policy 4C.16, 4C.17 & 4C.18	<p>The scheme would create a 6 m canalside open space and is consistent with the principle of the Blue Ribbon Network policies. The scheme did not maximise the view from canalside. The building height should be increased along the canalside, offering more water view units.</p>	<p>PDU report states that architectural features should acknowledge the existence of Regent Canal. Other recommendations were also included: addition of a marina or mooring dock.</p>
	Urban design for schemes alongside Blue Ribbon Network	Policy 4C.20, 4C.21		
	Developments near canal and canal restoration	Policy 4C.28, 4C30		
	The protection of moorings and docks	Policy 4C.19, 4C32		
Analyst’s overall judgement	<p>(1) PDU report (ref: PDU/0883/01) had appropriately commented on numerous urban design shortcomings and has made a number of positive ideas in improving the quality of this scheme. It is unfortunate that car park’s means of access as well as its delivery could not be improved as this large semi terrain space could have the potential to be breeding ground for anti social behaviours. (2) The scheme did not meet the sustainable design and construction objectives of the London Plan. The lack of reference to any energy saving scheme or household recycling program, is regrettable. Despite these issues, the application presented here offers more affordable units and diversity of housing units than the previous scheme at the appeal stage. (3) The scheme has exceeded the affordable units target in the London Plan and would have significant regeneration benefits for a disused industrial space in one of the most deprived wards in East London.</p>		Section 106	<p>£250,000: education: provision of 33 primary school student places within the locality.</p> <p>£50,000: highway improvements, signalised junction at Harford / Ben Johnson Road</p> <p>£30,000: cycleway improvements</p> <p>£95,000: local labour contribution scheme</p>
Priorities: Provision of affordable housing and improved access to Regent’s Canal.				

Proposal Title:	Acton High School, LB Ealing	Decision Date:	23 February 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/0894a/01 PDU/0894a/02
Description:	Education facility Replacement of existing school buildings with part two, part three storey secondary school, including attached singled storey sports hall, together with associated sports pitch and play provision, servicing, access and landscaping.	Mayor's decision	Not directed refusal	STAGE I / II	1 and 2
Planning History:	No case history. This a full planning application based on a previous approved outline application.	Strategic Area:		Planning App. Type	OUTLINE and FULL
		Use Class Order:	D1	Departure fr. Plan?	YES
		% of Aff Housing	N/A	GLA referral cat:	3C and 3E
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?			YES

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations	
Categories	Policy content	Reference			
1. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	The site is well served by public transport: bus stops and Acton Underground station (Piccadilly and District Lines) are all within walking distance.	PDU report did not comment on parking space and layout.	
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22			
2. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	This is an outline application and offers indicative layout. Consultant did not have access to drawings		
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3			
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6			
3. Open Space & Natural Resources	Green Belt & Metropolitan Open Space	Policy 3D.8 & 3D.9	LB Ealing and the applicant have agreed to a planning condition for reconfiguring open spaces prior to construction work. The reconfiguration combines 2 separate open spaces into a larger unit.	PDU report states that the loss of open space is not acceptable, and is contrary to national PPG 17 and London Plan policies. The planning condition (reconfiguration of 2 open spaces) is welcomed and would not result the net loss of open space. The inclusion of renewable energy saving scheme is consistent with London Plan policies 4A.7 – 9.	
	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6			
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9	There is energy conservation measure: 295 m of PV solar panels and 4 wind turbines.		
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14			
	Water conservation	Policy 4A.8			
4. Community	Sport facilities	Policy 3D.5	The development of floodlit all weather multi-use games area, grass football pitch, cricket field and athletics facilities and the redevelopment of education facility. The applicant stresses that the sport centre is for dual use (school and community) and LB Ealing would issue a planning condition for an access statement.	Both policies refer to world-renowned strategic facilities and clearly the influence of Acton High School is limited. However, 3.229 states that "London needs to develop a wide range of high quality but affordable sport facilities, which are accessible to all sections of the community." This proposal is consistent with the essence of this policy by providing a dual use.	
	Development and promotion of arts and culture	Policy 3D.4			
Analyst's overall judgement	(1) A travel plan, reducing the children's reliance on private transportation mode, should be included. While the school capacity does not increase significantly, an opportunity is presented here to address pupil's travel needs. (2) The use of renewable energy source is exemplar and aligns with London Plan. (3) A condition should be recommended for restricting the use of floodlit all-weather multi-use games area as the floodlit could be a source of light pollution in the evening. However, this is not a strategic issue. (4) Overall, the redevelopment of education and associated recreational facility would have qualitative and quantitative improvement to local residents. (5) It is regrettable that the applicant did not provide an access statement during Stage 2 phase for evaluation.			Section 106	LB Ealing has agreed to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reconfiguring two open spaces - Renewable energy scheme to ensure delivery.

Proposal Title:	Lower Lea Crossing, Leamouth Peninsula, LB Tower Hamlets & LB Newham	Decision Date:	17 March 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/0928/01 PDU/0928/02	
Description:	Opening pedestrian and cycle bridge across the River Lea, linking the Leamouth Peninsula to Canning Town and the Lower Lea Crossing	Mayor's decision	NOT Directed Refusal	STAGE I / II	1 and 2	
Planning History:		Strategic Area:	Blue Ribbon Network: Lea River / Opportunity Area: Lower Lea & Canning Town/ Area for Regeneration / Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation		Planning App. Type	FULL
		Use Class Order:	Sui Generis	Departure fr. Plan?	NO	
		% of Aff Housing	N/A	GLA referral cat:	1C	
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?			YES	

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference		
1. Office & Retail			The bridge would probably trigger new investment into this area.	LDA said that residents would benefit from this scheme. While quantitative justification was not requested, this scheme would likely to add values to local area.
2. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	This scheme would add a new walking and cycling path connecting Isle of Dogs to the West and Canning Town to the East. This connection would lengthen existing river – canalside in the dockland area and would enhance the attractiveness for walking and cycling.	The creation of new foot / cycling bridge is consistent with Policy 3C.20 and 3C.21. PDU, LB Tower Hamlets and Newham were all concern in regards to the path from Canning Town Tube to the footbridge. PDU suggested that a section 106 agreements should be established for implementing a footpath.
	Improving conditions for walking, cycling	Policy 3C.20, 3C.21		
3. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	The bridge is made of contemporary design and incorporates metal, steel beam and coil cable for structural integrity. The width of the bridge is approximately 4 m wide and 52 m length. The highest point and the most striking landmark is a steel mast of 53 m high. Wheelchair accessible: the on ramp gradient is set at 1:20	PDU report did not comment in length on the design of this structure. It appears that a bold contemporary design is suitable in this area as the Dockland / Lower Lea Valley has already a number of prominent structures.
	Guidelines for tall buildings	Policy 4B.8 & 4B.9		
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6		
4. Open Space & Natural Resources	Biodiversity and nature conservation	Policy 3D.12	Loss of biodiversity. The London Plan resists the net loss of biodiversity and natural habitat. The proposed scheme would remove intertidal habitat permanently and Environment Agency opposes this scheme stating the loss of intertidal habitat is irreversible.	PDU suggested that the applicant should undertake mitigation measure and an equivalent area of intertidal habitat should be restored. The report also noted that the light and increased movement of people would disturb wide life. The construction of the pier connecting to the footbridge would result in a net loss of intertidal land is contrary to Policies 4C.3 and 3D.12
5. Blue Ribbon Network	The natural value of the Blue Ribbon Network	Policy 4C.3	Flood risk: a flood risk assessment has been prepared for the Environment Agency. The structure itself is not prone to flooding, however, the statement highlights the potential impacts in terms of flood risk on existing flood defences.	PDU reports in both STAGE 1 / 2 mentioned policies complementary to the Blue Ribbon Network, however, they did not refer to any specific Blue Ribbon Network policies. Nevertheless, the proposal generally accords with the principle of Blue Ribbon Network, in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - improving recreational value - enhancing access - building structures over water without restrict navigation movement. - Improve attractiveness of the place and generate a new tourist attraction. However, the loss of biodiversity might be unacceptable with the London Plan.
	Flood plains and food defences	Policy 4C.6, 4C.7		
	Passenger and tourism uses on the Blue Ribbon Network	Policy 4C.13		
	Freight uses on the Blue Ribbon Network	Policy 4C.14		
	Leisure use, access and activities alongside / in / on the Blue Ribbon Network	Policy 4C.16, 4C.17 & 4C.18		
	Urban design for schemes alongside Blue Ribbon Network	Policy 4C.20, 4C.21		
	Structures over / into the Blue Ribbon Network	Policy 4C.22		
	Developments near canal and canal restoration	Policy 4C.28, 4C30		
The protection of moorings and docks	Policy 4C.19, 4C32	The bridge is 5.3 m air draught is maintained above the Mean High Water Springs, therefore, it can easily accommodate moorings and smaller boats to travel underneath. The bridge can also be lifted to allow larger vessels, creating a 9.4 m air draught.		
Analyst's overall judgement	(1) The design of this footbridge is elegant and would make an interesting addition to the mouth of River Lea. (2) New foot and cycle paths have significant regenerative elements and provide new route for travelling. (3) The design is highly appropriate to the area, however, it is regrettable not to include any renewable energy methods into this scheme. A small wind turbine, placed at the top of the steel mast, would associate the bridge with the maritime history of the Thames and East End. Inclusion of photovoltaic cells cladding around the landing areas (piers) would enhance sustainable development. (4) The loss of intertidal habitat is significant but it is unquestionable whether the Boroughs would have the expertise in dealing with this type of ecological remediation.		Section 106	A detailed scheme is required for mitigating the ecological impact of the bridge prior the commencement of development.
Priorities: need for regeneration.				

Proposal Title:	1 Millharbour, LB Tower Hamlets	Decision Date:	17 March 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/0017c
		Mayor's decision	NOT directed refusal		
Description:	Change of use from commercial to large scale residential scheme. Duplicate application for the construction of two residential buildings (one 48 storeys, the other 40 storeys) to provide 790 new homes, together with leisure, retail and community uses at ground floor. Includes: basement car parking, landscaped gardens and new walkways to and along Millwall Inner Dock.	STAGE I / II	1 and 2	Planning App. Type	FULL
		Strategic Area:	Opportunity Area: Isle of Dogs / Draft London Plan LBTH: Millennium Quarter Master Plan		
		Use Class Order:	C3	Departure fr. Plan?	YES
Planning History:	May 2001 – Granted for 25 storeys 70750 sqm of office floorspace.	% of Aff Housing	23 % or 35.9 %	GLA referral cat:	1a, 1b, 1c and 3e
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?	YES		

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference		
1. Housing	Housing choice	Policy 3A.4	786 new homes are provided, spread into 2 towers (47 storeys and 35 storeys). All affordable units would be placed into smaller tower, while the exterior materials do not acknowledge the tenure mixture. Affordable housing: 130 units in the 35 storey buildings + 51 units off site, however, location has not been secured and subject to another planning application. Affordable provision is 23 % of total units or 35.9 % of total habitable room. Regardless of the calculation method, affordable housing provision is still below the target of 50 % in London Plan. Despite below London Plan strategic target, proposal exceeds the affordability mix (Policy 3A.7) -- 80% social rent and only 20% intermediate. The adopted UDP policy is 25%.	Affordable housing: The low number of affordable units or habitable rooms are under target and do not accord with the London Plan. However, the application's quality improved as the applicant offered a "off site" option during stage 2 report. The off site option is problematic in that the location and planning permission need to be determined. 3 Dragons Toolkit was used to assess residual value with the full financial contribution at office level, exceptional costs and no subsidy. Layout: did not comment
	Affordable housing target	Policy 3A.7		
	Negotiating affordable housing in individual scheme	Policy 3A.8		
	Large scale residential development	Policy 3A.5		
	Social infrastructure and community facilities	Policy 3A.15		
2. Office & Retail	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3	Mixed use: This scheme is a symbolic mixed use development in which only 2 % or 1000 sqm would be allocated to non residential use. Office use: The Millennium Quarter Master Plan indicates that this plot of land should be reserved for commercial use as commercial land owner could contribute more towards transportation improvements. The London Plan resists the loss of office / employment space. Applicant: demand for residential scheme in this area and speculative commercial space is on the decline.	Loss of employment land: Under the Tower Hamlets Plan, the proposed site is designated for commercial / office use and the proposal for a high density residential tower is contrary to the plan. Stating that speculative office use is on the decline in this area, the applicant has demonstrated the rationale for residential use. Furthermore, PDU report (PDU/0017/01, page9) identifies conflict in planning policies. The Millennium Quarter Master Plan indicates commercial usage, while the LBTH UDP supports non commercial use, stating that "appropriate land use that could help provide a balance of uses and allow people to live close to where they work." PDU also emphasis on the flexibility of Millennium Quarter Master Plan places office use is not restrictive.
	Town centre development	Policy 3D.1 & 3D.2		
	Mixed use development	Policy 3B.4		
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	Parking: 259 parking space or 0.33 spaces per flat Public Transport: It is expected that financial contribution to public transport improvements for DLR (South Quay Station) is required at this location. However, the indicative target is varied greatly between commercial and residential space, leaving a shortfall of £3.8 M.	Parking: TfL is content with the restrictive ratio of car park: unit but number of parking spaces increased from 218 to 259 in revised scheme. Also note that TfL wanted one secure bike parking place per unit -- not achieved. Public Transport: This is a key indicator of the Mayor's influence on this scheme. Policy 3C.2 critical in this case The applicant has agreed to £ 4.9 M towards public transport improvement prior to stage 2 report. This amount fulfils the initial target stated in the Millennium Quarter Master Plan.
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22		
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	Tall Building: The height accords with the Millennium Master Plan and there is cluster of tall buildings in Canary Wharf. It is evident that the scheme is maximising use of available land. Density very high-density (about 1200 units/ha). PDU report says SRQ matrix sets out minima. This is not explicit – Policy 4B.1 says "... Boroughs should adopt the residential density ranges set out in Table 4B.1". Highest is 240-435 units/ha.	PDU report generally said the building is of high urban design quality and tall building is acceptable in this area.
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3		
	Guidelines for tall buildings	Policy 4B.8 & 4B.9		
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6		

(Continued)

5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6	The low number of car park would probably reduce the use of private vehicles, which is consistent with London Plan policies. Application material did include a Sustainability Strategy. Planning Statement states that housing will be designed to an Ecohomes "good" standard -- not very demanding.	PDU reports did not mention any sustainable design / construction or requirement for any energy assessment.	
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9			
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14			
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3			
	Water conservation	Policy 4A.8			
	6. Blue Ribbon Network		The site is next to the dock and not part of Thames Policy Area but drawings indicate that a dockside (north – south) walk is included. The applicant has added a west east link, connecting the dockside to the Millharbour, subsequent to PDU's request.		
Analyst's overall judgement	NOTE: When the initial representation was made, London Plan was still in its draft version and was not a statutory document and also the proposed site is intended for office uses, according to the Millennium Quarter Master Plan. (1) This residential proposal contradicts the Millennium Quarter Master Plan for a commercial / office building. The situation is also compounded by the differences between LBTH UDP and Millennium Quarter Master Plan, as well as the non-statutory status of London Plan. (2) The loss of commercial space means a permanent net loss of employment opportunities. It is regrettable that a commercial property could not be built here. (3) The provision of affordable housing is low. Additional affordable housing provided at an unidentified off site location without the benefit of planning permission is unfortunate. (4) Overall, PDU has extracted an identical amount of planning gain as if a commercial scheme had been submitted. PDU has also increased the quality of this application by requesting better landscaping plan and local labour arrangement.			Section 106	£4.9 M transport contribution. Case officer: the actual contribution is more than £4.9 Million. The use of local labour in the construction and occupation of the development Travel plan. Contribution to public art / craft
Priorities: Matching development with transport improvements, more housing units over renewable energy.					
Senior's analyst overall judgement	<p>1 UDP counterbalances the Master Plan to a limited extent. The adopted Master Plan is the more locationally specific. As one of the offsetting arguments against following the master plan, PDU refer to a generic policy in the UDP that supports housing in central activity zones.</p> <p>2 Agree it is regrettable that commercial property is lost but this is not expected to harm the status of Canary Wharf - there is already a critical mass of world-class financial offices here. The East London draft Sub-Regional Development Framework notes a downward revision of employment forecasts since the London Plan with implications that less office land may be needed.</p> <p>3 Agree that additional affordable housing being off site is unfortunate, but possibly a consequence of high land values. Regrettable that off site option not yet secured.</p>			Case officer's comment	Broadly agreed with analysis. PDU actually encourages affordable housing off site because policies favour family units and high land value site might not represent the optimal usage. Also, there is a presumption against putting children into high rises.

Proposal Title:	Newington Industrial Estate, Elephant & Castle, LB Southwark	Decision Date:	25 May 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/1186
		Mayor's decision	Withdrew Refusal		
Description:	Release of industrial land for residential use Part redevelopment of an industrial estate to provide three buildings, two of five storeys and one of seven, eight and nine storeys in height to provide 178 new flats (including 6 live / work units) and 5 work units including a semi basement car park with 83 parking spaces. Industrial units 19 to 24 will be retained for employment use.	STAGE I / II	2	Planning App. Type	Full
		Strategic Area:	Opportunity Area: Elephant and Castle		
		Use Class Order:	C3, B1, B	Departure fr. Plan?	Yes
Planning History:	None.	% of Aff Housing	27	GLA referral cat:	3E
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?			NO

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference		
1. Housing	Affordable housing target	Policy 3A.7	<p>The housing delivery is consistent with Policy 3A.8. From financial assessment, 27 % represents the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing.</p> <p>The applicant has agreed to provide £68,000 for playground enhancement in a suitable location, consistent with POLICY 3A.15</p> <p>Tenure split: 40 % social housing and 60% intermediate.</p> <p>Inclusive housing: The entire development meets the lifetime homes standard. Planning condition has been amended to meet the 10 % wheelchair accessible units requirement.</p>	<p>27 % is below the 50 % target. However, a financial assessment was performed and 27 % was the maximum level of affordable housing to ensure commercial viability. Open book analysis is a good sign of collaboration between applicant and PDU and is consistent with Policy 3A.8.</p> <p>There would be an additional 4,200 new homes in Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area. It is unclear whether 178 units, delivered here, represent the maximum level of housing.</p> <p>Tenure split: deemed as acceptable in the urban setting.</p>
	Negotiating affordable housing in individual scheme	Policy 3A.8		
	Social infrastructure and community facilities	Policy 3A.15		
2. Office & Retail	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3	<p>Release of industrial land: The scheme replaces industrial land with residential usage. The applicant has not demonstrated whether a permanent loss of industrial employment opportunities would result from this scheme. The applicant has also not shown whether there is a reduced demand for industrial space. However, Elephant & Castle is not part of Strategic Employment Land (SEL) and is not in conflict with Policy 3B.5S</p> <p>Mixed-use: The ground units along Webber Street and Southwark Bridge Road are allocated for retail usage.</p>	<p>The loss of employment space was resolved as the applicant demonstrated that existing tenants have already found suitable office in vicinity, subsequent to Mayor's refusal (based on Policy 2A.4)</p>
	Improving the skills and employment opportunities for Londoners	Policy 3B.12		
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	<p>Very few car parks are provided 82, giving a ratio of 0.38 spaces per residential unit. Cycling parking ratio of more than 1 space per residential unit.</p>	<p>Car parks are consistent with the goals of London Plan to reduce the reliance on private automobiles.</p>
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22		
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	<p>Site's potential: the site is of triangular shape, which are inherently challenging for development. The scheme's large footprints as well as the use of basement for car park and retail indicate that the site's potential is being maximised.</p> <p>Urban design: Staggered elevation along Belvedere Terrace is an unusual response for the complexity of different architectural design in the area. Landmark building located at the junction of Webber Street and Southwark Bridge Road could potentially provide a legible landmark in the area. The gradual descending height from the landmark tower towards Belvedere Terrace is a delicate balance between additional housing units and building height of human scale.</p> <p>Open space: there is a clear demarcation for public and private open space. A central courtyard is available for communal and all housing units have balconies.</p>	<p>PDU report, paragraph 15: "The standard of design is of the very highest order and, as such, is not considered in this report" and paragraph 33: "the building is otherwise designed to achieve very high standards of sustainable design and construction."</p>
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3		
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6		

(Continued)

5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6	<p>£5,000 contribution towards recycling installations</p> <p>£10,000 towards tree planting and planning condition, already agreed by the applicant, states that renewable energy would be used on site following an energy assessment.</p> <p>Greywater: for watering communal garden</p> <p>lightwell: provides additional lighting source in public hallway.</p>	<p>PDU report did not comment on these issues extensively. However from the applicant's financial contribution (section 106), it is plausible to say that sustainable development and development of open spaces have been partially met. Also, the restrictive number of car park would encourage the use of public transport, consistent with Policy 4A.6 and 3C.16.</p> <p>Renewable energy: condition was applied for incorporating renewable energy for the communal space.</p>
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9		
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3		
Analyst's overall judgement	<p>(1) Other issues, such as the level of affordable housing, parking provision, accessibility and renewable energy, were adequately demonstrate to meet the expectations from the London Plan. (2) It could be helpful if the applicant has submitted an energy statement. However, considering that the applicant has agreed to a financial assessment for affordable housing, it is very unlikely that further financial burdens for renewable energy could be met.</p>			<p>Section 106</p>
Priorities: None. There is no spatial deficiency in this application and most issues have been addressed.				<p>£375,000 package for transport, public realm, funds for small businesses, highway works and education. It covers plenty of spatial issues addressed in the London Plan.</p>

Proposal Title:	Former London Stock Exchange, Corporation of London	Decision Date:	25 May 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/0649/02 PDU/0649/01
Description:	Partial demolition and reconfiguration of existing London Stock Exchange. The tower element is retained and two separate building are created to provide accommodation comprising offices and retail floorspace.	Mayor's decision	Not directed refusal	STAGE I / II	1, 2
Planning History:	Permission granted on 8 July 2003 for an almost identical application.	Strategic Area:	Central Activities Zone, Bank Conservation Area, Many listed buildings in vicinity.	Planning App. Type	FULL
		Use Class Order:	A1-3, B1	Departure fr. Plan?	No
		% of Aff Housing	N/A	GLA referral cat:	1B, 1D, 1C
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?			Yes

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference		
1. Housing			Not applicable	Not applicable
2. Office & Retail	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3	Retailers occupy basement levels (1 and 2) and offices are allocated across 27 floors.	General feedback has been very positive. The provision of new modern open space building supports the principles of London Plan and London's world city status.
	Town centre development	Policy 3D.1 & 3D.2		
	Mixed use development	Policy 3B.4		
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	The site is very well served by public transport and the low number of car park is consistent with Table 4B.1	Cumulative impact on public transport is evident. TfL has secured planning gain of £350,000 towards Waterloo and City Line improvements on top of £1,3 Million general funding.
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22		
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	A significant improvement over existing structure (1960 / 70s concrete building), which is unsympathetic to the medieval street system and adjacent listed buildings) Proposal presents better integration with medieval street pattern and elevated pedestrian permeability. Access statement: the applicant has submitted a statement Energy statement: Applicant has submitted after PDU's request (stage 1 report).	The design is well received but a taller building could be appropriate. Access statement: PDU did not comment on this extensively except: "an access statement has been submitted with the application in accordance with Policy 4B.5 Creating an inclusive environment of the London Plan; this is welcomed in strategic planning terms." Energy statement: the applicant has followed the energy hierarchy and has demonstrated that renewable energy scheme would translate into minimal saving over building regulation controls. PDU is not satisfied with information provided and recommended planning conditions to be imposed.
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3		
	Creating an inclusive environment	Policy 4B.5		
	Guidelines for tall buildings	Policy 4B.8 & 4B.9		
	View corridor protection	Policy 4B.15, 4B.16 & 4B.17		
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6		
Analyst's overall judgement	As there is already an extant planning approval for the same scheme, scope of negotiations is constrained. (1) The proposal is consistent with numerous aspects of the London Plan: design and matching transportation with development. (2) It is regrettable that energy assessment was not submitted on time and renewable energy scheme could not be explored. (3) TfL has successfully extracted planning gains for transport improvement, meeting policies 3C.2 and 3C.9			Section 106
Priorities: The outcome appears to be well balanced and does not have any preference towards certain London Plan's policies.				

Proposal Title:	Copland Community School, Wembley, London Borough of Brent		Decision Date:	11 May 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/0632
			Mayor's decision	Not directed refusal		
Description:	Demolition of existing school buildings and erection of a new school, 451 unit residential development (including a 28 storey tower block), health and fitness club, retail units; single storey nursery building (including caretaker's flat); construction of new all weather sports area; alterations to existing footpath routes; improvement of playing fields and provision of 360 car parking spaces and 258 cycle parking spaces.		STAGE I / II	2	Planning App. Type	Full
			Strategic Area:	Opportunity Area: Wembley Park / Area for regeneration / Town Centre: Major Centre (Wembley)		
			Use Class Order:	B1, D1, C3	Departure fr. Plan?	Yes
Planning History:			% of Aff Housing	27 %	GLA referral cat:	1b, 1c, 3e
			Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?	NO		
Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan		PDU comments / recommendations	
Categories	Policy content	Reference	<p>Affordable housing is delivered at 28 %. Proceed from private units would be used to subsidy the redevelopment of the school. The applicant has provided a third party financial assessment and 28 % represents a maximum reasonable amount; more affordable units would render the scheme unviable. Mixture of affordable housing: 75 % social rented and 25 % share ownership. Unit types: 22 % or 28 units of affordable housings are 3x br. Amenities: The school would be highly duo used. Facilities, such as gym and hall would be accessible to residents for evening use. The applicant has also agreed for £25,000 for local health care and £200,000 towards public art strategy. Access statement: was not submitted but the applicant has agreed to submit retrospectively prior to the commencement of work.</p> <p>Retail and fitness centre are provided at the basement, ground and first floor level. Mixed use development (retail and residential) is not central to this development, but they would provide amenity to residents and be a great addition to the High street.</p> <p>The site has high accessibility by public transport. Car park: 65 for school and 292 car park for residential use, consistent with London Plan, and £ 100,000 towards an establishment of an on site city car club and green travel plan.</p> <p>Consultant did not have access to drawings and could not comment on the design aspect of residential and education facilities. Loss of open space: a net loss of 6 to 11 % open space would result from the development.</p> <p>Energy efficient facades, exceeding building control standards Use of passive ventilation, energy efficient lighting and lighting control.</p> <p>The applicant has not submitted an energy assessment.</p>		<p>PDU report recognised and accepted the trade off, demanding more affordable units would impede improvements on education facilities, one of many London Plan's objectives. 28 % is deemed as acceptable. Mixture of affordable housing: the split deviates from London Plan's objective of 70:30 but is deemed as acceptable by Housing association. Access: acceptable and would be unreasonable to refuse on this basis.</p> <p>Did not comment on retail units.</p> <p>PDU did not comment on this issue extensively.</p> <p>Residential: site is appropriate for a landmark building and cluster of bold structure would be an interesting feature for this suburban town centre. Open space: "The quantitative loss of open space has to be balanced against the qualitative improvements to the remaining open space and the overall benefits of the scheme."</p> <p>The incorporation of some energy efficient scheme is welcome however the absence of an energy assessment is regrettable.</p>	
1. Housing	Housing choice	Policy 3A.4				
	Affordable housing target	Policy 3A.7				
	Negotiating affordable housing in individual scheme	Policy 3A.8				
	Large scale residential development	Policy 3A.5				
	Social infrastructure and community facilities	Policy 3A.15				
2. Office & Retail	Addressing the needs of London's diverse population, Education facilities	Policy 3A.14 Policy 3A.21				
	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3				
3. Transport	Town centre development	Policy 3D.1 & 3D.2				
	Mixed use development	Policy 3B.4				
4. Urban Design	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2				
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22				
	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1				
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3				
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Guidelines for tall buildings	Policy 4B.8 & 4B.9				
	View corridor protection	Policy 4B.15, 4B.16 & 4B.17				
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6				
	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6				
Analyst's overall judgement	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9				
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14				
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3				
Priorities: Well balanced negotiation on delivery of housing units, renovation of much needed education facilities and improvement to public realm / open space.	(1) The Mayor did not have the opportunity for initial representation, therefore, there is a limited scope for negotiation. Nevertheless, this entire scheme offers attractive package and planning merits. Proceeds from private sale units could potentially cover the cost of redeveloping an out-dated substandard school. (2) In addition of providing new education facilities, 27 % of units would be affordable in which there are substantial 3 br units, which are uncommon. Finally, planning gains (section 106) have covered an array of social services. (4) The loss of open space is regrettable, however, this could be offset by a qualitative improvement in open space and public realm, therefore does not contravene the objectives of London Plan. (5) Overall, the scheme makes good strategic sense in the interest of maintaining London's education standard and London's world city status.		Section 106	£25,000 for local health care and £200,000 towards public art strategy. £ 100,000 towards an establishment of an on site city car club + green travel plan.		

Proposal Title:	Charlton School, Charlton Park Road, LB Greenwich	Decision Date:	11 May 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/1107/01
		Mayor's decision	Not directed refusal		PDU/1107/02
Description:	Erection of a part single, part two storey extension to the school including infill of existing play area and construction of a new play area in Charlton Park.	STAGE I / II	2 and 1	Planning App. Type	FULL
		Strategic Area:	Metropolitan Open Land / Charlton Conservation Area		
		Use Class Order:	D1	Departure fr. Plan?	Yes
Planning History:	None	% of Aff Housing	N/A	GLA referral cat:	3D and debateable.
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?			NO

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference		
1. Community Needs	Addressing the needs of London's diverse population	Policy 3A.14	The proposal consists of consolidation of two school facilities, qualitative and quantitative enhancement to education infrastructures.	The need for improvement is justified, however, the location (MOL) might not be entirely appropriate and the applicant does not provide development rationale.
	Education facilities	Policy 3A.21		
	Community strategies	Policy 3A.23		
2. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	No transport assessment has been submitted	Development's scale and intensity would not cause strategic concern on road network
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22		
3. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	The applicant has provided some degree of commitment for sustainable development / construction: high building mass concrete slab and passive stock ventilation. However, no energy and carbon dioxide strategy had been submitted, despite PDU officer's recommendation following stage 1 consultation.	The urban design principle on MOL is to minimise the visual impact / amenities on the openness. The applicant has submitted a design statement, however, the preservation of MOL's openness is not demonstrated. The applicant has not demonstrated the very special circumstances that are necessary to outweigh the protection of MOL.
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3		
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6		
4. Open Space & Natural Resources	Green Belt & Metropolitan Open Space	Policy 3D.8 & 3D.9	MOL: There is presumption against development on MOL. The applicant should demonstrate that it is necessary and required to build on MOL and all other available sites are unsuitable.	See case officer's comment below.
	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6		
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9		
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14		
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3		
	Water conservation	Policy 4A.8		
Case officer's comment	Correspondence challenged whether category 3D applied as arguably only less than 1000 sqm of floorspace was developed on MOL. The way this category is expressed, it is unclear whether part or whole of 1000 sqm has to be on MOL. The stage 1 and 2 reports raised the London Plan policy issues and stated that the applicant had not responded. It was left to the Mayor to decide whether he wants to exercise his powers of direction to refuse the application.			
Analyst's overall judgement	(1) PDU report: "it is considered that the proposal is deficient in achieving sustainable design, inclusive design, and its urban design response to the local context." It appears that PDU would recommend refusal on this case because the quality of development is not exemplar building achieving excellent standard. (2) the applicant did not meet numerous objectives of the London Plan and a refusal should be directed on this basis. (3) It appears that the Mayor weighted the importance of providing educational facilities.			Section 106
Priorities: Education development over MOL / Design / Accessibility and Sus Dev Construction.				N/A

Proposal Title:	St. Joseph's Academy, Lee Terrace, LB Lewisham	Decision Date:	28 June 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/0917
		Mayor's decision	Withdrew refusal		
Description:	Education facility Redevelopment of an existing primary and secondary school to provide a new nursery, primary and secondary school, involving the re-provision of sports pitches.	STAGE I / II	1 and 2	Planning App. Type	FULL
		Strategic Area:	Open space / Blackheath Conservation Area / Site of Borough Grade II Importance for Nature Conservation		
		Use Class Order:	D1	Departure fr. Plan?	YES
		Planning History:	None.	% of Aff Housing	N/A
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?		YES	

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference		
1. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	32 car parking spaces plus 2 spaces for disabled people. The site is also well served by public transport: overground network and buses.	The scheme would not impact transport on strategic terms and the applicant agrees to a Green Travel Plan.
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22		
2. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	Urban design: Architectural treatment is of high standard and respect the openness of Blackheath and does not dominate the surrounding landscape. Layout: Proposed internal circulation is a much improvement than existing structures with articulated partition and provides ample of opportunities for supervision.	The proposal consists of high quality educational facilities.
	View corridor protection	Policy 4B.15, 4B.16 & 4B.17		
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6		
3. Open Space & Natural Resources	Green Belt & Metropolitan Open Space	Policy 3D.8 & 3D.9	Carbon emission: The applicant states that a reduction of 30 % carbon dioxide emissions could be achieved, consistent with policy 4A.6 Renewable energy: The applicant has submitted an energy statement after a refusal from stage 2. The energy statement refuses most renewable scheme based on cost and practicality. As the building is efficient, CHP could not be used, as the benefit would be minimal. Solar panels and biomass were also rejected citing financial burdens. Solar panels would add an extra £ 30 million. Biodiversity: Stag beetles are known to colonise dead woods on site.	Open space: the loss of open space is small and is replaced by higher quality, informal playing fields. Renewable energy: The application was refused failing to meet Policy 4A.7 as the applicant had demonstrated that renewable energy is feasible but did not endorse any particular source of renewable energy. This is resolved via section 106 in which the applicant agrees to a feasibility test. If the study concludes that use of renewable technology is unfeasible, then the applicant would be required to pay £ 100,000 to the council. Biodiversity: Planning condition should be required to ensure a re-provision of habitat to stag beetles. Environment committee report: "High regard was had to energy, and water, biodiversity and open space issues were also well covered but not always at sufficiently early stages of the referral process. The Mayor may have been concerned that this case would set a precedent that large buildings would not include renewable energy. Through discussions the energy efficiency of the building was confirmed and improved to an excellent level, but renewables were ruled out due to costs and later design stage process."
	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6		
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9		
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14		
	Water conservation	Policy 4A.8		
Analyst's overall judgement	(1) This proposal consists of an education facility with high architectural details, careful urban design considerations to the visual amenities of existing open space and well-configured space for end users. (2) Furthermore, the ongoing negotiations between the applicant, council and GLA have successfully added values to this scheme. The insistence for renewable energy from PDU has augmented environmental performance in this proposal and the effort should be commended. (3) The earlier direction for refusal appears excessive but is caused by the applicant's misinterpretation of procedures.			Section 106 Conditions requested by PDU: cycle parking, audit of pedestrian routes, travel plan, provision of habitat for stag beetles, energy assessment
Priorities: qualitative improvements to school over the loss of open space.				

Proposal Title:	Secrets Nightclub, Angel Way, Romford, LB Havering	Decision Date:	25 May 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/1173
Description:	Residential redevelopment Demolition existing buildings in a conservation area and erection of a five, eight and nine storey building, to provide 45 one-bedroom flats and 115 two-bedroom flats with associated car parking, landscaping and amenity space, and 25 replacement disabled car parking spaces.	Mayor's decision	Directed REFUSAL	STAGE I / II	2
Planning History:	Minded to grant permission in May 2003 for 35 flats including demolition of existing buildings. This application was a resubmission of an application refused in early December 2004 with minor adjustments.	Strategic Area:	Town centres: Romford (metropolitan centre); Romford Conservation Area	Planning App. Type	FULL
		Use Class Order:	C3	Departure fr. Plan?	Yes
		% of Aff Housing	15 %	GLA referral cat:	3E
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?			NO

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference		
1. Housing	Housing choice	Policy 3A.4	Lifetime homes standard: the proposal inadequately deal with lifetime / mobility standard. Affordable housing: 24 flats out of 160 residential units are affordable. This represents 15 % of total units and is significantly below London Plan's target. Unit types: Most are 1 and 2 bedrooms units, which are compatible to the town centre environment.	15 % of affordable housing unit is unacceptable against London Plan's policy 3A.7 but 15 % social rent is consistent with current Havering SPG. Furthermore, the applicant has not provided financial assessment to clarify unviable development caused by more affordable units, which is also contrary to policy 3A.8
	Affordable housing target	Policy 3A.7		
	Negotiating affordable housing in individual scheme	Policy 3A.8		
	Social infrastructure and community facilities	Policy 3A.15		
2. Office & Retail	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3	Town Centre: Romford is an important local centre for Essex and is appropriate for mixed-use development. The application is seeking permission for a pure residential development without provision of any A, B or D class units and is contrary to UDP Policy ROM 11 (the discovery of this departure triggered the late referral to the Mayor)	The essence of this development is contrary to London Plan's aspirations for a mixed-use based city. The exclusion of any A B D class units is unfortunate and should be resisted.
	Town centre development	Policy 3D.1 & 3D.2		
	Mixed use development	Policy 3B.4		
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	Romford town centre is well served by overground network into central London Liverpool Street station and is an important transport node. Parking: 29 car spaces	The site is suitable for a dense development and the proposal is generally appropriate.
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22		
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	Existing building is of late Victorian period but is not a listed building. The applicant has provided conflicting statements in relation to the building's heritage merits. London Plan and national policy state that new structure should have overriding design quality to existing one. Senior Consultant: Note that English Heritage required an assessment of alternative designs including financial viability that would have kept the non-listed building of interest (Woolpack PH)	The design of proposed structure is uninspiring and does not have overriding quality, therefore, the justification is insufficient for demolition and redevelopment. PDU also raised noise and air quality protection for occupiers close to inner ring road (Policy 4A.14) - good application of the sustainability agenda.
	Respecting local context and communities	Policy 4B.6		
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3		
	Guidelines for tall buildings	Policy 4B.8 & 4B.9		
	View corridor protection	Policy 4B.15, 4B.16 & 4B.17		
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6	The applicant has not submitted any sustainable design and construction statement. No information submitted on energy and water conservation (Policies 4A.8 & 4A.11)	Inadequate information was provided to evaluate the proposal's accessibility and energy consumption.
	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6		
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9		
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14		
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3		
	Water conservation	Policy 4A.8		
Analyst's overall judgement	The Mayor did not have the opportunity for initial representation. (1) A refusal is appropriate in this instance, in that the proposal fails to meet numerous London Plan policies: affordable housing, preference for mixed use development in town centre, responsive design solutions to a conservation area and renewable energy scheme. (2) This proposal represents undesirable development and is contrary to policies 3A.7, 3A.8, 3D.1, 3D.2, 4A.7, 4B.1 and 4B.5. PDU has acted correctly and resistance towards sub standard development should be enforced.		Section 106	Not applicable.
Priorities: The scheme is highly deficient in numerous aspects, impossible to compromise.				
Senior analyst's comment:	Agree with PDU's decision. Density is higher than London Plan SRQ matrix and LB Havering IPG, also incompatible on amenity space and overlooking. Allegations of over-development, including from the Metropolitan Police. TfL requested one secure cycle place per unit -- not achieved.			

Proposal Title:	12 – 20 Paul Street and 85 – 105 Clifton Street, LB Hackney	Decision Date:	8 June 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/0320
		Mayor's decision	Not directed refusal		
Description:	Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide a 7 storey office building (more than 20000 sqm) with retail floorspace at ground level, associated parking	STAGE I / II	Both	Planning App. Type	Full
		Strategic Area:	Opportunity Area: South Shoreditch and Bishopsgate		
		Use Class Order:	B1, A1-5	Departure fr. Plan?	No
Planning History:	Permission granted for six storey building to form 7025 sqm of offices; 3 flats; 18 live / work units; a restaurant and car parking.	% of Aff Housing	N/A	GLA referral cat:	1B
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?	Yes		

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations	
Categories	Policy content	Reference			
1. Housing	Housing choice	Policy 3A.4	Housing element was initially not included and following extensively negotiation, the applicant has agreed to provide financial contribution to fund housing units off site.	Following initial representation, the applicant has agreed to provide financial compensation in lieu of providing on / off site of affordable housing. An independent valuation was submitted and stated that £600,000 was the maximum reasonable amount that the applicant could contribute for off site affordable housing.	
	Affordable housing target	Policy 3A.7			
	Negotiating affordable housing in individual scheme	Policy 3A.8			
	Social infrastructure and community facilities	Policy 3A.15			
2. Office & Retail	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3	Policy 3B.4 states that intensification within an opportunity area should have mixed use element. The applicant initially resists the provision of affordable housing, citing existing granted permission.	PDU did not extensively comment on the provision of office space but the addition of modern unobstructed office is consistent with the objectives in an Opportunity Area.	
	Town centre development	Policy 3D.1 & 3D.2			
	Mixed use development	Policy 3B.4			
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	The area is well served by public transport. The applicant initially has not provided any transport assessment.	TfL is satisfied that the scheme would not have an adverse impact on road network and understood that the applicant could not provide any financial contribution.	
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22			
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	The large footprint and increased floorspace indicate that the site is being maximised.	PDU generally welcomes the design: "successful modern interpretation of the finely modulated buildings in the area."	
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3			
	View corridor protection	Policy 4B.15, 4B.16 & 4B.17			
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6			
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6	No statement was submitted.	PDU report did not mention any energy statement.	
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9			
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14			
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3			
	Water conservation	Policy 4A.8			
Overall judgement	(1) The inclusion of housing units for a scheme in an opportunity area is appropriate and the demand for financial contribution, in lieu of physical provision of housing unit is consistent with policy 3A.8. (2) The applicant has not provided any energy assessment statement in selecting any feasible renewable energy scheme. As the independent financial assessment had indicated, the agreed amount of financial contribution is the maximum reasonable amount. Further demand for renewable energy is likely to be unviable. (3) Discussion in relation to accessibility was not included. (4) Overall, PDU has safeguarded the mixed-use development principle in the London Plan by requesting financial contribution.			Section 106	A total of £1.1 million or £968,550 was agreed depending on the scheme.
Priorities: Mixed-use development in an opportunity area.					

Proposal Title:	London Arena, Limeharbour, LB Tower Hamlets	Decision Date:	5 October 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/0511
		Mayor's decision	Not directed refusal		
Description:	Large scale redevelopment Demolition of the London Arena and redevelopment by erection of eight buildings ranging from 43 to 7 storeys in height in total of 142,180 sqm of floorspace over a podium. The proposal comprises 972 residential units, 26500 sqm of office space, 15560 sqm hotel, community facility of 1157 sqm, range of uses including A1-3 of 4810 sqm, new health and fitness clubs 1085 sqm, associated landscaping including new public open spaces and a dockside walkway, a new internal road and parking for 527 cars.	STAGE I / II	2 and 1	Planning App. Type	FULL
		Strategic Area:	Opportunity Area: Isle of Dogs		
		Use Class Order:	A1-3, B1, C1, C3, D1	Departure fr. Plan?	No
Planning History:	None	% of Aff Housing	35 %	GLA referral cat:	1C
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?			Yes

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference		
1. Housing	Housing choice	Policy 3A.4	Affordable housing: The applicant has increased affordable provision from 16 to 30 % following extensive negotiation with PDU. Nevertheless, it is still below the 50 % target and the applicant was requested to submit a financial statement, which reveals that 30 % is the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing. Tenure mixture: 84% social rent 16% intermediate housing.	PDU: "GLA officers have now verified the resulting toolkit analysis, and it is accepted that 30 % affordable housing is all the development can sustain based on projected residual value, which indicates a significant loss to the applicant." Tenure mixture: the proposed split is acceptable given the absence of subsidy.
	Affordable housing target	Policy 3A.7		
	Negotiating affordable housing in individual scheme	Policy 3A.8		
	Large scale residential development	Policy 3A.5		
	Social infrastructure and community facilities	Policy 3A.15		
2. Office & Retail	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3	The proposal is an authentic mixed-use scheme of which non residential floorspace consists of 49112 sqm or 34 % of total sqm.	PDU's comment on mixed-use was limited, nevertheless, the report states that "the proposed uses are compatible with the surrounding and emerging uses in the area."
	Town centre development	Policy 3D.1 & 3D.2		
	Mixed use development	Policy 3B.4		
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	Parking: 527 car park is less than 1:1 ratio.	Cycle: TfL states that cycle parking is grossly inadequate. After initial representation, the applicant has increased cycle parking but is still below TfL's guidance. Site: The site has the highest PTAL score and can support intensive redevelopment. TfL is, however, concerned with potential congestion on DLR and buses. Financial contribution: TfL has secured a parcel of land to accommodate DLR 3 car extension project at no cost and the applicant has agreed to provide £1.57 M for transport improvements in vicinity.
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22		
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	Urban design: The masterplan would create strong defined edges along Limeharbour road and permeable urban blocks. Tall building: The site is neither in strategic nor statutory view management corridor. The height has been reduced from 167.70 to 136.70 resulting from City Airport's consultation. Besides safeguarding height for aviation traffic, the proposed height would unlikely to impact on any strategic view. Rather, the building would enhance the visual appearance of Canary Wharf / Isle of Dogs cluster from distance.	PDU identifies good responsive design solution to this site. The two public squares have distinct ambience and the applicant has successfully matched these public squares with surrounding buildings.
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3		
	Guidelines for tall buildings	Policy 4B.8 & 4B.9		
	View corridor protection	Policy 4B.15, 4B.16 & 4B.17		
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6		
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6	Open space: A total of 7,777 sqm would be provided. The drawings indicate that there is a good mixture of hard and soft landscape. A basketball court and playground are also dedicated on the platform. Renewable energy: the applicant initially has not demonstrated whether 10 % of the site's energy would come from renewable sources. Nevertheless, the office building would have zero mechanical cooling system, leading to zero carbon emission for its ventilation system. Dock water would also be used to acclimatise office / hotel buildings. Lighting in the public area would be powered from UV panels.	Accessibility statement: lifetime homes standards applied and 10% wheelchair accessible housing target satisfied. Renewable energy: Prior to stage 2 report, the applicant has submitted further information in relations to energy saving. The report states that 20 % of energy saving could be achieved, exceeding London Plan's target. Environment Committee report: "water, biodiversity and open space are well addressed, given the limitations of the site. Given the discussions at stage 1 energy issues may be satisfactorily resolved as well, to include 10 % renewables."
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9		
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14		
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3		
	Water conservation	Policy 4A.8		

(Continued)

6. Blue Ribbon Network	Leisure use, access and activities alongside / in / on the Blue Ribbon Network	Policy 4C.16, 4C.17 & 4C.18	Well landscape path and retail units front the Millwall Dock. The scheme would also increase pedestrian permeability across the site (east – west) towards waterfront.	PDU report: “in general, the design will bring additional activity to this stretch of canal, include public spaces, new walkway and active uses fronting the canal.”		
Analyst’s overall judgement		<p>(1) This application has satisfied numerous strategic targets. Situated in an Opportunity Area, the intensification of this site with more residential units and mixed-use floorspace accords with Policy 2A.2 and Policy 3B.4 (2) While affordable housing did not achieve the 50 % target, the applicant has demonstrated financially that 30 % is the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing units. Financial consideration (construction cost, absence of social subsidy and acquisition cost) justifies 30 % provision level and is consistent with Policy 3A.8 (3) The site has also high standard of renewable energy consumption in that 20 % of saving could be achieved, exceeding Policy 4A.7 and 4A.8. (4) The masterplan indicates that it is genuinely mixed-use development with up to 34 % of non-residential floorspace. Amenities on both public squares and enhanced waterfront are likely to cater the needs of London’s diverse population, consistent with Policy 3A.14. (5) Overall, this application is a successful scheme in that it has satisfactorily addressed affordable housing, office supply, mixed-use development and sustainable development. However, planning condition should be recommended to prevent the change of use from hotel to residential, safeguarding the mixed-use nature of this site. Case officer commented: Not sure how easy it would be to impose such a condition on the hotel uses, the best schemes have to be adaptable to change otherwise if conditions change and the hotel use became unviable we would be left with quite a lot of redundant space which would kill the vitality of the scheme. Agree with the principle, but not convinced such a condition would be desirable or enforceable in reality.</p>			Section 106	
<p>Priorities: This scheme has achieved beyond the minimum requirements in the London Plan and compromising among competing issues was not evident.</p>						

Proposal Title:	Elektron (former electrical switch house), Aspen Way, LB Tower Hamlets	Decision Date:	8 June 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/048
		Mayor's decision	Not directed refusal		
Description:	Demolition of existing electrical Switch House building and the erection of one 25-storey and two 22-storey buildings to provide 437 1 and 2 x br units and 299 sqm of commercial floorspace (A1-5, B1, D1-2) together with 98 car parking spaces, landscaping and infrastructure works.	STAGE I / II	1 and 2	Planning App. Type	Full
		Strategic Area:	Thames Gateway / Area for regeneration		
		Use Class Order:	A1-5, B1, C3, D1-2	Departure fr. Plan?	No
Planning History:	There is an extant consent. Applicant: Barratt homes	% of Aff Housing	50	GLA referral cat:	1C
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?			Yes

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference	<p>Affordable housing: The proposed development in this application offers only 25 % of affordable housing units. The current site and adjoining site are under an identical development framework and ownership. In the planning statement, the applicant argues that the adjoining site, already approved and built, should be included in consideration when assessing the total percentage of affordable housing.</p> <p>The inclusion of neighbouring site brings affordable units to 46 %.</p> <p>Layout: affordable and private sale housing units have identical layout and external appearance.</p> <p>Access: Applicant has submitted an access statement of which includes 10 % wheelchair units and 100 % lifetime homes housing. The applicant has replaced platform lift with ramped access, following PDU's concern.</p> <p>Mixed use: The applicant has requested an unrestricted application for A1-5, B1 and D1-2.</p> <p>The site is next to DLR station and approximately 10 mins to Canary Wharf.</p> <p>Parking space: The ratio of car park to units is less than 1.</p> <p>Site use: This is a brownfield development and the applicant has utilised all available land for building and landscaping, either for noise mitigation or leisure use. Car park is located to the basement and below DLR station.</p> <p>Tall building: The building height does not impact on aviation traffic and strategic view corridor.</p> <p>Open space / public square: the applicant has proposed to improve the landing area of DLR station. Drawings indicate that layout would recognise the Greenwich Meridian line.</p> <p>Air quality: There is a strong resistance to private vehicles given the low provision of car parking and proximity to the DLR station.</p> <p>Noise: Traffic from A road and DLR would create incessant noise and vibration, the applicant has proposed to install triple glazed windows and heat recovery ventilation.</p> <p>Waste: The applicant has provided a waste / recycling strategy to facilitate and streamline recyclable materials on site.</p> <p>Energy: No statement was submitted.</p>	<p>Access: consistent with Policy 3A.4</p> <p>Affordable housing: PDU report states that "the methods by which Barratt has sought to justify the level of affordable housing provision is complicated." The report also points out that an individual building would have no affordable housing provision, nevertheless, the total percentage of affordable housing across the entire development framework is 50 %.</p> <p>Mixed use: PDU welcomes the inclusion of mixed use floorspace on the ground level, however, it notes that the site is isolated and might not support viable commercial units.</p> <p>Parking: The restrictive car park approach is welcome and is consistent with Table 4B.1</p> <p>Cycle parking: below TfL's guideline and request was made to increase cycle parking provision.</p> <p>The general response is positive but PDU was concern with pedestrian movement with other developments in the area, in particular to buildings north of the site, separated by a dual carriage way.</p> <p>Accessibility: PDU has requested some modifications to ensure all buildings to have step free access. The applicant complied.</p> <p>Noise: PDU has doubt regarding the effectiveness of triple glazing in that residents have to close window to benefit, resulting in poorer air circulation. PDU has suggested to enclose balcony with half folded windows, which would not only prevent the dissipation of heat but would also provide ventilation without compromising on noise attenuation.</p> <p>Energy: Energy statement would be secured via planning condition. PDU state that "it would be unreasonable to direct refusal on this basis." Negotiations predated the publication of the Renewable Energy Toolkit.</p>
1. Housing	Housing choice	Policy 3A.4		
	Affordable housing target	Policy 3A.7		
	Negotiating affordable housing in individual scheme	Policy 3A.8		
	Large scale residential development	Policy 3A.5		
	Social infrastructure and community facilities	Policy 3A.15		
2. Office & Retail	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3		
	Mixed use development	Policy 3B.4		
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2		
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22		
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1		
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3		
	Guidelines for tall buildings	Policy 4B.8 & 4B.9		
	View corridor protection	Policy 4B.15, 4B.16 & 4B.17		
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6		
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6		
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9		
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14		
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3		
	Water conservation	Policy 4A.8		

(Continued)

<p>Analyst's Overall judgement</p>	<p>(1) Applicant's argument for expanding the application site to assess affordable housing provision is unusual. Nevertheless, the entire masterplan area has achieved 50 % target and is consistent with Policy 3A.5 and 3A.8. PDU report also highlights that "the development also establishes a headline figure of 50% provision, which sets a benchmark for future developments." Barratt is a major house builder in Thames Gateway and this application, if approved, could be a precedent for future residential schemes. (2) The proposed scheme has achieved better urban design solution to a highly constrained site, demarcated by heavy infrastructures (cars and trains) than the consented application. Proposed layout would enhance pedestrian movement across the site and would open access to the Thames, consistent with Policy 4B.1 (3) It is regrettable that energy statement was not submitted, otherwise, this scheme would meet numerous objectives in the London Plan.</p>	<p>Section 106</p>	
<p>Priorities: Well balanced outcome with exception of energy statement.</p>			

Proposal Title:	71 Carmen Street and 134 136 Chrisp Street, LB Tower Hamlets	Decision Date:	24 August 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/1081
		Mayor's decision	Not directed refusal		
Description:	Demolition of existing buildings and construction of four blocks up to 17 storeys to provide 926 sqm of commercial and retail space and 154 residential units (including six family houses) with 47 parking spaces.	STAGE I / II	1 and 2	Planning App. Type	Full
		Strategic Area:	Thames gateway / Area for regeneration		
		Use Class Order:	A1-5, B1	Departure fr. Plan?	No
Planning History:	None	% of Aff Housing	35 %	GLA referral cat:	1c
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?			Yes

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference	<p>Access: statement was submitted after stage 1 consultation.</p> <p>Affordable housing: In the first instance, the proposal would provide up to 50 % of affordable housing with subsidy. The applicant reduced the affordable housing to 35% as subsidy was no longer available. A financial assessment was performed (Three Dragons model) and 35 % represents the maximum reasonable amount.</p> <p>Housing units: 1 bedroom and 2 bedrooms units are the predominate types of unit. The scheme also offers a number of 3 / 4 bedrooms and six terrace houses.</p> <p>Access: The scheme meets Policy 3A.4 lifetime home standard but falls short of the 10 % wheelchair units requirement.</p> <p>Displacement of office / retail: The site is not located in a Strategic Employment Location and the proposal does not conflict with Policy 3B.5 The development would displace existing commercial tenants, however, the development would have a qualitative improvement to office / commercial stock.</p> <p>Only buses are currently servicing the area. This application belongs to a wider masterplan / framework, which proposes for a DLR station adjacent to the application site.</p> <p>Parking is highly restrictive and is well below Table 4B.1</p> <p>Urban design: The site is irregular shape and bounded by DLR railway, which imposes challenges for development. The proposal represents good urban design solutions to these environmental issues.</p> <p>Waste: Design statement indicates that a household waste program would be available.</p> <p>Renewable energy: Subsequent to PDU's request, the applicant had submitted an energy statement. The scheme would include solar water panel, individual gas boilers and six micro CHP systems.</p> <p>Noise: The applicant has submitted a technical statement in regards to acoustic impact from DLR and noise level is deemed as acceptable.</p>	<p>Access: all units meet lifetime homes standard and is slightly short of the 10 % wheelchair accessible units. Only 8 % of units would be provided on site.</p> <p>Affordable housing: the reduction of affordable housing is disappointing nevertheless, the applicant has provided justification and complies with Policy 3A.8</p> <p>LDA is concerned " that the proposal would result in the displacement of existing businesses that currently occupy the application site and request the satisfactory relocation of these"</p> <p>The development is acceptable in transport terms and the proposal for a new DLR station is welcome in strategic terms.</p> <p>PDU: "the proposal is an excellent response to the potential of the site...The disposition of the various buildings forms a logic response to the characteristics of the site." Tall building is acceptable for the area and could possibly becomes a landmark / gateway to Poplar when DLR station is established.</p> <p>Renewable: carbon emission is likely to be reduced by 25 %, exceeding Policy 4A.7 and 4A.10 PDU did not comment on waste and noise issues.</p>
1. Housing	Housing choice	Policy 3A.4		
	Affordable housing target	Policy 3A.7		
	Negotiating affordable housing in individual scheme	Policy 3A.8		
	Social infrastructure and community facilities	Policy 3A.15		
2. Office & Retail	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3		
	Mixed use development	Policy 3B.4		
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2		
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22		
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1		
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3		
	Guidelines for tall buildings	Policy 4B.8 & 4B.9		
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6		
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6		
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9		
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14		
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3		
	Water conservation	Policy 4A.8		
Analyst's Overall judgement	(1) This proposal has met numerous objectives in the London Plan: affordable housing, matching development with transport provision, sustainable energy and accessibility, satisfying Policies 3A.8, 3B.2, 3C.2, 4A.6, 4A.9, 4B.3 and 4B.5 (2) LB Tower Hamlets has not finalised planning decision.		Section 106	N/A
Priorities: the outcome is well balanced, meeting numerous policies of the London plan.				

Proposal Title:	UEL Docklands Campus, LB Newham	Decision Date:	10 August 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/1145
Description:	Erection of student residential accommodation on a vacant site adjacent to the existing UEL Docklands Campus comprising 819 bed spaces in 5 seven storey blocks with 4 three storey link blocks and a two storey care / bar at the western end of the development.	Mayor's decision	Not Directed Refusal	Planning App. Type	FULL
Planning History:	None.	STAGE I / II	1 and 2	Strategic Area:	Thames Gateway / Area for Regeneration
		Use Class Order:	C1	Departure fr. Plan?	No
		% of Aff Housing	N/A	GLA referral cat:	1B
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?			NO

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference		
1. Housing	Access	Policy 3A.4	The entire scheme consists of student accommodation; so affordable housing is not discussed. Access: There is inadequate provision of wheelchair accessible accommodation (1.5 % as opposed to 10 %) The applicant claims that this is acceptable in that it is based on current demand. Unit types: The proposal would create a wide spectrum of housing units from studios, 3 bedrooms to 6 bedroom units. All units would be student accommodation.	Access: PDU is disappointed with current provision but recommends revision to planning condition to ensure that public realm be accessible to people with visual and mobility impairments. (Policy 3A.4) Unit types: there is strategic support for student accommodations.
	Social infrastructure and community facilities	Policy 3A.15		
2. Office & Retail			Not applicable	Not applicable
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2		PDU states the density is slightly higher than the indicative range set out in the London Plan.
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22		
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	Elevation: Predominate rhythm is horizontal with unique window pattern, drawing the visual line towards the river. The overall fenestration pattern is ideal and avoids a boring antisocial environment, associated with large estate. Each building also has its own unique colour scheme, positively enforcing the landmark's status along the river.	PDU did not comment extensively on this and states that " overall the urban design aspects of the scheme satisfies London Plan policy 4B.9.
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3		
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6		
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6	Renewable energy / energy statement: The applicant was requested to submit statement after stage 1 report. The applicant failed to respond claiming the time frame was too short and has agreed to planning condition, requiring an energy statement, satisfying Policy 4A.7.	PDU states that planning condition is not the ideal solution, as the Mayor cannot influence on the outcome, nevertheless, the report suggests that "The council and the applicant have fully cooperated with the GLA to ensure that issues can be optimally resolved given the circumstances."
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9		
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14		
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3		
6. Blue Ribbon Network	Water conservation	Policy 4A.8	Design: The 4 proposed buildings read as a group. Each building has a circular elevated platform on the rooftop and its elongated oval shape footprint resembles the shape of a boat. The external design associates closely with Dockland's maritime history. Riverside walkway: The proposal includes a new stretch of riverside walk (public right of way)	PDU: "The public right of way continues east and west through the site and the proposal contributes to the improvement and provision of open space along the river, supporting policy 4C.17" The scheme is also appropriate, meeting policy 4C.20.
	Leisure use, access and activities alongside / in / on the Blue Ribbon Network	Policy 4C.16, 4C.17 & 4C.18		
	Urban design for schemes alongside Blue Ribbon Network	Policy 4C.20, 4C.21		
Analyst's Overall judgement	(1) Even though the proposed density is higher than the matrix, there is no impression of over development. (2) PDU has added value to this application by assisting Newham Council to secure relevant section 106 agreements (transport). (3) Attempts have been made to raise the application's standard (inclusive design and renewable energy) and it is disappointing that both requirements are resolved via planning conditions. Like other cases, the applicant was not aware of such requirements until stage 1 report and the applicant and planning conditions are the best solution to avoid delays.			Section 106
Priorities: It is a well balanced outcome.				

Proposal Title:	40b Warton Road, Straford, LB Newham		Decision Date:	18 October 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/0989
Description:	Redevelopment to provide 249 residential units, 771 sqm of commercial space and a gym in three buildings (18, 8 and 4 storeys), plus car and cycle parking and amenity space.		Mayor's decision	Withdrew refusal		
Planning History:	Not applicable.		STAGE I / II	Both	Planning App. Type	Full
			Strategic Area:	Opportunity Area: Stratford, Area for regeneration		
			Use Class Order:	A1-3, B1, C3	Departure fr. Plan?	NO
			% of Aff Housing	35	GLA referral cat:	1C
			Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?			YES
Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan		PDU comments / recommendations	
Categories	Policy content	Reference	Access / Housing choice: there are only 4 wheelchair accessible dwellings, well below the 10 % target in the London Plan, contrary to policy 3A.4. The applicant has revised drawings and brought wheelchair units to 10 % of units, meeting policy 3A.4 Affordable housing: 35 % of total units, but the applicant has submitted a financial assessment to justify this level. Tenure mixture: 50 % social rented accommodation; 35.4% shared ownership, and 14.3% of intermediate rented, with only 5 % of social subsidy. The provision of tenure mixture does not follow the 70 / 30 breakdown in the London Plan. The provision is partially contrary to Policy 3A.7, yet taking Policy 3A.8 into consideration, the proposal is deemed as acceptable.		Housing choice: it is unacceptable and PDU had directed refusal based on policy 3A.4. Affordable housing: satisfied with the proposal Tenure mixture: did not comment.	
1. Housing	Housing choice	Policy 3A.4	The proposal is not part of a Strategic Employment Location. Existing office buildings are vacant and the general quality is low. The proposal offers qualitative improvement to office supply but it is unclear whether it is a replacement for actual floor space.			
	Affordable housing target	Policy 3A.7				
	Negotiating affordable housing in individual scheme	Policy 3A.8				
2. Office & Retail	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3	Car park: 125 car parking spaces, well within the standard in Table 4B.1 Cycle park: 100 PTAL: 3			
	Town centre development	Policy 3D.1 & 3D.2				
	Mixed use development	Policy 3B.4				
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	Design: PDU has commented extensively on the design and elevation of the proposal. The overall feedback is positive. Tall building: The proposal "would create an attractive landmark of suitable proportions ... The massing and layout of the site makes very good use of a brownfield site."			
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22				
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	Renewable energy: The applicant has submitted an energy statement and financial appraisal, outlining which schemes were viable or unviable. Subsequently, the applicant agreed to install a solar thermal panel to supply heated water for the top floor flat. According to the consultant, this would increase energy efficiency against baseline. Waste and others: Achieves the excellent Eco Home standard for reducing water consumption and maximising recycling.			
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3				
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6				
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6	Energy: The energy statement was initially found to be inadequate and resulted in refusal. The applicant needs to follow procedure and energy hierarchy stated in policy 4A.6 and 4A.7 and generate alternatives. The applicant has revised renewable energy and pledged to include low energy light fitting throughout the development and solar thermal panel.			
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9				
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14				
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3				
	Water conservation	Policy 4A.8				
Analyst's overall judgement	(1) There was strong political will to increase the quality of this application. PDU / Mayor had appropriately exerted power to demand further revisions to this scheme. (2) A refusal was probably possible because the application did not meet a number of criteria and failed to adhere to the energy hierarchy of Policy 4A.6 and 4A.7. If the application were contrary to fewer policies, a refusal would probably be unsustainable and unreasonable. (3) Efforts had been made to extract higher level of planning gains for DLR improvements but were not successful. Nevertheless, PDU / Mayor's intervention has resulted in better delivery in planning terms.				Section 106	The applicant has agreed to numerous conditions subsequent to refusal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - £ 150,000 for children playspace - local labour agreement, - revision of cycle park layout, potentially increasing provision to 96 % - linkage road for buses.
Priorities: the outcome is well balanced with emphasis on housing, sustainable development, inclusive development over planning gains for DLR.						

Proposal Title:	Multi-level car park, Earl's Way, Orpington, LB Bromley		Decision Date:	12 January 2005	GLA ref:	PDU/0817a/02 PDU/0817a/01	
Description:	Demolition of existing multi storey car park and health care building and erection of a part 5 / part 6 storey building for a mixed use development consisting of A1 retail, 73 residential units C3 and non residential institutional use D1, with 924 car parking spaces (basement inclusive), servicing area, formation of new vehicular accesses to Station Road and Augustus Lane and associated landscaping and related works.		Mayor's decision	Not directed refusal	STAGE I / II	1 and 2	
Planning History:	An outline application for a similar proposal was submitted and was refused by virtue of the scheme's excessive height, bulk and scale.		Strategic Area:	Town Centre classifications: Major Centre: Orpington			
			Use Class Order:	A1, C3	Departure fr. Plan?	NO	
			% of Aff Housing	41 %	GLA referral cat:	1B and 3F	
			Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?				YES
Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan		PDU comments / recommendations		
Categories	Policy content	Reference	Access: statement has been submitted and all units satisfy the Lifetime Homes standard and other accessibility issues, such as parking for disabled users and internal / external circulation has been dealt with.			Affordable housing: Proposed provision failed to meet the 50% London wide target but has exceeded LB Bromley's requirement of 30 %. Additionally, LB Bromley rarely has affordable housing and the applicant has demonstrated that more affordable units would render the scheme unviable in this town centre location. The mixture of 3 br for larger household is crucial in maintaining a diverse community, however, it is acceptable to have only 1 / 2 br in a town centre location. Tenure mixture: it is acceptable according to Bromley's UDP.	
1. Housing	Housing choice	Policy 3A.4	Affordable housing: 73 residential units (43 for private sale and 30 for affordable units), leading to a 41 % provision. The scheme provides 26 1x br and 47 2 x br. Besides a Tesco store, a new medical facility would be introduced to replace nearby premises. Tenure mixture: The exact proportion is unclear but most units would be catered to social rented housing.				
	Affordable housing target	Policy 3A.7					
	Negotiating affordable housing in individual scheme	Policy 3A.8					
	Large scale residential development	Policy 3A.5					
	Social infrastructure and community facilities	Policy 3A.15					
2. Office & Retail	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3	Tesco store would employ 400 people FT / PT and liaise with JobCentre Plus for recruitment.				
	Town centre development	Policy 3D.1 & 3D.2					
	Mixed use development Improving the skills and employment opportunities for Londoners	Policy 3B.4 Policy 3B.12					
3. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	924 parking spaces (401 for Tesco / 18 for Tesco Staff / 263 for office / 32 residential / 210 public) The restrictive number of car park for residents is welcome and is consistent with London Plan. However, the number of car park spaces for Tesco exceeds the recommended guidelines.				
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22					
4. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1	The scheme is a redevelopment, and meets the principle of London Plan. The inclusion of affordable housing above Tesco Store is an innovative way of delivering mixed use development. The high glazed elevation treatments gives an impression of an office building. Nevertheless, it is an improvement from the previous rejected version.				
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3					
	Guidelines for tall buildings	Policy 4B.8 & 4B.9					
	View corridor protection	Policy 4B.15, 4B.16 & 4B.17					
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6	There is no reference to renewable energy or any other conservation measure. No proposal has been made for increasing biodiversity. Separate recycling receptacles were not part of a standard provision in residential units, furthermore, there is also no discussion of recycling centres, common to larger Tesco stores.				
5. Open Space & Natural Resources	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6					
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9					
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14					
	Minimisation of household waste	Policy 4A.1, 4A.2 & 4A.3					
	Water conservation	Policy 4A.8	No reference				
Overall judgement	There was a strong political move for removing the outdated multi level parking in a town centre. (1) It is regrettable that the scheme has made no reference for any sustainable design and construction, and furthermore, GLA/PDU did not impose energy assessment through planning conditions. (2) The allocation of affordable housing was clearly illustrated and did not conflict with the London Plan. (3) In terms of employment, the addition of a Tesco store would add diversity to the town centre and could possibly raise foot fall. Therefore, it has strong strategic support for this location. (4) Parking could be excessive. Case officer was correct to evaluate parking spaces on a category basis. The effort to reduce car parking is justified and the addition of a large format Tesco store in a town centre makes strategic sense, in that it would raise the viability and attractiveness of a town centre against out of town centres. However, sustainability and environment issues could have been overlooked and should have been secured by planning conditions.					Section 106 & Conditions	
Priorities: Delivering a mixed-use scheme, sympathetic to the circumstances in Outer London.							

**Mayoral involvement in Planning Appeals:
review of Former British Gas Site, Purley Way, LB Croydon and Brewery Wharf, LB Greenwich**

Proposal Title:	Former British Gas Site, Purley Way, LB Croydon		Decision Date:	10 December 2003	GLA ref:	PDU/0442
			Mayor's decision	Stage 2 report requested		
Description:	Erection of two buildings for use within Class B1, B2, B8 with ancillary offices, service area, fuel island, car wash and a building for use as car dealership / workshop; formation of vehicular access road and associated parking for a total of 322 cars.		STAGE I / II	1	Planning App. Type	Full
			Strategic Area:	Strategic Employment Location: Purley Way Area		
			Use Class Order:	B1, B2, B8, Sui Generis	Departure fr. Plan?	No
Planning History:	None		% of Aff Housing	N/A	GLA referral cat:	1B, 3F
			Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?	Yes		
Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan		PDU comments / recommendations	
Categories	Policy content	Reference				
1. Office & Retail	Office supply	Policy 3B.2 & 3B.3	Proposed element of B1 (light industry), B2 (general industry) and B8 (storage and distribution): The site is not in an Opportunity Area but is designated as a Strategic Employment Location (Croydon – Purley Way Area). London Plan generally discourages the loss of industrial / warehousing spaces due to the permanent loss of employment opportunities. This proposal attempts to revitalise the disused industrial space. Proposed element of retail (car dealership): The release of industrial land into retail is generally not supported by London Plan.		Proposed elements of B1 (light industry), B2 (general industry) and B8 (storage and distribution): There is a presumption in favour of B use class order. The site has been disused for up to 5 years and the proposed redevelopment has been prelet. This proposal safeguards the light industry / warehouse activities along Purley Way, which encountered a significant increase in retail activities. Proposed element of retail (car dealership): A separate appeal was filed in 1998 in an approximate site. Planning inspector ruled that car dealership is similar to traditional light industry / warehouse activities in terms of density and range of jobs and found car dealership acceptable.	
	Mixed use development	Policy 3B.4				
	Job creation in emerging sectors	Policy 3B.6 – 11				
	Strategic employment locations (SEL)	Policy 3B.5				
2. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	Car parking: This should be measured against Annex 4 parking standard. 173 car parking for 19,750 sqm of industrial / warehouse buildings For an outer London location, table A4.1 recommends 1 car park for every 100 to 600 sqm. The proposed 173 spaces are within the recommended range. 149 car parking for 2,782 sqm of car dealership. Table A4.3 indicates the maximum car parking guidelines for retail activities. PTAL score has not been provided and it would be fair to assume a PTAL score between 4 to 2. A non food warehouse, such as a car dealership should have 1 car parking for 50 – 30 sqm, translating into 55 to 92 car parking spaces. Proposal is requesting 149 car parking spaces (including display, servicing and customers).		Car access: TfL said that the proposed means of access from A23 is not ideal in that it would increase traffic congestion on an already busy thoroughfare in Croydon. TfL recommends a reconfiguration of access road. The Mayor was minded to refuse if means of access was not improved. Car parking: the arrangement of car parking space is complicated and “this results in higher overall parking levels than would be allowed if draft London Plan were applied” Bike and Pedestrian: TfL supported the deculvertment of Wandle River, in that it would provide high quality of pedestrian and bike movement between A23, Wandle Park and tram station.	
	Parking provision	Policy 3C.22				
3. Urban Design	Urban design principles	Policy 4B.1			Urban design: the proposal is not outstanding but is not unattractive. PDU's overall position is neutral. Intensification: PDU suggested the inclusion of housing as an enablement for deculverting the Wandle River and an intensification of this proposal has strategic support.	
	Density and maximising site potential	Policy 4B.3				
	Sustainable construction	Policy 4B.6				
4. Open Space & Natural Resources	Improvement of air quality	Policy 4A.6	Sustainable development initiatives: the proposed development would have a compactor for recycling on site, satisfying Croydon's UDP. There was no submission of an energy assessment, however, the application predates London Plan requirement.		PDU did not object on the grounds of sustainable development / renewable energy.	
	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9				
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14				
	Water conservation	Policy 4A.8				

(Continued)

5. Blue Ribbon Network	Leisure use, access and activities alongside / in / on the Blue Ribbon Network	Policy 4C.16, 4C.17 & 4C.18	Council's position: would like the Wandle River to be deculverted to the northern part of the site. PDU's position: has no objection to deculverting the Wandle River, however, a decision should be made quickly without jeopardising the entire scheme.
	Urban design for schemes alongside Blue Ribbon Network	Policy 4C.20, 4C.21	
	Structures over / into the Blue Ribbon Network	Policy 4C.22	
Overall judgement	<p>(1) The redevelopment of an industrial site has strategic support and would provide vital employment floorspace for light industrial and warehousing activities. The incorporation of a car dealership would be hard to argue in that an appeal decision in neighbouring site favoured the applicant.</p> <p>(2) Local planning authority has strong desire to improve the permeability across the site by deculverting the Wandle River. It has strong strategic support from London Plan and Local UDP in that both documents recommend the use of development opportunities to improve the Blue Ribbon Network. However, this request might appear excessive and might not make financial sense. The insistence for this landscape feature has significant impact on scheme viability and might outweigh the overall benefit of regenerating a vacant disused gas site.</p> <p>(3) A final contested issue is the means of access from A23 and the provision of car parking spaces. The Mayor was minded to direct refusal if means of access is not improved.</p>		
Progress of appeal	<p>LB Croydon reasons for refusal of application:</p> <p>1) The proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse impact on amenity in terms of the outlook of adjoining residential occupiers by reason of the close proximity, size and uninteresting design of Units C and D. The application is thereby contrary to Policies SP1, BE1 and BE17 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policies SP3 and UD2 of the Second Deposit Draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (the Croydon Plan).</p> <p>2) The proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the outlook from Wandle Park due to the close proximity, size and uninteresting design of Unit B. The application is therefore contrary to Policies SP1, BE1 and SP8 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policies SP3, UD2 and SP7 of the Second Deposit Draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (the Croydon Plan)</p> <p>3) The proposed development does not propose the deculverting of the River Wandle where it passes under the site thereby failing to enhance the biodiversity and amenity of the Blue Ribbon Network. The application is thereby contrary to Policy SP13 of the Unitary Development Plan, Policies SP2, SP11 and EP13A of the Second Deposit Draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (the Croydon Plan), the guidelines for Proposals Site P22a contained in the Croydon Plan, and Policies 2A.1 and 4C of the London Plan.</p> <p>4) The development does not propose high quality pedestrian/cycle routes through the site, due to the limited width and lack of adequately landscaped environment of the routes that are proposed. The application is therefore contrary to Policies SP1, SP18, T28, BE1, BE10 and BE14 of the Unitary Development Plan, Policies SP3, SP16, T7, T9, T11, UD2, UD10, UD13 and EP13A of the Second Deposit Draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (the Croydon Plan), and Policy 4C of the London Plan.</p> <p>5) The proposed development shows an access on to Purley Way that is not satisfactory and which will give rise to problems on Purley Way in the form of increased traffic congestion, increased delays to buses and access problems for both the appeal site and other sites in the locality. The application is thereby contrary to Policies SP18, SP19, SP25, T1, T6, T30, T31, T37, T45 and T46 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policies SP16, T2, T6, T10, T14, T42 and T43 of the Second Deposit Draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (The Croydon Plan).</p> <p>Planning Inspector's decision and report: Allowed the appeal; planning permission granted subject to conditions. <i>Main Issue 1</i> - Effect on living conditions for occupier and effect on the quality of views from Wandle River: Concluded that the proposed building would not harm the visual amenity of neighbouring occupiers. There would be more harm if the site, designated for industrial employment, was left vacant. <i>Main Issue 2</i> - Deculverting the River Wandle as a pre-requisite to an acceptable scheme: Stated that the deculverting of Wandle River would trigger the general clean up of the stream, caused by illegal discharges to the river; improve visual amenities and restore biodiversity. However, the main impediment is the cost, feasibility and compatibility with a strategic employment location for large-scale industry and warehousing. Deculverting would lead to loss of employment land and the costs of deculverting would render development non-viable. Wandle Park, which is council owned land, would be a more suitable location for deculverting the river in that more people would benefit from the site. Concluded that the deculverting of Wandle River is not a prerequisite for planning permission. <i>Main Issue 3</i> - Proposal to include residential development to enable deculverting of Wandle River: Concluded that residential development would be contrary to policies of UDP and London Plan policies for safeguarding land of strategic importance.</p>		

Proposal Title:	Brewery Wharf, LB Greenwich	Decision Date:	31 March 2004	GLA ref:	PDU/0105a
		Mayor's decision	Supported the appeal		
Description:	The erection of 500 tonne cement silo.	STAGE I / II	Referral for an appeal	Planning App. Type	Comments for appeal
		Strategic Area:	Thames Gateway; Opportunity Area: Deptford Creek / Greenwich Riverside; safeguarded wharf identified by Secretary of State		
		Use Class Order:	B1, B2, B8	Departure fr. Plan?	No
Planning History:	The site has been used for aggregate delivery terminal, sand and gravel shipment from 1966. An application was submitted for the development of Meridian Gateway scheme, a residential scheme in adjacent properties. Negotiations between GLA, boroughs and applicants around measures for minimising nuisance and noise. GLA informed LB Greenwich that any subsequent development for both sites should be considered simultaneously.	% of Aff Housing	N/A	GLA referral cat:	4
		Did the LPA submit application and associated docs on time?			LB Greenwich did not refer the application for initial representation.

Planning Considerations			Content of application and comparison against London Plan	PDU comments / recommendations
Categories	Policy content	Reference		
1. Transport	Matching development with transportation	Policy 3C.1, 3C.2	The quantitative impact of the development on vehicular traffic is unclear. The proposed development relies heavily on water borne freight transport and is generally consistent with London Plan objectives in reducing carbon emission and dependence on London's road network. Policy 3C.24 Freight strategy states that the Mayor would promote the sustainable development of the full range of water-borne facilities.	TfL: fully supportive of this site due to reduction in traffic volume on the road network. The increase in water freight transport is equivalent to removing 1,286 lorries per year. Port of London: fully supportive of the proposal and the site's function should be safeguarded.
2. Urban Design	Guidelines for tall buildings	Policy 4B.8 & 4B.9	Strategic view: the proposed structure is approximately 25m high and would not trigger any strategic referral in terms of height. View assessment: The proposed structure is located within the view assessment area of designated areas and the visual impact needs to be assessed. Based on adjacent approved schemes, it appears that the silo would be part of a cluster of tall structures and its visual prominence would be dwarfed.	Strategic view: The proposed structure is not distracting and would not have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity in the view assessment area. There are already numerous taller structures in the vicinity comparable to the scale of proposed cement silo. Tall building: The approved Meridian Gateway Scheme is fronting the River Thames and its height exceeds the proposed height of 25 meters.
	View corridor protection	Policy 4B.15, 4B.16 & 4B.17		
3. Open Space & Natural Resources	Endorsement of renewable energy	Policy 4A.7, 4A.8, 4A.9	Ambient noise: There is no doubt that ambient noise from cement silo would be a potential concern for adjacent occupiers, reducing their residential amenity. However, Policy 4C.18 (see below) indicates that any proposal should not preclude the strategic importance of the safeguarded wharf.	Ambient noise: PDU found the noise generated from the site acceptable and balance needs to be struck for the reduction in lorry movements if water transport is implemented. Air quality: Water transport is far more sustainable in terms of pollutant emission than moving cement on London's road network.
	Noise abatement and separation of noise sensitive development	Policy 4A.14		
4. Blue Ribbon Network		Policy 4C.15	The site is designated as a safeguarded wharf and the proposal is consistent with London Plan policies and its proposed function should be supported. Policy 4C.18 states that development opposite safeguarded wharfs should be designed to minimise the potential for conflict and disturbance between different types of usage. This policy indicates that priority is given to existing wharf operation and any future non-wharf operation should not interfere with existing condition and the design should incorporate mitigation measures.	London Plan policies have a presumption for retaining wharves in operation and the proposal is entirely consistent with maintaining a supply of cement delivered via means of water transport.
		Policy 4C.18		
	Urban design for schemes alongside Blue Ribbon Network	Policy 4C.20, 4C.21		
	Structures over / into the Blue Ribbon Network	Policy 4C.22		
	Developments near canal and canal restoration	Policy 4C.28, 4C30		
	The protection of moorings and docks	Policy 4C.19, 4C32		

(Continued)

Overall judgement	<p>(1) The council did not refer the application for initial representation by the Mayor. It appears that there was a tendency in favouring residential redevelopment in the area.</p> <p>(2) The proposal would indeed have a health and noise impact on neighbouring occupiers. The erection of a new structure would likely incorporate better technology for reducing air pollutant and noise, affecting the neighbouring residents.</p> <p>(3) Benefits associated with proposed structures - the reduction of road traffic, preserving the current usage at a safeguarded wharf and the promotion of sustainable travel - clearly outweigh any perceived impact on the visual appearance of the area.</p> <p>(4) The impact on strategic view might not be as excessive as one would imagine. There are number of taller residential towers, dwarfing the impact of cement silo and its protrusion into the skyline.</p>
Progress of appeal	<p>LB Greenwich reasons for refusal of application:</p> <p>1) The proposed silo by reason of its design, height, scale and bulk represents an overdevelopment of this site. The proposal would have a disproportionate and discordant physical impact on the locality. It would constitute a core dominant and visually obtrusive feature in a prominent location, which could be viewed from the Greenwich Maritime World Heritage Site. As such the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would be contrary to Policies J11, E1, D1, D2, D4 and D8 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policies SE1, SD1, SD2, SD4, D1, TC7 and W1 of the First Deposit Draft Unitary Development Plan.</p> <p>Planning Inspector's decision and report:</p> <p>Allowed the appeal; planning permission granted subject to conditions.</p> <p><i>Main Issue 1 - Effect on strategic view / view corridor on World Heritage Site:</i></p> <p>Concluded that the proposed cement silo would not introduce an element out of character or alien to the area as current land use is dedicated for cement production. Furthermore, the proposed structure's height is lower than existing crane alongside. The visual impact on the Greenwich Maritime World Heritage Site would be minimal. Trees and other landmark residential towers nearby largely screen the site, and the cement silo would only be observed in occasional glimpses.</p> <p><i>Main Issue 2 - Environmental impact on neighbouring occupiers:</i></p> <p>Concluded that current operation appears to be viable and there is no reason to withhold planning permission for a proposal, which is consistent with London Plan and supported by Port of London Authority. The proposal encourages the use of river transport / freight and the reduction in lorry movement on London's road network is significant. The benefit in reducing road transport clearly outweighs any negative impact.</p>