

The Glassmill, 1 Battersea Bridge Road

Local Planning Authority: Wandsworth

Local Planning Authority reference: 2024/1322

Strategic planning application stage 2 referral

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended); Greater London Authority Acts 1999 and 2007; Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008.

The proposal

Construction of a part 10 storey, part 28 storey building comprising 110 dwellings (50% affordable), 535 sqm affordable workspace, 274 sqm community floorspace, and a 189 sqm restaurant.

The applicant

The applicant is **Promontoria Battersea Limited** and the architect is **Farrells**.

Key dates

GLA pre-application meeting: 22 March 2023

GLA stage 1 report: 1 July 2024

LPA Planning Committee decision: 24 April 2025

Strategic issues summary

Wandsworth Council has resolved to refuse permission for this application. The Mayor must consider whether the application warrants a direction to take over determination of the application under Article 7 of the Mayor of London Order 2008.

Having regard to the details of the application, the strategic issues raised at Stage 1, the matters set out in the Council's report and the Council's draft decision notice GLA officers do not consider that there are sound planning reasons for the Mayor to intervene in this particular case and therefore there is no basis to issue a direction under Article 7 of the Order 2008.

The Council's decision

In this instance Wandsworth Council has resolved to refuse permission.

Recommendation

That Wandsworth Council be advised that the Mayor is content for the Council to determine the case itself, subject to any action that the Secretary of State may take, and does not therefore wish to direct that he is to be the local planning authority.

Context

1. On 28 May 2024 the Mayor of London received documents from Wandsworth Council notifying him of a planning application of potential strategic importance to develop the above site for the above uses. This was referred to the Mayor under the following categories of the Schedule to the Order 2008:

- **1B(c):** *“Development (other than development which only comprises the provision of houses, flats, or houses and flats) which comprises or includes the erection of a building or buildings outside Central London and with a total floorspace of more than 15,000 square metres”*; and,
- **1C(a):** *“The building is more than 25 metres high and is adjacent to the River Thames”*.

2. On 1 July 2024 the Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills, acting under delegated authority, considered planning report [GLA/2024/0291/S1](#)¹ and subsequently advised Wandsworth Council that whilst the proposed land uses were supported in principle, the scale of the proposal raises some concern and the application did not fully comply with some London Plan policies, as summarised below:

- **Land use principle:** Subject to demonstrating that the existing office space is not viable, the proposed residential-led redevelopment is supported in principle.
- **Housing:** The proposed new homes would contribute to housing targets. The proposal includes a 35% affordable housing offer that meets with Fast Track Thresholds.
- **Urban Design and heritage:** The site has not been identified as suitable for a tall building and visual and environmental impacts need to be robustly addressed. The proposal would result in harm to heritage assets. This harm must be outweighed by public benefits in order to be acceptable.
- **Transport:** Active Travel Zone Assessment should be amended. Contribution towards TfL’s Battersea Bridge Road scheme are requested. General parking removed. Proposed servicing and cycle arrangements need to be reviewed. Management Plans need to be secured.
- Other issues on **environment** and **sustainability** also require resolution prior to the Mayor’s decision making stage.

3. The essentials of the case with regard to the proposal, the site, case history, strategic planning issues and relevant policies and guidance are as set out therein, unless otherwise stated in this report.

4. On 24 April 2025 Wandsworth Council decided that it was minded to refuse permission for the application, and on 8 May 2025 it advised the Mayor of this

¹ <https://planapps.london.gov.uk/planningapps/2024-1322>

decision. Under the provisions of Article 5 of the Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor may allow the draft decision to proceed unchanged; direct Wandsworth Council under Article 6 to refuse the application; or, issue a direction to Wandsworth Council under Article 7 that he is to act as the Local Planning Authority for the purposes of determining the application and any connected application. The Mayor has until 21 May 2025 to notify the Council of his decision and to issue any direction.

5. Wandsworth Council's draft decision notice includes the following reasons for refusal:

- The proposal, by reason of its excessive height and scale, within an established local spatial character that is predominantly low-rise, while also being located within a low-rise policy zone, would represent an unacceptable and incongruous transformative change within the location that would significantly harm the spatial character of the same location. The significant harm identified has not been outweighed by material considerations that indicate otherwise. As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to the NPPF 2024, Policy D9 (Tall buildings) of the London Plan 2021 and Policies PM9 (Riverside) and LP4 (Tall and Mid-rise Buildings) of the Wandsworth Local Plan 2023.
- In the absence of a completed Section 106 planning obligation the proposal fails to meet the objectives of Policy LP62 (Planning Obligations) of the Wandsworth Local Plan 2023. In order to mitigate the policy conflict as identified, a Section 106 planning obligation would be required to include, but not be limited to:

Housing

- Provision of 54 social rent units;
- To secure a minimum of 10% of units meeting Building Regulation 'Wheelchair User Dwellings' M4(3) standards with final design agreed in consultation with OT advisor;
- Operation management plan for the communal amenity spaces;
- Play Space contribution of £147,300.

Sustainability

- Carbon off-setting payment of £157,917;
- Be Seen energy monitoring.

Highway and transport:

- Exclusion from CPZ;
- Car club membership and driving credit for residents;
- To secure a construction management plan;
- To secure a travel plan and Transport Officer Monitoring Fee of £730.00;

- To secure highways works (under a section 278 agreement) to complete public realm improvements within the highway boundary north of the development. These include level changes, the addition of steps, and planting;
- Healthy Street Corridor Improvements contribution of £436,812.00 to TfL.

Others areas:

- Best endeavours for raising of the flood defence to TE2100 plan level
- Enhancements to the Thames river wall adjacent to the development site with installation of timber fenders (Option 1), or, contribution made to a local river restoration effort (Option 2);
- Air quality monitoring during construction contribution of £30,000;
- Health Care contribution of £30,000;
- To enter into a Local Employment and Enterprise Agreement securing Employment and Skills Plan and Local Procurement Plan, with the target number of job, training and apprenticeship places based on the Council's Planning Obligations SPD
- To secure payment of Employment and Enterprise Contribution based on the Council's Planning Obligations SPD (£91,506.25);
- Art and Culture contribution of £110,000;
- Monitoring fee in accordance with calculation set out in the Planning Obligations SPD.

6. The decision on this case, and the reasons, will be made available on the City Hall website: www.london.gov.uk

Response to neighbourhood consultation

7. Wandsworth Council publicised the application by sending 98 notifications to local addresses, and issuing site and press notices. The relevant statutory bodies were also consulted. Copies of all responses to public consultation, and any other representations made on the case, have been made available to the GLA.
8. Following the neighbourhood consultation process Wandsworth Council received a total of 1,150 responses (763 in objection, and 387 in support) following the initial consultation, and 1,625 responses (660 in objection, and 965 in support) following the second consultation after the proposals were amended. A petition of objection containing 5,044 signatures was also received, as well as representations of objection from the following local community groups: Battersea Society, Chelsea Society, Putney Society, Wandsworth Society, and the Wandsworth Conservation and Heritage Advisory Committee. The reasons for objection and support raised as part of the neighbourhood consultation process are collectively summarised below.

Neighbourhood objections

- Poor public consultation with general public, no justification for the height was articulated. Appears like a tick-box exercise, leaving residents frustrated at failing to grasp and resolve key concerns, such as environmental, heritage and conservation and community
- We need 100% affordable housing in this current housing crisis. Council must ask for the developers' internal calculations
- The small-scale cultural & commercial uses proposed for this focal point would likely be insufficient in size to bring the intended vibrancy to the area
- Noise and odour disturbance from commercial and community activities
- Inappropriate development within the available plot and excessive height
- The existing structure should be replaced but not with a development of this nature
- Heavily conflicts with Wandsworth's Local Plan, and tall building policy
- Proposed landscaping is poor quality
- On-site tree to the south must be protected
- Harmful light pollution, affecting nocturnal life and other habitats
- The cladding will unpleasantly absorb and reflect solar radiation on sunny days
- Harmful impact to the environment, ecology and habitats
- Unacceptable flood risk
- No information has been provided to show that the building will not create wind sheer or vortex dangers to helicopters. The Battersea Heliport is 500m west to the site. Cranes and completed building being a danger to flight paths
- Harmful impact to existing neighbouring residents, loss of light, outlook, overlooking, and sense of enclosure
- Proposed development would limit development opportunity at neighbouring sites due to harmful amenity impact for future occupiers and neighbouring residents
- Negative impacts to the local community and public services due to road closures during construction
- Local services at capacity (doctor surgeries, schools, dentists, etc)

- Vague description of engagement with local charities concerning community space
- Insufficient public transport infrastructure to accommodate influx of people
- Insufficient parking space for proposed occupiers. This will significantly strain public transport infrastructure and nearby on-street parking spaces
- Limited emergency vehicular access
- Existing services (e.g. electricity, water etc) will be stretched to account for new occupiers
- Revised scheme is still harmful to the character and wider area, including the Thames Conservation Area, Lots Village Chelsea Conservation Area and Cheyne Conservation Area in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and impact numerous statutorily Grade I and Grade II listed buildings. The building is of no architectural merit and would create a canyoning effect along the river
- Harmful impact on heritage assets, including but not limited to Battersea Bridge and Albert Bridge
- The proposed 'improvements' to the public realm at ground level are minimal
- Construction process, such as 80 metre pile driving, may lead to structural damage to Battersea Bridge, Thameswalk apartments, 6 Hester. Residents know this is not a material consideration but worryingly little information has been provided about this. Battersea Bridge is already at capacity
- No information submitted related to the air conditioning units
- Whole Life Carbon Assessment is a work of fiction and demonstrates a wildly exaggerated expectation both in the likely CO2 release in demolition and CO2 generation in construction
- Negative air quality impacts during construction

Neighbourhood support

- Support the redevelopment of the underutilised brownfield site
- Provision of high-quality homes that pose fewer health issue risks
- Clear economic benefits of the proposal, including the provision of affordable housing which will alleviate housing pressure in the borough, affordable office space, new restaurant at ground level and community space
- Need different types of affordable housing – single, group and family occupiers
- The development would positively contribute to national housing targets

- Local, affordable homes needed
- Strongly support social housing provision and cutting down waiting times
- Social renting would avoid people moving away for a better quality of life
- Development will help tackle homelessness
- Please don't reduce the amended affordable housing provision
- Works would unlock the south side of Battersea Bridge and greatly improve the public realm, especially along the Thames Path and riverfront, bringing new visitors to the area and increased footfall
- New and improved pedestrian access should be made to both sides of Battersea bridge
- Support the purpose-built community space proposed
- More youth centres needed
- Engagement with local charities to occupy the purpose-built community space
- Improvement to the character and aesthetic of the area
- Realistically won't affect local residents negatively
- Comparatively few people object relative to the majority of people in Wandsworth who support development of needed housing
- Harmful impact of NIMBYism on building much needed dwellings
- Lots of people objecting don't live in Wandsworth Council
- Improvement to design of the development can be made but principle of tall building acceptable.
- The tower should be taller and less affordable housing. There's a housing shortage which must be met
- Keep the originally proposed height of the tower
- Improved quality of outlook for neighbouring residents
- Sun reflecting off proposed development would increase amount of light to neighbouring dwellings.
- The development would positively contribute to the vibrancy of the community
- The proposed development will support the existing local community
- Generate jobs, whether during the construction process and afterwards which will increase local spending to local businesses and services

- Support the scheme. However, efforts to mitigate traffic congestion during construction must be made
- Temporary negative impacts of the construction process not a reason for the development not to go ahead
- Too many cars make it unsafe for children to play outside, need more parks
- Need sufficient play space
- Cycling infrastructure must be improved
- Requires transport infrastructure to support additional housing units
- Proposed scheme would work well with more public artwork and general green land
- Need church hall, function hall and sound system for people over 50 years old
- Dental practice and GP required
- Fairfield Court requires better management
- More bins required in public spaces
- Public spaces need to be well lit to encourage safety
- Support the scheme but concerned about slight increase in crime
- Needs improves natural surveillance and CCTV along the riverside
- Need a greater police presence in the area

Responses from statutory bodies and other organisations

Environment Agency

9. Objection and request for amendments/further information as follows:

- Provide appropriate 16 metre offset to the adjacent Thames tidal flood defences, including buried elements
- Demonstrate that the flood defence has a lifetime commensurate with that of the development
- Demonstrate how the flood defences adjacent to the site will be raised in line with the requirements of the Thames Estuary 2100 (TE2100) plan

Historic England

10. Objection: the tall building would remain a visually intrusive and incongruous addition to the townscape with wide reaching harmful impacts on the historic environment.

Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

11. The proposed development by virtue of its siting, height, and form would result in a discordant, dominate, and oppressive building. The proposal would harm the special interest of the Thames and Cheyne Conservation Areas which are defined by the open character and special relationship with the river Thames. Further, the development would disrupt the established trajectory of height which increases only to the west of Battersea Bridge. The development would fail to comply with Local Plan Policies CD1, CD2, CLD3, CD4, CD5, CD8, CD15.

No objection received from the following:

- CCTV
- Emergency Planning (subject to condition)
- Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service (subject to condition)
- Hammersmith and Fulham
- Health and Safety Executive – Fire
- London Fire Brigade
- London Gatwick
- London Heliport
- London Underground/DLR Infrastructure Protection
- Met Police/Secure by Design (subject to condition)
- Port of London Authority (subject to condition)
- Thames Water (subject to conditions)

Representations to the Mayor

12. The Mayor has received 12 written representation/s on the application, as summarised below:

Objections (10)

- Too tall – negative visual impacts and pressure on local amenities and infrastructure

- Contrary to local plan – not in a tall building zone
- Battersea Bridge unable to cope with the traffic
- Detrimental daylight impacts to neighbouring dwellings
- Impact to party wall shared with Thames Wharf
- Not in keeping with the character of the area and local townscape
- Loss of outlook
- Disruption to the local area during construction
- Erosion of the riverside from historical view points
- Noise impacts on neighbours from change of use of land and introduction of restaurant
- Plans include changes to land that the developers do not have rights to.

Neutral (1)

- The developer should offset the impact on wildlife and plant-life in the immediate area, and replace concrete with grass, wild flowers and hedges, attractive to hedgehogs.

Support (1)

- A high-quality building bringing jobs and economic growth to the area is needed.

Response to public consultation - conclusion

13. Should the Mayor take over the application for his own determination, the above statutory and non-statutory responses to the public consultation process will be fully considered as part of GLA officer's assessment of the application.

Article 7: Direction that the Mayor is to be the local planning authority

14. The initial statutory test regarding the Mayor's power to take over and determine applications referred under categories 1 and 2 of the schedule to the Mayor of London Order 2008 is a decision about who should have jurisdiction over the application, rather than whether planning permission should ultimately be granted or refused.

15. The test consists of the following three parts, all of which must be met in order for the Mayor to take over the application:

- a. Significant impact on the implementation of the London Plan;
- b. Significant effects on more than one borough; and,

c. Sound planning reasons for his intervention.

16. Parts (a) and (b) of the test identify the impact an application would have on the Mayor’s policies and the geographical extent of the impact, whilst part (c) deals with the reasons for the Mayor’s intervention, having regard to the Council’s draft decision on the application. These tests are intended to ensure that the Mayor can only intervene in the most important cases.

17. This report considers the extent to which the statutory tests under Article 7(1) are met in this case and whether, therefore, the Mayor should direct that he is to be the local planning authority and apply the tests set out under Article 7(3) of the Order 2008.

Matters the Mayor must take into account

18. Article 7(3) of the 2008 Order requires the Mayor, when considering whether to exercise his power to become local planning authority in respect of an application of potential strategic importance (PSI), to take account of certain matters. In respect of all categories of PSI application, the Mayor is required to take account of whether the London Borough is achieving and has achieved any relevant development plan targets.

19. Table 1 sets out Wandsworth Council’s housing delivery against the London Plan targets within the past five years of monitoring (2019/20 to 2023/24). As shown below, overall net self-contained and non-self-contained housing completions within use classes C3 and C4 in Wandsworth during this period have met the required completion figures, although the affordable housing delivery has not met the Mayor’s strategic target of 50%.

| | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | Total | (% of target) |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------------|
| Housing target | 1,950 | 1,950 | 1,950 | 1,950 | 1,950 | 9,750 | 100% |
| Net housing completions | 1,330 | 1,399 | 1,974 | 2,264 | 2,815 | 9,782 | |
| Net affordable completions | 383 | 328 | 343 | 589 | 824 | 2,467 | 25% |
| % of housing delivery | 29% | 23% | 18% | 30% | 31% | 26% | |

Table 1 – Wandsworth Council net housing completions (Source: Wandsworth Authority Monitoring Report Housing Trajectory and Summary Tables 2023/24)

Statutory test 7(1)(a): Significant impact on the implementation of the London Plan

20. London Plan Policy H1 seeks to ensure that at least 66,000 net additional homes across London are consistently provided annually. Additionally, London Plan Policy H4 seeks to ensure that the need for circa 43,500 additional affordable homes per year is met. London Plan Table 4.1 assigns the London Borough of Wandsworth a

ten year housing target of 19,500. On an annualised basis this would be equivalent to 1,950 homes per year. The provision of 110 residential units (equivalent to 6% of the annualised figure) would contribute to meeting the target of additional homes in London and Wandsworth, which is not considered to be an insignificant amount on a singular, relatively small sized site. The proposed 50% affordable housing by habitable room, consisting entirely of social rent, would also contribute towards meeting the affordable housing target set by Policy H4.

21. It is noted that the borough is performing well against the London Plan housing target, but in the context of London's overall housing need, the proposed development would contribute towards the delivery of housing, in line with Policy H1. The Councils' resolution to refuse would therefore mean that new residential units, both private and affordable, which could contribute to meeting London's housing need, would not be consented at this time.
22. Having regard to the above, and the significant London wide shortfall against the minimum strategic affordable housing target, it is considered that the proposed development has the potential to make a positive contribution towards achieving local and strategic housing and affordable housing targets set out in the London Plan. Accordingly, the proposal would have a significant impact on the implementation of the London Plan in terms of provision of new homes and affordable homes. As such, it is considered that the test set out in Article 7(1)(a) of the Order is met.

Statutory test 7(1)(b): Significant effects on more than one borough

23. Article 7(1)(b) concerns whether the Mayor considers that the development or any of the issues raised by the development to which the application relates has significant effects that are likely to affect more than one London borough.
24. While the strategic need for housing is broken down into borough-level targets, paragraph 1.4.4 of the London Plan states that the London Plan is able to look across the city to plan for the housing needs of all Londoners and treats London as a single housing market. Boroughs can rely on the London Plan targets when developing their Development Plan Documents rather than nationally derived figures. As such, the delivery of housing is a London-wide issue affecting all boroughs.
25. Further, the application site is located at the Thames riverside near Wandsworth's shared borders with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (RBKC), and the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham (LBHF). Wandsworth Council consulted both neighbouring boroughs on the planning application. The visual impacts of the proposal would affect more than one London Borough and this matter will be fully considered should the application be called in.
26. In light of the above, it is concluded that the development would have significant effects that are likely to affect more than one London borough and the test set out in Article 7(1)(b) of the Order is met.

Statutory test 7(1)(c): Sound planning reasons for intervening

27. Part (c) of the statutory test within Article 7(1) of the 2008 Order concerns whether the Mayor considers there to be sound planning reasons to exercise his power to become local planning authority in respect of the application. The potential local and London-wide level benefits of the scheme, subject to appropriate conditions and obligations being secured, are acknowledged to have included:

- new housing and affordable housing
- affordable workspace and community floorspace
- public realm improvements, as well as contributions towards playspace, river wall enhancements and flood defence improvements, carbon off-setting, transport, healthcare, employment, art and culture, CIL, and employment opportunities..

28. Notwithstanding this, having regard to the details of the proposal, the Council's delegated report and draft reasons for refusal, the outstanding issues from Stage 1 also set out below, and responses to the statutory and public consultation, GLA officers do not consider that there are sound planning reasons for the Mayor to issue a direction that he is to be the local planning authority in respect of the application, and the test set out in Article 7(1)(c) of the Order has not been met.

Conclusion

29. For the Mayor to issue a direction that he is to be the local planning authority, all relevant tests must be met. It is considered that the development is of a nature or scale that would have a significant impact on the implementation of the London Plan, and would have significant effects which are likely to affect more than one London Borough, but it is not considered that there are sound planning reasons for the Mayor to issue a direction under Article 7 of the Order 2008.

30. Therefore, the application would not meet the statutory tests to trigger the Mayor's power to take over and determine this application as set out in the Mayor of London Order 2008.

Issues raised at consultation stage

31. When considering whether to take over the application, it is also relevant for the Mayor to have regard to the planning issues that were raised at consultation stage. In this context, it should be noted that the Mayor is only considering whether to intervene by becoming the local planning authority. The Mayor is not at this stage required or being invited to reach any decision on the overall merits of the proposal, and whether or not to grant or refuse planning permission. An update on the issues raised at consultation stage is discussed in the following sections.

Relevant policies and guidance

32. Since consultation stage the following is now a material consideration:

- The National Planning Policy Framework 2024, as amended.

Outstanding issues

33. An assessment of the issues raised at consultation stage is discussed below.

Land use principles

34. The proposed residential dwellings would contribute positively to meeting the borough's housing targets as set out in the London Plan and was supported at consultation stage, subject to the applicant's marketing assessment justifying the net loss of employment floorspace being accepted by the Council. GLA officers were however supportive of the proposed employment floorspace being delivered as entirely affordable workspace, subject to it being provided at a suitable discounted rate. The proposed restaurant and community use were also generally accepted. As such, the principle of the proposed land use is supported in strategic planning terms.

Housing

35. The scheme at consultation stage proposed 142 dwellings with 35% affordable housing with 70% social rent, and 30% intermediate. The revised proposal includes 110 residential units with 50% affordable housing by habitable room, comprising of 100% social rent. GLA officers strongly support the improved affordable housing offer.

36. The Council have confirmed the tenure mix is acceptable, and as it exceeds the threshold level for this site of 35% it is eligible to follow the Fast Track Route, meaning an application stage viability appraisal and late stage review mechanism are not required. The Council have also confirmed that unit mix is also accepted, and were particularly in favour of the weighting towards larger homes within the social rented tenure.

Children's play space

37. It was incorrectly stated at consultation stage that a total of 712 sqm of play space would be required for the development in line with London Plan Policy S4. This was also incorrectly quoted within the Council's committee report as 968 sqm. The required figure is actually 958 sqm. Nevertheless, the scheme's proposal of 231.5 sqm on site fell short of the requirement, and the Council had accepted the shortfall to be provided off-site via a payment in lieu of £147,300. GLA officers are satisfied that this would be acceptable in strategic planning terms.

Urban design and heritage

38. At consultation stage GLA Officers were broadly supportive of the design principles and location of uses subject to some minor suggested refinements to layout.

39. Whilst supportive of improving the riverside public realm and landscaping of the site in general, GLA Officers raised concerns about the illustrative public realm

proposals beyond the application boundary, and consequential insufficient public realm being delivered within the boundary to contribute to place making for the wider community commensurate with the scale of the development. This remains unchanged since Stage 1, however, GLA officers note that the Council was satisfied that this could have been secured through a Section 278 agreement and has not raised any specific concerns in this regard.

40. In terms of architectural quality, at consultation stage GLA Officers considered the proposed material palette and building proportions to be appropriate.

Tall building, scale and massing

41. As set out at consultation stage, the proposed development would be considered a tall building in line with the definitions set out in the Wandsworth Local Plan and the London Plan. However, as it sits outside of a tall building zone, it would not meet the locational requirements of London Plan Policy D9 (Part B).

42. At consultation stage GLA officers highlighted that a landmark building could be an appropriate design principle for the site, but recognised that the tall building proposal, whilst slender and architecturally elegant, would represent a new urban typology in its immediate setting, and would result in heritage impacts as summarised below.

43. The Council's committee report concluded that the excessive height and scale of the tall building would represent an unacceptable and incongruous transformative change within the location that would significantly harm the spatial character of the area. Subsequently, the Council cited the impact of the proposed tall building as a reason for refusal.

44. Officers also raised concerns about the pedestrian wind comfort level and highlighted that improved mitigation was required to ensure the ground floor public spaces and residential terrace would be versatile and functional. In considering environmental impacts, the Council reviewed the submitted wind and microclimate assessment and raised no objections. The associated mitigation would have been secured by condition had the application been recommended for approval.

45. The Council has also reviewed the daylight and sunlight assessment and considered it to be acceptable on balance.

Fire safety

46. The fire statement submitted at consultation stage provided most of the information required by London Plan Policy D12, and confirmed buildings with a height above 18 metres would provide two staircases, as well as evacuation lifts provided to all buildings. Further clarification in the way of a declaration of compliance was provided following consultation stage via a revised Fire Strategy document which addressed the original concerns of GLA officers.

Heritage

47. At consultation stage GLA officers concluded overall the proposed development would cause less than substantial harm to a number of nearby heritage assets and Conservation Areas as set out in Table 2 of the GLA's Stage 1 Report, contrary to London Plan Policy HC1. GLA officers set out that this harm could be outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme.

Inclusive access

48. In the amended scheme, a total of 12 dwellings equal to 11% were proposed to meet the M4(3) wheelchair user dwellings standard, while the remainder would meet the M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings standard. This was proposed to be split 50/50 between the affordable and private tenures.

Transport

49. Transport issues highlighted at consultation stage included a contribution towards Battersea Bridge Road improvements, the removal of all general parking proposed, amendments to the cycle stores and servicing arrangement proposed, and structures technical approval for Battersea Bridge Road was requested. The need for travel plans, a car park management plan, delivery and servicing plan, and construction logistics plan to be secured by condition or legal agreement was also requested.

50. A further reduction in car parking due to the sites location and access to public transport is considered appropriate.

51. Concerns over cycle parking and servicing have been satisfactorily addressed since consultation stage. Structures approval was to be secured as a pre-commencement condition had the application been recommended for approval.

52. A contribution of £436,812.00 was to be secured in the Section 106 Agreement towards Battersea Bridge Road improvements adjacent to the site had the application been recommended for approval.

53. A Car Parking Design and Management Plan, a Delivery and Servicing Plan and Construction Logistics Plan were to be secured by condition. A Travel Plan and residents exclusion from parking permits were all to be secured through the Section 106 agreement had the application been recommended for approval.

Sustainable development

Energy

54. The energy statement that supported the planning application was considered by GLA officers to not fully comply with the London Plan at consultation stage. Further information was subsequently requested regarding compliance with Be Lean, Be Clean, Be Green and Be Seen requirements; as well as heat risk and energy infrastructure information.

55. The domestic element of the proposed development is estimated to achieve an 66% reduction in CO2 emissions compared to the 2021 Building Regulation, and for the non-domestic element a 42% reduction is expected. A carbon offset payment of £157,917 to achieve zero carbon was calculated as being required to account for the shortfall.

Whole life-cycle carbon

56. GLA officers reviewed the Whole Life-Cycle Carbon (WLC) Assessment at consultation stage and concluded it did not fully comply with London Plan Policy SI2. Further information and clarifications were provided following consultation stage and found to be acceptable.

Circular economy

57. GLA Officers reviewed the Circular Economy Statement at consultation stage and concluded it did not fully comply with London Plan Policy SI7 and further information was subsequently requested. Further information and clarifications were provided following consultation stage and found to be acceptable.

Environmental issues

Urban greening

58. At consultation stage the scheme was proposing an urban greening factor (UGF) score of 0.4, which meets the minimum requirement of 0.4 set out in London Plan Policy G5. This remains unchanged.

Sustainable drainage and flood risk

59. At consultation stage, GLA officers identified a need for groundwater monitoring (ideally during winter months) which could be managed by condition.

60. At consultation stage, while GLA officers supported the strategy to provide green roofs, podium gardens, blue roofs, tree pits, rain gardens and a tank, officers raised concerns with the proposed drainage strategy.

61. At Stage 1, GLA officers raised concern with the applicant's proposal to target a maximum indoor water consumption of 110 L/person/day, which exceeds the London Plan Policy SI5 target of 105 L/person/day. This remains unchanged.

Air quality

62. The applicant's Air Quality Assessment (AQA) was reviewed by GLA officers at consultation stage and officers accepted the assessment conclusion that the development would be air quality neutral. GLA officers requested the Council secure conditions regarding Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM), and measures to control dust and air quality during construction.

Legal considerations

63. Under the arrangements set out in Article 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor has the power under Article 7 to direct that he will become the local planning authority for the purposes of determining the application. The Mayor may also leave the decision to the local authority. If the Mayor decides to direct that he is to be the local planning authority, he must have regard to the matters set out in Article 7(3) and set out his reasons in the direction.

Financial considerations

64. Should the Mayor take over the application he would be responsible for holding a representation hearing and negotiating any planning obligation. He would also be responsible for determining any reserved matters applications (unless he directs the Council to do so) and determining any approval of details (unless the Council agrees to do so).

Conclusion

65. Having regard to: the details of the application and the development proposed; the matters set out in Article 7(3) of the Mayor of London Order 2008; the relevant planning issues; the Council's committee report; and, the Council's draft decision notice, it is concluded that whilst the land use principles and affordable housing provision is supported in strategic planning terms, there are not sound planning reasons for the Mayor to intervene in this particular case, and therefore no basis to issue a direction under Article 7 of the Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008. It is therefore recommended that Sutton Council is advised to determine the case itself, subject to any action that the Secretary of State may take.

For further information, contact GLA Planning Unit (Development Management Team):

Leah Moniz, Senior Strategic Planner (case officer)

email: leah.moniz@london.gov.uk

Graham Clements, Team Leader – Development Management

email: graham.clements@london.gov.uk

Allison Flight, Deputy Head of Development Management

email: alison.flight@london.gov.uk

John Finlayson, Head of Development Management

email: john.finlayson@london.gov.uk

Lucinda Turner, Assistant Director of Planning

email: lucinda.turner@london.gov.uk

We are committed to being anti-racist, planning for a diverse and inclusive London and engaging all communities in shaping their city.