

GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY

(By email)

Our Ref: MGLA220725-0518

26 September 2025

Thank you for your further correspondence which the Greater London Authority (GLA) received on 22 July 2025.

You have expressed dissatisfaction with the way the GLA has responded to a request for information that you have made. I am now responding to you under the GLA's internal review procedure in relation to our response to case.

Background

On 27 June 2025, you submitted the following requests for information (GLA ref MGLA270625-8878):

Please provide all documentation related to the **Haringey Warehouse District** project as it relates to its finalist position for the **Mayor's Award for Innovation in Planning** at the **2018 London Planning Awards**.

Specifically, I am requesting:

1. The original **award submission or nomination pack** submitted by or on behalf of Provewell Ltd / Collective Planning / London Borough of Haringey.
2. Any accompanying **project descriptions, supporting evidence**, or presentations included in the entry.
3. Any **internal evaluations, scoring sheets, or feedback** prepared by the judging panel regarding the project.
4. Any **correspondence** (email or otherwise) between GLA officers, partners, or judging panel members discussing the merits of this project or its shortlisting.
5. The **official outcome summary** and rationale for why the project was shortlisted but not selected as the winner (if applicable).

The GLA responded to you on 22 July 2025 and informed you that we do not hold the information within the scope of your request.

Your complaint

With regards to our response, you have submitted the following complaint(s):

Thank you for your response to my Freedom of Information request, reference MGLA270625-8878.

I would like to respectfully request a review of the decision, as I do not believe it is accurate to state that the Greater London Authority does not hold information within the scope of my request.

According to the Collective Planning website, this project was confirmed as a finalist for the award, indicating direct involvement by or communication with the GLA. I have attached a screenshot from the website as evidence of this fact.

Given that the London Planning Awards are run in association with the Mayor of London and the GLA, I believe it is reasonable to expect that relevant documentation—such as the award submission, internal evaluations, or correspondence—should be held by your office or an associated team.

I kindly request that you conduct a more thorough search, or confirm whether the records may be held by a specific department or third-party partner.

If you maintain that no such information is held, I would be grateful if you could clarify where this information is available in the public domain.

Internal review

The Freedom of Information Act and Environmental Information Regulations give you rights to access official information. Internal reviews are handled by the Information Governance team. We are responsible for reviewing any decision and the material (if held).

This internal review is conducted by someone who was not involved in the handling of the original request. I will now respond to each point of your request in turn:

I have asked that the Planning team undertake another search of their records for information falling within the scope of your request. I can confirm that the only thing that they have found is the original judging sheet (attached) for the innovation category which gives an overview of judging criteria but no further details. The team recall that these were completed manually and not subsequently saved.

Unfortunately, the lead officer left the GLA, and the records are likely to have been saved on their personal drive which was deleted in line with our movers and leavers policy.

I have also asked the relevant area of the Mayor's Office to perform a search to see if any residual information is held and I can confirm we have located one email chain relevant to your enquiry. Please also find attached.

Please note that the Deputy Mayor for Planning was not involved in the judging and simply received the judges' recommendation to the GLA for the Mayor's Award for Innovation in Planning and was informed that the Haringey scheme was only suggested by London First as a potential winner when the initially suggested winner – a major scheme in south London – was rejected due to its reduction in affordable housing. As the email exchange demonstrates, the Deputy Mayor wasn't convinced that promoting the other shortlisted scheme was justified, but after questioning accepted it.

Sometime between this email and the awards event (January 18th, 2018) an alternative scheme (Rectory Farm in Hounslow) was identified as a better recipient of the Mayor's award. The Deputy Mayor has confirmed that they hold no written or electronic records relating to that change (and after almost eight years he cannot recall what exchanges may have taken place between London First, GLA Planning, GLA Regen and the Mayor's office that arrived at that result).

Outcome

In reviewing your complaint, I consider that the GLA has reviewed its original response to you and undertaken further searches. We have provided the outcome of those searches to you which is in scope of your request.

We have provided additional information on why there is no further information held that is relevant to your request. I have therefore upheld your complaint, with additional information located and disclosed to you together with this response. I can also confirm that the GLA holds no further recorded information in scope of your request.

I trust I have addressed your concerns. However, if you remain dissatisfied you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner at the following address:

*Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
SK9 5AF
<http://www.ico.org.uk/complaints>*

Yours sincerely

Sylvia Edohasim
Information Governance Manager

 LONDON PLANNING AWARDS 2017/18	LONDON PLANNING AWARDS 2017/18 MAYOR'S AWARD FOR INNOVATION IN PLANNING	<i>LPA entry ref</i> <i>no</i>
<i>project name</i>		
This award is open to any scheme that demonstrates innovative approaches to planning in either plan making/policy, planning practice or delivery of development including new buildings, open space or infrastructure. It could relate to innovation in design, construction practice; development involving heritage assets or listed buildings; thought leadership or innovation in planning policy or practice; approaches to planning skills and technology or approaches to project delivery, community engagement or stakeholder collaboration.		
<i>criteria</i>	<i>judges' comments</i>	
Develops or takes new approaches to plan making, planning practice or development delivery	<i>at shortlisting</i> <i>at site visit/interview</i>	
Takes new approaches to communication and community/stakeholder engagement or access to planning data	<i>at shortlisting</i> <i>at site visit/interview</i>	
Demonstrates thought leadership in the field of planning	<i>at shortlisting</i> <i>at site visit/interview</i>	
<i>summary</i>		
<i>final view</i>		
<i>Shortlisted? Y/N</i>		
<i>Mayor's Award contender?</i>		

[REDACTED]

From: Jules Pipe
Sent: 06 December 2017 13:17
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: LPA awards

Hmmm. I'm not convinced, but I'll go along with the Haringey entry.

It's had Westminster's Director of Planning and someone senior from Waltham Forest choosing it. I'd have to be on firmer ground to start overruling their decision.

It really does highlight though that we should be in at the beginning setting the criteria, if its to carry the Mayor's endorsement.

On 6 Dec 2017, at 12:47, [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@london.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@london.gov.uk)> wrote:

Hello,

[REDACTED] response to your questions is below. Overview of an alternative winner (Meridian Water) is attached.

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 December 2017 12:26
To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@london.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@london.gov.uk)>
Subject: RE: LPA awards

Hi [REDACTED]

Thanks for coming back to me. The decision was made collectively between this year's judges (myself, [REDACTED] of London First, [REDACTED] from Westminster and [REDACTED] from Waltham Forest).

We felt that it was innovative in terms of securing genuinely affordable live/work space whilst also promoting a strong community of creatives and artists, in line with the Mayor's vision for Culture.

An alternative winner for this category would be the short-listed entry Meridian Water in Enfield, which would be consistent with London Plan mixed use/co-located intensification policies. It also includes Segro's multi-storey industrial units proposal. I've attached some information on this.

Thanks
[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 December 2017 10:15
To: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]@london.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: LPA awards

Hi [REDACTED],

Thanks for this. I've discussed it with Jules and he has some further questions:

Who was the decision maker on this one? I.e. who is actually recommending the scheme as the winner?

Are we comfortable that it fits with new London Plan policy and so is something the Mayor should be endorsing? Jules has some concerns that it doesn't fit with our emphasis on optimising density.

Thanks
[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 December 2017 10:06
To: [REDACTED]@london.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: LPA awards

Hi [REDACTED]

Please find some further information as requested on the Haringey warehouse living scheme, set out against the entry criteria below, with some images attached.

Haringey Warehouse District
Collective Planning (agent), LB Haringey and Provewell (landowner)

1. Develops or takes new approaches to plan making, planning practice or development delivery

The approach to plan positively for an innovative form of communal living and working in a part of Haringey presents a new, exciting and fresh approach to plan making. The new 'warehouse living' development management policy and site allocation creates a positive policy framework that protects a specific and flourishing creative community living and working in converted warehouses. The policy not only protects the existing community but also allows for additional affordable warehouse living units and experimental design solutions to meet current and future needs.

The policy is the first of its kind in London and the UK, and will genuinely support the regeneration of redundant warehouse sites to provide hubs of entrepreneurship, creativity and community. The policy will lead to spaces specifically designed around the

needs of the community that are spatially generous, community focussed and fresh in design. The innovative policy supports the efficient delivery of both jobs and homes.

2. Takes new approaches to communication and community/stakeholder engagement or access to planning data

This collaborative approach between developer and LB Haringey involved taking officers on tours of the area to showcase the unique way the community lived and worked in these warehouses. This allowed officers to speak directly with residents to understand their needs and what made the warehouses unique and special to them.

Architects were also appointed and collaborated to demonstrate what the future delivery of further warehouse living could look like on the estates. Emerging typologies were explored that helped the drafting of the policy.

Collective Planning undertook surveys of the site to understand the number of people living and working in the area, which allowed the policy to take into account the needs of the existing community as well as ensuring future uplift in homes and jobs.

3. Demonstrates thought leadership in the field of planning

The bold, innovative and new approach to creating London's first warehouse living policy demonstrates that new ways of living and working in London can be planned for positively and are possible. The collaboration of landowner, council and Collective Planning has allowed a new policy that will allow a unique, special and creative community to flourish and grow. Whilst it has never been formally planned for before the boldness for such a new approach to policy in these areas of Haringey represents real innovation that can show the art of possibility in plan making in London. This type of collaboration, innovation and creativity in plan making will hopefully be an example of what is possible as plan makers and developers grapple with how they will play their part in meeting the significant housing and employment challenges of London.

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 04 December 2017 11:57

To: [REDACTED]@london.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: LPA awards

Thanks [REDACTED]

The additional info re: Haringey is to confirm whether the Mayor's office is happy with the award, so they shouldn't print the information until we've had that.

Thanks,
[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 December 2017 11:54
To: [REDACTED]@london.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: LPA awards

Hi [REDACTED]

Ok thanks, I'm out of the office today but will send through some more info on Haringey Warehouses tomorrow morning.

Just to confirm that the mayor is happy with the mayors awards winners?

Thanks
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 9:21 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: LPA awards

Hi [REDACTED]

We talked [REDACTED] through the LPA Awards on Friday pm. He was broadly ok, but do you have any further info on the Haringey scheme (proposed as winner of the innovation in planning award) that you could send up?

Thanks
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] | Senior Advisor to the Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills
City Hall | The Queen's Walk | London | SE1 2AA | [REDACTED] GREATER
LONDON AUTHORITY