

GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY

[REDACTED]
(By email)

Our Ref: MGLA270819-0848

23 September 2019

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your request for information which the GLA received on 23 August 2019. Your request has been dealt with under the Environmental Information Regulations (EIR) 2004.

You asked for;

All communications between the GLA and Westminster Council regarding the Millbank redevelopment in 2015 and 2016, with specific interest in any emails sent by the office of Boris Johnson while he was Mayor of London

Our response to your request is as follows:

Please find attached the information held by the GLA within scope of your request. Please note that some names of members of staff are exempt from disclosure under Regulation 13 (Personal information) of the EIR. This information constitutes as personal data which is defined by Article 4(1) of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) to mean any information relating to an identified or identifiable living individual. It is considered that disclosure of this information would contravene the first data protection principle under Article 5(1) of GDPR which states that Personal data must be processed lawfully, fairly and in a transparent manner in relation to the data subject.

If you have any further questions relating to this matter, please contact me, quoting the reference at the top of this letter.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]
Information Governance Officer

If you are unhappy with the way the GLA has handled your request, you may complain using the GLA's FOI complaints and internal review procedure, available at:

<https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/governance-and-spending/sharing-our-information/freedom-information>

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@westminster.gov.uk>
Sent: 03 August 2015 17:36
To: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Confirmation of pre-planning application meeting request: Millbank Complex

Dear [REDACTED]
Thanks for the invite, however I am not able to attend as I have another meeting.
Kind regards,
[REDACTED]
Senior Planning Officer
Development Planning | Growth, Planning & Housing

Westminster City Council
12th Floor Westminster City Hall
64 Victoria Street
London SW1E 6QP

[REDACTED]
www.westminster.gov.uk



ASPIRATION CHOICE HERITAGE

Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the sender, and whilst given in good faith, do not necessarily represent a formal decision of the Local Planning Authority unless a statutory application is or has been made and determined in accordance with requisite procedures, planning policies and having had regard to material considerations.



please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to

From: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]@london.gov.uk]
Sent: 03 August 2015 15:52
To: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Confirmation of pre-planning application meeting request: Millbank Complex

Dear [REDACTED]

As you may be aware, the GLA will be hosting a pre-application meeting on this scheme on Wednesday afternoon (details below). If you are available you would be most welcome come along and to join us.

I will include you on the agenda circulation, let me know if you would like to attend and I will forward you a diary invite.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] | Senior Strategic Planner | Development & Projects | Development, Enterprise & Environment
GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY | 4th Floor, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London SE1 2AA
[REDACTED] | Email: [REDACTED]@london.gov.uk

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2015 15:21
To: [REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk'
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Confirmation of pre-planning application meeting request: Millbank Complex

Dear [REDACTED]

Site: Millbank Complex, 21-25 Millbank, SW1P 4QP
LB: Westminster
Our reference: D&P/3716 (please quote this number in all further correspondence)

Your request for a pre-planning application advice meeting has been confirmed for **05 August at 3pm** at City Hall.

Please could you let us know who will be attending and whether you want a laptop and projector for the meeting? Please could you also let us know if you will be bringing any presentation material e.g. site model?

Meeting arrangements

When you arrive at City Hall for the meeting, please ask at reception for [REDACTED] [REDACTED] You should allow time to clear security. It would be appreciated if you could arrive together to ensure the meeting starts on time.

We can only comment on information provided in advance of the meeting. Where we have no or limited information we will not be able to provide a comprehensive assessment. The advice letter will only address issues that you have sent documentation on. The case officer will carry out a site visit and assess the documentation prior to the meeting. A meeting note will be sent to you two working days prior to the meeting which will outline the issues that will be discussed. Detailed officer level comments will be issued by letter no more than ten working days after the meeting, unless otherwise agreed with the applicant.

The advice given by officers does not constitute a formal response or decision by the Mayor with regard to future planning applications. Any views or opinions expressed are without prejudice to the Mayor's formal consideration of the application.

Cancellation

If, due to circumstances out of our control, we cancel the meeting we will reschedule for another time as soon as practical. Meetings can be rescheduled at your request up to 48 hours prior. The fee is non-refundable on cancellation.

Freedom of Information

Since January 2005 the Freedom of Information Act 2000 has allowed the public to request information from public authorities including the Greater London Authority. The public will have a right to request information which includes pre planning application advice and documents associated. Each case will be taken on its individual merits. If you have any concerns or wish to discuss this matter please contact [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Comments and complaints

If you are not happy with the service you have received and wish to complain or make a comment all the information is located at <http://www.london.gov.uk/contact-us/complaints>.

Further queries regarding the process can be sent to both [REDACTED] london.gov.uk and [REDACTED] london.gov.uk quoting the D&P reference number, whilst queries regarding policy and the content of the meeting should be sent to the case officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
email: [REDACTED]@london.gov.uk.

Yours sincerely

■■■■ ■■■■ | Business Support Officer | Planning | Development, Enterprise & Environment
GREATERLONDONAUTHORITY | City Hall | The Queens Walk | London | SE1 2AA
■■■■■■■■■■ | E: ■■■■■■■■■■ [london.gov.uk](https://www.london.gov.uk)

GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY

Development, Enterprise and Environment

■■■■ ■■■■
City of Westminster
Development Planning
Westminster City Hall
64 Victoria Street
London
SW1E 6QP

Our ref: D&P/3716/PS
Your ref: 15/07756/FULL
Date: 3 September 2015

Dear Mr ■■■■

**Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended); Greater London Authority Act 1999 & 2007; Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008. Development Site at Millbank Complex, 25 Millbank, London SW1P 4QP
Local Planning Authority Reference: 15/07756/FULL**

Thank you for consulting the Mayor of London in respect of the above application of potential strategic importance, which your Council validated on 25 August 2015.

Under Article 4(2) of the above Order the Mayor has six weeks from the date of receipt to provide a statement setting out whether he considers the application complies with his London Plan and his reasons for taking that view.

I hereby give notice that your letter was received on 26 August 2015 and therefore the six-week period will terminate on 6 October 2015.

The application has been allocated to ■■■■ ■■■■ who can be reached on ■■■■ or email ■■■■ [london.gov.uk](mailto:■■■■@london.gov.uk)

A copy of this letter has been forwarded to the agent for information.

Yours sincerely,

Development & Projects
Greater London Authority

cc: Mr ■■■■ ■■■■ DP9, 100 Pall Mall, London SW1Y 5NQ

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 September 2015 15:36
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: D&P/3716 Millbank Complex (15/07756/FULL)

Dear [REDACTED]

Many thanks for your time on the phone just now.

As discussed, the Mayor's Sept/Oct meeting programme has been shifting around a bit which has made it more difficult for me to target a workable planning decisions meeting within the usual 6-week period. Accordingly, and as we have agreed, I am targeting a planning decisions meeting on 9 October (three days after our normal deadline) in order to obtain the Mayors endorsement of our stage 1 report. I will ensure that you receive an electronic copy of our representations by the close of business that day.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] | Senior Strategic Planner | [Development & Projects](#) | [Development, Enterprise & Environment](#)
GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY | 4th Floor, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London SE1 2AA
[REDACTED] | Email: [REDACTED] [london.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@london.gov.uk)

GREATER **LONDON** AUTHORITY
Development, Enterprise and Environment

[REDACTED]
Development Planning
Westminster City Council
Westminster City Hall
64 Victoria Street
London SW1E 6QP

Our ref: D&P/3716/GC/02
Your ref: 15/07756/FULL
Date: 8 October 2015

Dear [REDACTED]

**Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended); Greater London Authority Acts 1999 and 2007; Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008
Millbank Complex, 25 Millbank, London SW1P 4QP
Local Planning Authority reference: 15/07756/FULL**

I refer to the copy of the above planning application, which was received from you on 26 August 2015. On 8 October 2015, Sir Edward Lister, Deputy Mayor and Chief of Staff, acting under delegated authority, considered a report on this proposal, reference D&P/3716/01. A copy of the report is attached, in full. This letter comprises the statement that the Mayor is required to provide under Article 4(2) of the Order.

The Deputy Mayor considers that whilst the scheme is generally acceptable in strategic planning terms, the application does not yet fully comply with the London Plan for the reasons set out in paragraph 60 of the above-mentioned report. The resolution of those issues could, nevertheless, lead to the application becoming compliant with the London Plan.

If the City Council subsequently resolves to make a draft decision on the application, it must consult the Mayor again under Article 5 of the Order and allow him fourteen days to decide whether to allow the draft decision to proceed unchanged, or direct the City Council under Article 6 to refuse the application, or issue a direction under Article 7 that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application and any connected application. You should therefore send me a copy of any representations made in respect of the application, and a copy of any officer's report, together with a statement of the decision your authority proposes to make, and (if it proposed to grant permission) a statement of any conditions the authority proposes to impose and a draft of any planning obligation it proposes to enter into and details of any proposed planning contribution.

Please note that the Transport for London case officer for this application is [REDACTED]
e-mail [REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk, telephone [REDACTED]

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Senior Manager– Development & Projects

cc Kit Malthouse, London Assembly Constituency Member
Nicky Gavron, Chair of London Assembly Planning Committee
National Planning Casework Unit, DCLG
Alex Williams, TfL
[REDACTED] DP9, 100 Pall Mall, London SW1Y 5NQ

Millbank Complex, Millbank

in the City of Westminster

planning application no. 15/07756/FULL

Strategic planning application stage I 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

Refurbishment of Grade II Listed Millbank Complex (including replacement facades, three-storey roof extensions to Millbank Tower and 'Y' building, and single-storey roof extension to north podium) and change of use to provide 215 flats and skybar at Millbank Tower; an arts/cultural facility at south podium; and, a 195 bedroom hotel at north podium and 'Y' building.

The applicant

The applicant is **Basio Holdings Ltd.**, and the architect is **John McAslan + Partners**.

Strategic issues

The proposed **refurbishment and conversion** of this **Grade II listed CAZ office** to provide a **residential-led mixed use** scheme incorporating **culture** and **hotel** uses is supported in strategic planning terms.

Nevertheless, issues with respect to **affordable housing, historic environment, strategic views, inclusive access, sustainable development** and **transport** should be resolved prior to the Mayor's decision making stage.

Recommendation

That Westminster City Council be advised that whilst the scheme is generally acceptable in strategic planning terms, the application does not yet fully comply with the London Plan for the reasons set out in paragraph 60 of this report. The resolution of those issues could, nevertheless, lead to the application becoming compliant with the London Plan.

Context

1 On 25 August 2015 the Mayor of London received documents from Westminster City Council notifying him of a planning application of potential strategic importance to develop the above site for the above uses. Under the provisions of The Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor had until 6 October 2015 to provide the City Council with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that view. However, in this case Westminster City Council has agreed that the Mayor will provide his comments on 8 October 2015. This report sets out information for the Mayor's use in deciding what decision to make.

2 The application is referable under the following categories of the Schedule to the Order 2008:

- 1A 1. *“Development which comprises or includes the provision of more than 150 houses, flats, or houses and flats”;*
- 1B 1.(b) *“Development... which comprises or includes the erection of a building or buildings - in Central London (other than the City of London) and with a total floorspace of more than 20,000 square metres”;* and,
- 1D 1(a)(b) *“Development which comprises or includes the alteration of an existing building where - the development would increase the height of the building by more than 15 metres and the building would, on completion of the development, fall within a description set out in paragraph 1 of Category 1C”.*

3 Once Westminster City Council has resolved to determine the application, it is required to refer it back to the Mayor for his decision as to whether to direct refusal; take it over for his own determination; or, allow the City Council to determine it itself.

4 The Mayor of London’s statement on this case will be made available on the GLA website www.london.gov.uk.

Site description

5 The Millbank Complex is located north of Vauxhall Bridge, on the Thames riverside at Millbank. The site falls within the Central Activities Zone (CAZ) as identified by the London Plan, and is at the boundary of the Smith Square Conservation Area (to the north) and the Millbank Conservation Area (to the south). Tate Britain is located just to the south of the site, and GLA officers understand that this site has been identified by the UK Holocaust Memorial Foundation as one of three potential locations for the London Holocaust Memorial and Museum. It is understood that the Foundation will select its chosen site for the Memorial and Museum in January 2016.

6 The Millbank Complex comprises a 33-storey tower; 8-storey ‘Y’ block; and, a linking podium block which fronts Millbank. Constructed in 1963, Millbank Tower is Grade II Listed, and recognised as a modernist building of national architectural and historic interest. Designed to provide high-rise office space, the building is still partially occupied, albeit, it is understood that the existing leases within the complex are soon to expire.

7 In terms of the transport context, Millbank (fronting the site) forms part of the Transport for London Road Network, and Cycle Super Highway 8 (CS8) and River Bus Services are directly available along this route. Pimlico London Underground Station is located some 700 metres to the southwest, and 10 bus services are available within a reasonable walking distance of the site. Victoria and Vauxhall National Rail & London Underground Stations are also located just over one kilometre from the site. This area is also served by the Cycle Hire network, with a dock occupying part of the highway on the site’s Millbank frontage. Overall the site registers a public transport accessibility level of between four and five (on a scale of one to six, where six denotes the most accessible locations in the capital).

Details of the proposal

8 The proposal is for thorough refurbishment of the Millbank Complex (Grade II) comprising: replacement facades; erection of three additional floors and plant enclosure to Millbank Tower (from 33 to 36-storeys); erection of three additional floors to the ‘Y’ building (from 8 to 11-storeys); demolition and replacement of north and south podium buildings -

including erection of single storey roof extension to north podium; infill of courtyard between 'Y' building and north podium building; excavation of basement levels; and, demolition of rear car park in association with re-landscaping and reconfiguration of the wider site.

9 The refurbishment is intended to support a proposed change of use comprising: use of Millbank Tower as 215 residential flats (Class C3); use of south podium as an arts/cultural facility (Class D1); and, use of north podium and 'Y' building as a 195 bedroom hotel (Class C1), with an ancillary hotel Skybar proposed on the 34th floor of Millbank Tower.

Case history

10 A GLA pre application meeting was held to discuss this proposal at City Hall on 5 August 2015. The advice issued by GLA officers stated that the principle of the proposed refurbishment and change of use of the Millbank Complex is supported in strategic planning terms. The applicant was, nevertheless, advised to ensure that the planning submission addresses matters with respect to CAZ office, housing, culture, visitor infrastructure, urban design (including historic environment and strategic views), inclusive access, sustainable development and transport.

Strategic planning issues and relevant policies and guidance

11 The relevant strategic issues and corresponding policies are as follows:

- Central Activities Zone *London Plan; the Mayor's Economic Development Strategy; Employment Action Plan;*
- Offices *London Plan; draft Central Activities Zone SPG;*
- Housing *London Plan; Housing SPG; draft Interim Housing SPG; Housing Strategy; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Character and Context SPG;*
- Affordable housing *London Plan; Housing SPG; draft Interim Housing SPG; Housing Strategy;*
- Density *London Plan; Housing SPG; draft Interim Housing SPG;*
- Culture *London Plan;*
- Visitor infrastructure *London Plan;*
- Urban design *London Plan; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Character and Context SPG; Housing SPG; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG;*
- Historic environment *London Plan; World Heritage Sites SPG;*
- Strategic views *London Plan; London View Management Framework SPG;*
- Inclusive access *London Plan; Accessible London: achieving an inclusive environment SPG;*
- Sustainable development *London Plan; Sustainable Design and Construction SPG; Mayor's Climate Change Adaptation Strategy; Mayor's Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy; Mayor's Water Strategy;*
- Transport and parking *London Plan; the Mayor's Transport Strategy; and,*
- Crossrail *London Plan; Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy; and, Use of planning obligations in the funding of Crossrail and the Mayoral Community infrastructure levy SPG.*

12 For the purposes of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the development plan in force for the area is the 2013 Westminster City Plan; 2010 City of Westminster Proposal Map; 2007 Westminster Unitary Development Plan saved policies; and, the 2015 London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2011).

13 The following are also relevant material considerations:

- National Planning Policy Framework, Technical Guide to the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance;
- Draft Minor Alterations to the London Plan 2015;
- Westminster Planning Obligations SPG 2008; and,
- Draft Mixed Use Revision to Westminster City Plan (Regulation 19 consultation stage).

Principle of development

14 Having regard to related considerations with respect to proposed loss of CAZ office space and the renovation and conversion of this heritage asset (refer below), GLA officers support the principle of the proposed refurbishment and change of use of the Millbank Complex (Grade II) in strategic planning terms. Moreover, GLA officers are satisfied that the uses proposed are appropriate for this CAZ location.

CAZ office

15 The London Plan identifies this part of the CAZ as being mixed use with a strong 'state' character. Office development (including the Millbank Complex) historically came forward in this area due to its proximity to central Government. However, in more recent times it is understood that higher rents for office space at this riverside location have led to the relocation of a number of public bodies previously occupying the Millbank Complex. Notwithstanding this, the Millbank location is not generally regarded as among the most attractive for large commercial office occupiers. Indeed, the Complex is understood to be significantly under-occupied at present.

16 London Plan Policy 4.2 identifies strong long term demand for office space in the CAZ. Whilst there is no strategic protection afforded to CAZ office space (beyond a 2013 Government exemption to permitted development rights), the London Plan strongly promotes the renewal of CAZ office space in order to support London's continuing function as a World City. Further to this, recently adopted alterations to London Plan Policy 4.3 encourage local planning authorities to develop policy to manage the loss of office space to residential use (and/or to mitigate an on-site loss of office space) - where this is justified by local and strategic demand. The Mayor is currently undertaking public consultation on a draft CAZ Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) which is intended to assist with the implementation of this approach.

17 In response to the above policy context, and specific local circumstances, Westminster City Council is consulting on a draft Mixed Use Revision to the Westminster City Plan. This essentially seeks to strengthen controls on residential-led redevelopment at office sites. Whilst this is still an area of emerging local policy, the City Council has stated that after 1 September 2015, *"in the core CAZ, Named Streets and Opportunity Areas, housing is no longer acceptable in principle where it results in the loss of office floorspace"*¹. This site lies within the core CAZ as defined by the 2010 City of Westminster Proposal Map, however, on the basis that the application was submitted prior to 1 September 2015, GLA officers understand that the proposal does not generate an 'in principle' objection from the City Council.

¹http://transact.westminster.gov.uk/docstores/publications_store/Statement%20on%20office%20to%20resi%2022nd%20July%202015.pdf

18 Having regard to the above (including the particular characteristics of this CAZ location), GLA officers are of the view that the proposed loss of office space (through conversion of the Millbank Complex to a residential-led mix of uses) is acceptable in strategic planning terms. Furthermore, it is noted more generally that the increased viability associated with a residential-led scheme in this location (as opposed to office renewal) would enable a higher quality refurbishment of this prominent heritage asset on the River Thames. As discussed below, the enabled delivery of a new cultural facility to complement Tate Britain is also a key benefit of the scheme.

Housing

19 The proposal includes 215 residential flats within the Millbank Tower. The proposed delivery of these units is supported in accordance with London Plan policies 2.11 (CAZ strategic functions) and 3.3 (increasing housing supply). The proposed residential schedule is set out in the table below.

Unit type	Private market	Proportion of mix
One bedroom	74	34%
Two bedroom	109	51%
Three bedroom	30	14%
Four bedroom	2	1%
Total	215	100%

20 London Plan Policy 3.12 seeks the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing, and requires that such provision is made on-site - unless exceptional circumstances justify otherwise (refer to Policy 3.12, part C, and Housing SPG).

21 The housing provision proposed in this case is entirely for private market sale. The applicant states that due to the proposal to deliver an arts/cultural facility at south podium (refer below) it is not viable for this scheme to provide affordable housing. The applicant has submitted an affordable housing viability statement, and Westminster City Council is understood to be in the process of having this independently reviewed. GLA officers will update the Mayor of the findings of the review, and of any subsequent revision to the affordable housing offer, at the decision making stage.

22 GLA officers acknowledge that delivery of the proposed cultural facility may represent a significant financial burden on the scheme (where this would not be supported by other funding streams). However, on the basis that this site may be selected to accommodate the London Holocaust Memorial and Museum, it is understood that there is potential for it to benefit from associated funding of up to £50 million. Accordingly, GLA officers encourage the City Council to design a Section 106 review mechanism and/or contribution cascade that (under a windfall funding scenario) would divert a reasonable proportion of the scheme's enabling funding for the culture facility towards the provision of additional affordable housing units.

23 With respect to housing matters more generally, GLA officers are satisfied that the balance of unit types (including 15% family sized dwellings) is acceptable in this case. Furthermore, a strategic review of the proposed residential layouts confirms that these would be generously proportioned dwellings that respond well to the design quality benchmarks established within the Mayor's Housing SPG. The applicant has also stated the commitment to ensure that all units would meet the 'Lifetime Homes' standard and that 10% of the provision would be wheelchair accessible/adaptable. This is supported, however, noting that new national housing standards now apply as part of Building Regulations, the City Council is advised to

include planning conditions to secure standards M4(2) and M4(3) as per the Mayor's proposed minor alterations to London Plan Policy 3.8.

24 The proposed landscaped garden area to the west of the complex (totalling 4,258 sq.m.) would offer valuable amenity space for the scheme, and it is understood that 915 sq.m. of this space is proposed to be dedicated to play and recreation. This would comfortably meet the on-site play space requirement for this scheme based on the Mayor's Play and informal recreation SPG, and is supported in line with London Plan Policy 3.6.

25 The applicant has stated that the proposed residential density is 425 habitable rooms per hectare. This falls below the range typically identified for a site of these characteristics (650 to 1,100 habitable rooms per hectare), however, having regard to the urban design and heritage considerations below, GLA officers support the proposed building conversion approach, and are satisfied that the proposal optimises the housing potential of this site in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.4.

Culture

26 The scheme includes 4,737 sq.m. of Class D1 floorspace at the south podium. This represents a unique opportunity to provide a culture facility to complement Tate Britain, and to support the agglomeration of a cultural cluster at this part of Millbank in accordance with London Plan Policy 4.6, and emerging guidance within the draft CAZ SPG. The end user for this facility is not yet confirmed, however, as discussed above there is potential for this site to be chosen as the location for London's Holocaust Memorial and Museum. In the absence of certainty at this point (and with a view to activating this facility as soon as possible), the applicant is strongly encouraged to engage in early discussions with a range of potential occupiers for this space. This will be important to generate operator interest, and to scope out occupier specifications (for example with respect to floorspace quantum and layout, and access to outdoor space). The applicant advised GLA officers at pre-application stage that it would be willing to revisit the detailed design of the culture facility within the scheme where this is necessary in order to reasonably respond to end user requirements. This is strongly supported.

Visitor infrastructure

27 The scheme includes the provision of a 195 bedroom hotel within 'Y'-building. At this stage an operator has not been identified, however, it is understood that the product is likely to be aimed at the four-star market. The hotel would also include ancillary gym/restaurants/cafes as well as public access to a viewing gallery within Millbank Tower. The proposed provision of this visitor infrastructure is supported in strategic planning terms. In line with London Plan Policy 4.5 the City Council should include a planning condition requiring that at least 10% of the proposed hotel bedrooms are wheelchair accessible.

Urban design

28 The design vision seeks to remain true to the distinctive form and simplicity of the Millbank Complex. Based on the submitted plans GLA officers are of the view that the proposed refurbishment and conversion of this heritage asset would be high quality (refer below), and the overall design of the scheme is broadly supported in strategic planning terms.

29 Millbank Tower stands as a prominent feature on the Thames riverside, significantly taller than its neighbours. Accordingly, the proposed additional three-storeys of height (at both Millbank Tower and the 'Y'-block) would result in little change in terms of its relationship with its immediate setting. Notwithstanding this, the additional height would result in some impact

when viewed from mid-range townscape views and strategic views. This is considered in the strategic views section below.

30 With respect to the ground plane, the proposed increased activation of the embankment edge of the site would be a significant enhancement for the both Millbank Complex and the adjacent public realm – and is particularly welcomed.

31 The landscaped area to the rear of the site is a significant asset for the scheme. Whilst it is recognised that it will be necessary for this space to offer amenity to the proposed residential flats, GLA officers strongly encourage the applicant to explore opportunities for this space to contribute to a wider provision of public/semi-public realm – potentially in conjunction with the proposed cultural facility.

Historic environment

Refurbishment of Grade II Listed Building

32 Having regard to the submitted Heritage Impact Assessment, GLA officers are of the view that the value of this heritage asset has been carefully considered as part of the proposed refurbishment and conversion scheme. The approach to building cladding appears particularly well considered – and would retain the fundamental composition and appearance of elevations, whilst providing a considerably more energy efficient skin for the building.

33 The proposed increase in height (additional three-storeys) at both Millbank Tower and the ‘Y’-block, and the alterations to the podium, are not considered to harm the important interrelationship between the three key parts of the Listed Building. Indeed, it is noted that the proposals for the roofscape would deliver a number of enhancements to the Complex – including a decluttering of the crown of Millbank Tower, and inclusion of a public viewing gallery.

34 Whilst it is recognised that the proposal would result in a change from the Listed Building’s historic use, having regard to the quality of the proposed refurbishment (which will help to secure the long-term future of this building) and the public benefits of the scheme (including the rooftop viewing gallery and cultural space), GLA officers are of the view that the proposed approach is justified and consistent with the sustainable conservation of this asset. Moreover, having had special regard to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings, their settings and any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess, GLA officers support the proposed refurbishment and conversion of the complex to residential-led mixed use in accordance with London Plan Policy 7.9.

Response to historic context

35 The Millbank Complex is adjacent to two Conservation Areas – the Smith Square Conservation Area (to the north) and the Millbank Conservation Area (to the south), there are also various Listed Buildings in the vicinity including Tate Britain (Grade II*), Thames House (Grade II) and Millbank Estate (Grade II). Having regard to comments in paragraph 29 above, GLA officers are of the view that the proposal would not result in harm to the neighbouring heritage assets. Indeed, officers are of the view that the building refurbishment and increased activation at the ground floor would enhance the setting of the aforementioned assets.

36 In longer views Millbank Tower will continue to be seen in the context of the Palace of Westminster World Heritage Site (Grade I). London Plan Policy 7.10 states that development should not cause adverse impacts on World Heritage Sites or their settings, and, in particular, should not compromise the ability to appreciate Outstanding Universal Value, integrity, authenticity or significance. In this case it is concluded that principal effect on the World Heritage Site would be a visual change to its setting occurring as a result of the three-storey Millbank Tower roof extension. Related consideration is set out within the strategic views section below – the applicant should address associated matters to ensure accordance with London Plan Policy 7.10.

Strategic views

37 The applicant has submitted a Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment which includes various visualisations of the scheme from key viewpoints – representing the proposal as a wire outline on the horizon. It is acknowledged that the Grade II Listed Millbank Tower currently represents a prominent feature in a number of townscape and river prospect views. Accordingly, in general terms, the proposed additional three-storeys on Millbank Tower results in little change – and would essentially preserve the fundamental composition of the cityscape. However, given the relationship of the site to the Palace of Westminster World Heritage Site (Grade I), and the high sensitivity of that asset, particularly careful consideration must be given to the proposed impact in instances where these Listed Buildings would be seen together in close proximity. In order to facilitate this assessment (and as previously discussed with the applicant team) GLA officers seek a fully rendered visualisation of the proposal in London View Management Framework view 18A.3 and townscape view ‘Parliament Square, north-east’.

Inclusive access

38 The applicant has set out its response to access and inclusion within the design and access statement. GLA officers support the stated commitment to ensure equal and convenient access throughout the development, and note that, in particular, the refurbishment scheme presents a valuable opportunity to enhance the accessibility of this heritage asset, and to deliver a new inclusive cultural venue for the capital.

39 Based on the material provided it is evident that the building entrances would be legible, accessible and uncluttered. Internally the proposed refurbishment has been well resolved, with floorplans and circulation routes generously proportioned and well laid out. The landscaping details confirm that the garden area to the rear of the Complex would be generally well handled with respect to access considerations, however, clarification is sought with respect to the detail of the vehicular drop off arrangement to the hotel entrance foyer – in order to ensure that pedestrian routes along this part of Millbank would be safe and inclusive.

Sustainable development

Energy strategy

40 For the purposes of assessing applications against the carbon dioxide savings target within London Plan Policy 5.2, the Mayor now applies a 35% reduction target beyond Part L 2013 of Building Regulations. In accordance with the principles of Policy 5.2 the applicant has submitted an energy statement for the proposed refurbishment scheme, setting out how the development proposes to reduce carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the London Plan energy hierarchy. In summary, the proposed strategy comprises: energy efficiency measures (including low energy lighting and mechanical ventilation with heat recovery); a single energy centre (driven by a gas fired combined heat and power unit (CHP)) capable of connection to a district network in future;

and, a water source heat pump. Overall the strategy would achieve a 37% carbon dioxide saving, which would exceed the target within London Plan Policy 5.2.

41 The proposed strategy is broadly supported in strategic planning terms, however, GLA officers seek further discussion/information with respect to the following matters:

- **Efficiency:** GLA officers seek further discussion with respect to the constraints that the Listed Building refurbishment is placing on energy efficiency performance. To support this, the applicant should confirm the total site-wide emission figures, at each stage of the energy hierarchy, for the whole development (n.b. only figures for commercial spaces appear to have been provided to date). Sample SAP calculation worksheets should also be provided to support the savings claimed.
- **Cooling:** GLA officers would welcome further information on how the risk of overheating will be mitigated (to include consideration of any possible additional passive measures that could reduce this risk further).
- **CHP:** The applicant should provide information on how the CHP has been sized - including details on typical monthly demand profiles for heating, cooling and electrical loads, and whether the system will include a thermal store. The applicant should also provide a manufacturers data sheet for the proposed CHP engine - so that the assumed efficiencies may be verified.
- **Renewables:** The applicant should provide further information on how the water source heat pump system will work in conjunction with the CHP.

Climate change adaptation

42 The proposed roofscape strategy for the scheme includes a mix of biodiverse green roof as well as more formally planted roof terrace areas as part of a contribution towards the enhancement of green infrastructure within the CAZ. This provision is strongly supported and, in conjunction with the landscape area to the west of the Complex, this will positively contribute to the proposed sustainable urban drainage strategy in accordance with London Plan policies 5.10, 5.11 and 5.13. The City Council is encouraged to secure detailed approval of these climate change adaptation measures by way of planning condition. Given the riverside location of this site, the applicant is also invited to consider a site drainage approach that would discharge residual surface water directly to the River Thames (rather than the sewer network).

Transport

Car parking

43 The proposal would increase the existing level of car parking on site from 130 spaces to 215 spaces - comprising 211 residential spaces (21% wheelchair accessible spaces) and two spaces each for the hotel and cultural uses (all four to be wheelchair accessible). Provision of electric vehicle charging points is proposed in accordance with London Plan standards.

44 TfL is of the view that the level of residential car parking proposed (equivalent to a ratio of 0.98 spaces per unit) is excessive for a site of this level of public transport accessibility. London Plan Policy 6.13 and the Housing SPG seek that development in areas of good public transport accessibility should aim for significantly less than one space per unit. Accordingly, residential car parking levels should be reduced.

45 Notwithstanding the above concern with respect to the level of residential car parking, the City Council should ensure that London Plan standards with respect to wheelchair parking provision and EVCPs are secured for the agreed parking level by way of planning condition/obligation.

Cycle parking

46 The applicant proposes 495 cycle parking spaces in order to meet the level required by London Plan Policy 6.13. Whilst this is supported, it is unclear where the 103 short stay spaces are to be provided. The location and type of these spaces should be identified by the applicant. TfL expects these to be visible and easily accessible to visitors to the site. The design of detailed cycle storage design should then be secured by way of planning condition.

Coach and taxi provision

47 Adequate local coach parking facilities exist to serve the proposed hotel development. TfL will, nevertheless, review the potential need to provide a taxi rank following the receipt of additional information regarding the proposed changes to parking provision indicated for the site's Millbank frontage.

Trip generation

48 Trip generation has been carried out using 'TRICS' sites and census data. Despite some minor inaccuracies (discussed separately with the Council), the exercise demonstrates a net reduction in overall trip levels, albeit, with a minor to moderate increases in peak hour trip generation in the car/taxi/walk modes.

Pedestrian environment

49 It is understood that the development would bring forward improvements to the public realm within the vicinity of the site (the majority of which would relate to public highway within TfL's jurisdiction). This is supported in principle, however, the applicant is advised that TfL seeks further detailed information in order to determine the acceptability of any changes to parking/road space use, kerb alignments or materials. It is also noted that a proposed reduction in footpath width (along with a realignment of the kerblines where Thorney Street meets Millbank) is proposed for Thorney Street - in order to facilitate access to a relocated servicing/loading area accessed from that road. Vehicle tracking should also be provided to demonstrate that delivery vehicles can safely enter and exit Thorney Street from Millbank.

50 Further information regarding construction management should be provided to demonstrate that the development is able to proceed without impacting upon access to or use of the adjacent Cycle Hire docking station.

Servicing and construction

51 A Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP) in line with TfL guidance should be secured by planning condition/obligation. This should be submitted and approved prior to first occupation.

52 The applicant has proposed that all construction vehicles will conform to the Construction Logistics and Cyclist Safety (CLOCS) requirements as well as being registered to the Fleet Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS) to maintain the safety of third parties. This is welcomed by TfL and should be incorporated within the subsequent detailed Construction Logistics Plan, to be secured by planning condition/obligation.

Travel Plan

53 A draft Travel Plan for the proposed uses has been provided as an appendix to the transport assessment. This is of a good quality, though the subsequent detailed Travel Plan(s), shall be required to be secured, funded and monitored through a Section 106 agreement - with a range of the indicated potential measures developed into specific agreed outcomes.

Crossrail

54 In accordance with London Plan Policy 8.3, the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) came into effect on 1 April 2012. All new development that creates 100 sq.m. or more additional floor space is liable to pay the Mayoral CIL. The levy is charged at £50 per square metre of additional floor space in the City of Westminster.

55 This site is also in the area where Section 106 contributions for Crossrail will be sought in accordance with London Plan Policy 6.5 and the associated Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 'Use of planning obligations in the funding of Crossrail'. However, on the understanding that the development would result in a net reduction in chargeable floorspace, a Crossrail Section 106 contribution would not be expected to arise in this case.

Local planning authority's position

56 Westminster City Council is expected to formally consider the application at a planning committee meeting in November/December 2015.

Legal considerations

57 Under the arrangements set out in Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor is required to provide the local planning authority with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that view. Unless notified otherwise by the Mayor, the City Council must consult the Mayor again under Article 5 of the Order if it subsequently resolves to make a draft decision on the application, in order that the Mayor may decide whether to allow the draft decision to proceed unchanged, or direct the City Council under Article 6 of the Order to refuse the application, or issue a direction under Article 7 of the Order that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application and any connected application. There is no obligation at this present stage for the Mayor to indicate his intentions regarding a possible direction, and no such decision should be inferred from the Mayor's statement and comments.

58 Pursuant to section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the Mayor must have special regard to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings, their settings, or any features of special architectural or historic interest that they may possess.

Financial considerations

59 There are no financial considerations at this stage.

Conclusion

60 London Plan policies on CAZ, office, housing, culture, visitor infrastructure, urban design, historic environment, strategic views, inclusive access, sustainable development and transport are relevant to this application. Whilst the scheme is generally acceptable in strategic planning terms, the application does not yet fully comply with the London Plan as set out below:

- **CAZ:** The proposed provision of residential, cultural and hotel uses at this CAZ site is supported in accordance with London Plan policies 2.10, 3.3, 4.5 and 4.6.
- **Office:** The proposed loss of office space (through conversion of the Millbank Complex to a residential-led mix of uses) is acceptable in accordance with London Plan policies 4.2 and 4.3.
- **Housing:** The proposed housing units are supported in principle, however, it must be demonstrated that the scheme would provide the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing in line with London Plan Policy 3.12.
- **Culture:** The scheme presents a unique opportunity to provide a new culture facility to complement Tate Britain, and to support the agglomeration of a cultural cluster at this part of Millbank in accordance with London Plan Policy 4.6.
- **Visitor infrastructure:** The proposed hotel is supported in accordance with London Plan Policy 4.5.
- **Urban design:** The proposals for the refurbishment and conversion of this heritage asset are of high quality, and the design of this scheme is broadly supported in accordance with London Plan Policy 7.1.
- **Historic environment:** GLA officers support the proposed refurbishment and conversion of this Listed Building to residential-led mixed use in accordance with London Plan Policy 7.9. However, rendered visualisations (refer below) are sought in order to facilitate an assessment of impact on the Palace of Westminster World Heritage Site in accordance with London Plan Policy 7.10.
- **Strategic views:** GLA officers seek a fully rendered visualisation of the proposal in London View Management Framework view 18A.3 and townscape view 'Parliament Square, north-east' in accordance with London Plan policies 7.10 and 7.12.
- **Inclusive access:** The proposed approach to access and inclusion is broadly supported in line with London Plan Policy 7.2, nevertheless, further information is sought with respect to the detailed treatment of the vehicular drop off arrangement to the hotel entrance foyer.
- **Sustainable development:** The proposed energy strategy broadly complies with London Plan Policy 5.2, however, further information is sought with respect to: efficiency; cooling; CHP; and, renewables. The proposed climate change adaptation measures are supported in line with London Plan policies 5.10, 5.11 and 5.13.
- **Transport:** Whilst the application is broadly acceptable in strategic transport terms, further clarifications and commitments are sought with respect to: car parking; cycle parking; pedestrian environment; servicing and construction; and, Travel Plan to ensure accordance with London Plan policies 6.3, 6.9, 6.10, 6.13 and 6.14.

61 The resolution of the outstanding issues above could lead to the application becoming compliant with the London Plan.

for further information, contact GLA Planning Unit (Development & Projects Team):

Senior Manager – Development & Projects

email [REDACTED]@london.gov.uk

Strategic Planning Manager (Development Decisions)

email [REDACTED]@london.gov.uk

Senior Strategic Planner (case officer)

email [REDACTED]@london.gov.uk

Our ref: 15/07756/FULL

Please reply to:

Tel No:

Email: [REDACTED]@westminster.gov.uk

Manager - Development & Projects
Greater London Authority
4th Floor - City Hall
The Queen's Walk
London SE1 2AA

Pending Applications
Development Planning
City of Westminster
PO Box 732
Redhill, RH1 9FL

12 February 2016

Dear [REDACTED]

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
PLANNING (LISTED BUILDINGS & CONSERVATION AREAS) ACT 1990

Address: Development Site At Millbank Complex, 25 Millbank, London, SW1P 4QP,

Proposal: Refurbishment and replacement of facades and erection of 2 additional floors and plant enclosure to both Millbank Tower and 1 additional floor to the Y buildings; excavation of basement levels; demolition of rear car park in association with re-landscaping and reconfiguration of wider site; all in association with the use of the Tower as 207 private residential flats (Class C3) and Skybar (ancillary to adjacent Class C1), the south podium as an arts/ cultural facility (Class D1) and the north podium and Y buildings as a 150 bedroom hotel (Class C1). Use of roof of podium building as a terrace with associated alterations. [Amended description]

The City Council has received an application for planning permission for a development which is described in brief above.

Images of planning application documents can be viewed on the Councils website at:
<http://idoxpa.westminster.gov.uk/online-applications/>

Please use the reference number 15/07756/FULL as the primary search criteria.

Allow 3 working days from the date of this notification for images of the documents to be made available on the website.

Please submit any comments about this proposal **within 25 days of the date on this notification online through the "Comments" facility**. Please be aware that your comments will be available for view online. If an appeal is lodged, any representations received will be forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate and the appellant.

For your information the name and address of the agent who submitted this application is:

[REDACTED]
100 Pall Mall, London, SW1Y 5NQ

If you wish to discuss the details of the amended proposal please contact me on the above phone number or by email.

Yours faithfully

[Redacted Signature]

[Redacted Name]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@westminster.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 February 2016 11:22
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: D&P/3716 Millbank Complex - Deputy Mayor's representations

Hi [REDACTED]

Thanks for coming back to me.

I will talk to my director in relation to the clawback option, however I think that the holocaust museum has now been selected at an alternative site, so it is highly unlikely that this funding will come forward for this site.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]@london.gov.uk]
Sent: 22 February 2016 11:16
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: D&P/3716 Millbank Complex - Deputy Mayor's representations

Thanks [REDACTED]

Yes, we received your consultation notice. I am still to fully review the associated material which we received from DP9 at the end of last week. I can nevertheless see that some additional rendered views have been provided - which will be helpful for the conclusion of LVMF & WHS assessments. Beyond that it may be that the revisions don't raise any new strategic issues for us, in which case we may not have much more to say at this stage.

With respect to viability/affordable housing matters, are you able to confirm whether the City Council intends to pursue a review/clawback of enabling funding for the cultural facility in the event of any funding windfall (e.g. for the Holocaust Memorial/Museum)?

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] | Senior Strategic Planner | Development & Projects | Development, Enterprise & Environment
GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY | 4th Floor, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London SE1 2AA
[REDACTED] | Email: [REDACTED]@london.gov.uk

From: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]@westminster.gov.uk]
Sent: 22 February 2016 10:16
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: D&P/3716 Millbank Complex - Deputy Mayor's representations

Dear [REDACTED]

Just wanted to make you aware that we have sent out re-consultations on this one, just over a week ago. Hopefully it has made its way to you. We have a fairly tight timeframe, with the application due to be presented at planning committee early April.

Any questions please let me know.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]
Area Planning Officer

Development Planning
Growth, Planning and Housing
PO Box 732, Redhill, RH1 9FL

www.westminster.gov.uk

The planning department has moved to a digital application process, with a goal to improve the time taken to validate and process applications. It is highly likely that there will be delays booking in and validating applications and your patience would be very much appreciated during this transition period.

Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the sender, and whilst given in good faith, do not necessarily represent a formal decision of the Local Planning Authority unless a statutory application is or has been made and determined in accordance with requisite procedures, planning policies and having had regard to material considerations.



From: [redacted] [mailto:[redacted]@london.gov.uk]
Sent: 09 December 2015 12:22
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: D&P/3716 Millbank Complex - Deputy Mayor's representations

Noted, thanks [redacted]

Please keep me posted on any amendments.

Kind regards

[redacted]

[redacted] | Senior Strategic Planner | Development & Projects | Development, Enterprise & Environment
GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY | 4th Floor, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London SE1 2AA
[redacted] | Email: [redacted]@london.gov.uk

From: [redacted] [mailto:[redacted]@westminster.gov.uk]
Sent: 09 December 2015 12:18
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: D&P/3716 Millbank Complex - Deputy Mayor's representations

Dear [redacted]

It is likely that we will be doing an additional round of consultation as the proposals are likely to be amended. We are currently in talks with the developers.

Kind regards,

Senior Planning Officer
Development Planning
Growth, Planning and Housing
PO Box 732, Redhill, RH1 9FL

www.westminster.gov.uk

From: [redacted] [mailto:[redacted]@london.gov.uk]
Sent: 09 December 2015 11:55
To: [redacted]
Subject: FW: D&P/3716 Millbank Complex - Deputy Mayor's representations

Dear [redacted]

Are you able to give me a brief progress update on the above application please?

The main thing I want to do (with the holiday season fast approaching) is ensure that I am clear on the programme for any impending stage 2 referral.

Many thanks

[redacted]
[redacted] | Senior Strategic Planner | Development & Projects | Development, Enterprise & Environment
GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY | 4th Floor, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London SE1 2AA
[redacted] | Email: [redacted]@london.gov.uk

From: [redacted]
Sent: 08 October 2015 17:28
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] ([redacted]@dp9.co.uk)
Subject: D&P/3716 Millbank Complex - Deputy Mayor's representations

Dear [redacted]

As discussed, please find attached a scanned copy of the Deputy Mayor's representations on this application. The original is in the post, and a high quality PDF of the report is available on request.

Don't hesitate to give me a call to discuss once you have had the opportunity to review the comments.

Kind regards

[redacted]
[redacted] | Senior Strategic Planner | Development & Projects | Development, Enterprise & Environment
GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY | 4th Floor, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London SE1 2AA
[redacted] | Email: [redacted]@london.gov.uk

The way that you register to vote has now changed. It's important that you are on the register to vote in the elections for London's Mayor and Assembly next May.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 March 2016 16:09
To: [REDACTED]@westminster.gov.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk
Subject: D&P/3716 Millbank Complex (15/07756/FULL)

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for consulting us on the submitted revisions to the above application. I am now in a position to provide the following officer level response, which I hope will be of assistance.

Historic environment and strategic views

It is noted that as part of the revisions the proposed increases in height at Millbank Tower and the Y-building have been reduced by one storey and two storeys respectively.

In response to initial representations GLA officers welcome the provision of rendered views (LVMF view 18A.3 and townscape view 'Parliament Square, north-east') as requested. Having considered these, and noting also the reduced overall height of the proposal, GLA officers are satisfied that the proposal: would not cause harm to the setting of the Palace of Westminster (Grade I); would preserve the viewer's ability to recognise and appreciate the strategic landmark in LVMF and townscape views; and, would not compromise the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site. Accordingly GLA officers are of the view that the application accords with London Plan policies 7.8, 7.10 and 7.12.

Energy strategy

The applicant has submitted further energy strategy details in response to initial representations, including: residential emissions figures and the sample SAP sheets; information to demonstrate that the cooling demand has been reduced; and, a manufacturer data sheet for the CHP engine. This is welcomed. Having regard to this information, and noting the importance of retaining the architectural integrity of the Listed Building in heritage terms, GLA officers are satisfied that the proposed physical efficiency and passive design measures are sufficient in this instance. The CHP specification information is also sufficient to verify that the attributed carbon dioxide savings are reasonable.

However, no further information has been provided on how the water source heat pump will operate alongside the CHP communal heating system. From the energy statement addendum document it is understood that the water source heat pump will provide space heating from a separate distribution loop, and will not be connected to the communal heat network. Whilst the use of this innovative technology is supported, the operation of separate distribution systems for heating and domestic hot water is generally discouraged due to increased potential for overheating. If the applicant proceeds with this approach, the heat distribution infrastructure within the building should be designed to minimise pipe lengths as far as possible.

Based on the information available GLA officers would encourage a revised approach, where, the CHP is optimised as the lead heat source (including for space heating), with the water source heat pump acting as a top up. GLA officers would welcome further discussion on this with the applicant team accordingly.

Transport

In summary, having considered the revised plans, the position on transport issues is as follows:

- Overall car parking has been increased in the revised scheme so the ratio of spaces per unit is 1.04 – this is not supported given the location and PTAL of the site.
- Cycle parking has been significantly reduced in the revised scheme and the applicant openly states that there is a shortfall of 59 cycle parking spaces. This does not comply with London Plan standards.
- An updated travel plan has not been submitted.
- The construction management plan has been updated, and takes on board TfL's comments. This is welcomed.

- TfL encourages the applicant to liaise with London Taxi and Private Hire as to whether a taxi rank can be provided on site.
- The position on trip generation and impact on public transport remains as per GLA report D&P/3716/01.
- Changes to the pedestrian environment and access will need to be discussed further with TfL – applicant will need to enter into Section 278 agreements.

Please note that [REDACTED] [\[REDACTED\]@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk) / [REDACTED]) is TfL's new case officer for this scheme. [REDACTED] can provide further detail on the transport position on request.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] | Senior Strategic Planner | Development & Projects | Development, Enterprise & Environment
GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY | 4th Floor, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London SE1 2AA
[REDACTED] | Email: [REDACTED] [\[REDACTED\]@london.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@london.gov.uk)

From: [redacted] <[redacted]@westminster.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 April 2016 15:21
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Millbank Complex 15/0756/FULL - GLA stage 2 letter
Attachments: Millbank Report.pdf; Millbank LBC.pdf; draft minute.pdf; GLA stage 2 letter.docx

Dear [redacted]

Please find attached a stage 2 letter in relation to the above development. I copy of the documents (including the representations), will follow by recorded mail.

Kind regards,

[redacted]
Area Planning Officer
Development Planning
Growth, Planning and Housing
PO Box 732, Redhill, RH1 9FL

www.westminster.gov.uk

Any views or opinions expressed in this email are those of the sender, and whilst given in good faith, do not necessarily represent a formal decision of the Local Planning Authority unless a statutory application is or has been made and determined in accordance with requisite procedures, planning policies and having had regard to material considerations.



ASPIRATION

CHOICE

HERITAGE



please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to



LONDON PLANNING AWARDS 2015/16
WINNER - BEST PLANNING AUTHORITY

Register by midnight on 18 April to be eligible to vote on 5 May. Register to vote at www.gov.uk/register-to-vote or find out more about postal or proxy applications at www.westminster.gov.uk/electoral-services

Run the most famous mile in the world on Sunday 29th May. Register for the Vitality Westminster Mile at www.westminstermile.co.uk

Did you know, your two-year-old could qualify for up to 15 hours of free childcare a week? Apply now at www.westminster.gov.uk/information-childcare

Westminster City Council: www.westminster.gov.uk

MAYOR OF LONDON

[REDACTED]
Area Planning Officer – North Team
Westminster City Council
Westminster City Hall
64 Victoria Street
London SW1E 6QP

Our ref: D&P/3716/GC/04
Your ref: 15/07756/FULL
Date: 25 April 2015

Dear [REDACTED]

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended); Greater London Authority Acts 1999 and 2007; Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008
Millbank Complex, 25 Millbank, London SW1P 4QP
Local Planning Authority reference: 15/07756/FULL

I refer to your letter, received on 13 April 2016, informing the Mayor of London that Westminster City Council is minded to grant planning permission for the above application subject to planning conditions and conclusion of a Section 106 legal agreement.

The Mayor has delegated his planning powers to me, and having now considered a report on this case (reference D&P/3716/02, copy enclosed) I am content to allow Westminster City Council to determine the case itself, subject to any action that the Secretary of State may take, and do not therefore wish to direct refusal or to take over the application for my own determination.

The application represents EIA development for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011, as amended. I have taken the environmental information made available to date into consideration in formulating my decision.

Yours sincerely



Sir Edward Lister
Deputy Mayor for Planning and Chief of Staff

cc Kit Malthouse, London Assembly Constituency Member
Nicky Gavron, Chair of London Assembly Planning Committee
National Planning Casework Unit, DCLG
Alex Williams, TfL

[REDACTED] DP9, 100 Pall Mall, London SW1Y 5NQ

Millbank Complex, Millbank

in the City of Westminster

planning application no. 15/07756/FULL

Strategic planning application stage II 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 (revised)

Refurbishment of Grade II Listed Millbank Complex (including replacement facades, two-storey roof extension to Millbank Tower and one-storey roof extension to 'Y' building, and change of use to provide 207 flats and skybar at Millbank Tower; an arts/cultural facility at south podium; and, a 150 bedroom hotel at north podium and 'Y' building.

The applicant

The applicant is **Basio Holdings Ltd.**, and the architect is **John McAslan + Partners**.

Strategic issues

The proposed **refurbishment and conversion** of this **Grade II listed CAZ office** to provide a **residential-led mixed use** scheme incorporating **culture** and **hotel** uses is supported in strategic planning terms.

Furthermore, issues with respect to **affordable housing, historic environment, strategic views, inclusive access, sustainable development** and **transport** have now been resolved, and the application complies with the London Plan.

The Council's decision

In this instance Westminster City Council has resolved to grant permission subject to planning conditions and conclusion of a Section 106 legal agreement.

Recommendation

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

Context

1 On 25 August 2015 the Mayor of London received documents from Westminster City 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:

- 1A 1. *“Development which comprises or includes the provision of more than 150 houses, flats, or houses and flats”;*
- 1B 1.(b) *“Development... which comprises or includes the erection of a building or buildings - in Central London (other than the City of London) and with a total floorspace of more than 20,000 square metres”;* and,
- 1D 1(a)(b) *“Development which comprises or includes the alteration of an existing building where - the development would increase the height of the building by more than 15 metres and the building would, on completion of the development, fall within a description set out in paragraph 1 of Category 1C”.*

2 On 8 October 2015 the Deputy Mayor for Planning, Sir Edward Lister, considered planning report D&P/3716/01, and subsequently advised Westminster City Council that whilst the scheme is generally acceptable in strategic planning terms, the application did not fully comply with the London Plan for the reasons set out in paragraph 60 of the above-mentioned report. The Deputy Mayor nevertheless stated that the resolution of those issues could lead to the application becoming compliant with the London Plan.

3 A copy of the above-mentioned report is attached. 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. On 12 February 2016 the Council notified the Mayor of the submission of revised plans (refer below), and on 12 April 2016 Westminster City Council decided that it was minded to grant permission for the application subject to planning conditions and conclusion of a Section 106 legal agreement. The City Council advised the Mayor of this decision on 13 April 2016. 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 Westminster City Council under Article 6 to refuse the application; or, issue a direction to Westminster City 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 26 April 2016 to notify the Council of his decision and to issue any direction.

4 The environmental information for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (as amended) has been taken into account in the consideration of this case.

5 The decision on this case, and the reasons, will be made available on the GLA's website www.london.gov.uk.

Update

6 At consultation stage Westminster City Council was advised that whilst the scheme is generally acceptable in strategic planning terms, the application did not fully comply with the London Plan for the reasons set out below. The Deputy Mayor nevertheless stated that the resolution of these issues could lead to the application becoming compliant with the London Plan.

- **Housing:** The proposed housing units are supported in principle, however, it must be demonstrated that the scheme would provide the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing in line with London Plan Policy 3.12.
- **Historic environment:** The proposed refurbishment and conversion of this Listed Building to residential-led mixed use is supported in accordance with London Plan Policy 7.9.

However, rendered visualisations (refer below) are sought in order to facilitate an assessment of impact on the Palace of Westminster World Heritage Site in accordance with London Plan Policy 7.10.

- **Strategic views:** GLA officers seek a fully rendered visualisation of the proposal in London View Management Framework view 18A.3 and townscape view 'Parliament Square, north-east' in accordance with London Plan policies 7.10 and 7.12.
- **Inclusive access:** The proposed approach to access and inclusion is broadly supported in line with London Plan Policy 7.2, nevertheless, further information is sought with respect to the detailed treatment of the vehicular drop off arrangement to the hotel entrance foyer.
- **Sustainable development:** The proposed energy strategy broadly complies with London Plan Policy 5.2, however, further information is sought with respect to: efficiency; cooling; CHP; and, renewables. The proposed climate change adaptation measures are supported in line with London Plan policies 5.10, 5.11 and 5.13.
- **Transport:** Whilst the application is broadly acceptable in strategic transport terms, further clarifications and commitments are sought with respect to: car parking; cycle parking; pedestrian environment; servicing and construction; and, Travel Plan to ensure accordance with London Plan policies 6.3, 6.9, 6.10, 6.13 and 6.14.

7 Since consultation stage the applicant team has engaged in joint discussions with Westminster City Council, GLA and TfL officers with a view to addressing the issues set out above. On 12 February 2016 the Mayor was notified that revised plans had been submitted. In summary the proposed revisions include: a reduction in the proposed height of Millbank Tower (by one-storey) and Y-building (by two-stories); removal of a proposed additional storey to podium building; a reduction in the quantum of residential units from 215 to 207; a reduction in the quantum of hotel rooms from 195 to 150; removal of a proposed courtyard infill; a reduced extent of demolition; alterations to basements (including one less basement level); alterations to landscaping and servicing; the provision of a new terrace atop the podium building; and, relocation of the skybar to the top of Millbank Tower.

8 On 14 March 2016 the Mayor published the Parking Standards and Housing Standards Minor Alterations to the London Plan. Therefore, for the purposes of Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, these minor alterations are now operative as part of the London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2011). At the same time, the Mayor also published his Housing SPG (2016) and Central Activities Zone SPG (2016).

9 Having regard to the above, and the various planning conditions and obligations proposed as part of Westminster City Council's draft decision on the case, the response to the various issues raised within the Deputy Mayor's representations are considered below.

Housing

10 It was noted at consultation stage that the proposed housing provision is 100% private market sale. The applicant has cited exceptional costs associated with restoration of the Listed Building, and delivery of the proposed cultural facility, as fundamental constraints on the delivery of affordable housing in this case. Further to an independent financial review of the scheme undertaken on behalf of Westminster City Council, this position has been verified, and the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing in this instance is zero.

11 Following joint discussions with the applicant and the City Council a review mechanism is not being proposed in this case. GLA officers initially sought discussion on such a mechanism given the potential for the scheme to benefit from windfall funding for the cultural facility. However, noting that the draft Section 106 has been designed to ensure that the developer must deliver and fit out the cultural facility (and provide a lease for the facility at a peppercorn rent for 50 years), it is evident that the scheme would, in any event, make a full financial contribution towards the facility. Therefore, any additional funding that may be awarded to the cultural facility would simply allow for an improved specification of this facility.

12 Having regard to the above, GLA officers are satisfied that the application accords with London Plan Policy 3.12.

Historic environment and strategic views

13 At consultation stage the Deputy Mayor expressed support for the proposed refurbishment and conversion of the Millbank Complex (Grade II), stating that the scheme would enable the sustainable conservation of this heritage asset in line with London Plan Policy 7.9. The Deputy Mayor also stated that the proposal would not result in harm to neighbouring heritage assets (including Smith Square and Millbank conservation areas; Grade II* Tate Britain; Grade II Thames House; and, Grade II Millbank Estate). Noting that Historic England has concluded that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the Millbank Complex, GLA officers reiterate their view (as set out within GLA report D&P/3716/01) that the proposed approach is justified in view of the quality of the refurbishment and the public benefits of the scheme.

14 In terms of the impact of the scheme in longer townscape views, the Deputy Mayor expressed the opinion that, given the Grade II Millbank Tower already represents a prominent feature of the townscape, the proposal would result in little change – and would essentially preserve the fundamental composition of the cityscape. Notwithstanding this, given the relationship of the site to the setting of the Palace of Westminster World Heritage Site (Grade I), the Deputy Mayor sought fully rendered visualisations of the proposal from London View Management SPG (LVMF) view 18A.3, and townscape view ‘Parliament Square, north-east’.

15 Following consultation stage, GLA officers welcome the submission of these visualisations in response to the Deputy Mayor’s initial representations. Having now fully considered the impact of the proposal on the Palace of Westminster in line with the statutory duty under Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and noting also the reduced overall height of the scheme, GLA officers are satisfied that the proposal: would not cause harm to the setting of the Palace of Westminster (Grade I); would preserve the viewer’s ability to recognise and appreciate the strategic landmark in LVMF and townscape views; and, would not compromise the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site. Accordingly GLA officers are of the view that the application accords with London Plan policies 7.8, 7.10 and 7.12.

Inclusive access

16 Whilst the approach to access and inclusion was broadly supported at consultation stage, GLA officers sought further detail on the proposed treatment of the vehicular drop off area for the hotel – in order to ensure that pedestrian routes along this part of Millbank would be safe and inclusive. Following discussions it has been confirmed that necessary tactile surfaces will be provided as part of the wider public realm strategy for the scheme to support a legible public realm, particularly for disabled people. This approach applies similarly to the revised service entrance arrangement, and officers note that corresponding landscaping plans will be secured by way of

planning condition. Accordingly, GLA officers are satisfied that the application accords with London Plan Policy 7.2.

Sustainable development

17 At consultation stage the Deputy Mayor broadly supported the proposed energy strategy, which is expected to achieve a 37% carbon dioxide saving overall. Furthermore, in response to initial representations further energy strategy details have been submitted (including: residential emissions figures and the sample SAP sheets; information to demonstrate that the cooling demand has been reduced; and, a manufacturer data sheet for the CHP engine). This is welcomed. Having considered this new information, and noting the importance of retaining the architectural integrity of the Listed Building in heritage terms, GLA officers are satisfied that the proposed physical efficiency and passive design measures are sufficient in this instance. The combined heat and power system detail and specification is also sufficient to verify that the attributed carbon dioxide savings are reasonable, and that the water source heat pump would not conflict with the communal heating system in operational terms. Accordingly, GLA officers are satisfied that the application accords with London Plan Policy 5.2.

Transport

18 At consultation stage TfL requested that the applicant provide 59 short stay cycle spaces to meet the London Plan minimum standards. The applicant has subsequently agreed to this level of provision, which will be secured by way of planning condition.

19 Whilst the proposed level of car parking has not been reduced in line with TfL advice, GLA officers are satisfied that the provision (which includes a 21% allocation of Blue Badge spaces) is acceptable in strategic planning terms. It was noted at consultation stage that Electric Vehicle Charging Points are proposed in line with London Plan standards. Whilst the City Council has not included a planning condition to explicitly secure this provision, it is noted that the draft decision notice would require development in accordance with approved plans and documents – which effectively commit the applicant to delivery in this regard. A condition has, nevertheless, been proposed to secure a Car Parking and Lift Management Plan. This is supported.

20 Following an investigation of feasibility, TfL accepts that it is not possible to accommodate a taxi rank (with drop-off/pick-up facilities) as part of this scheme.

21 In response to initial representations a planning condition is proposed to secure detailed hard and soft landscaping plans (to be approved by Westminster City Council in consultation with TfL). This is welcomed. A delivery and servicing management plan and construction management plan have also been secured by way of planning condition. Furthermore, the applicant has submitted an updated Travel Plan in response to TfL advice. Whilst the City Council has not included a planning condition to explicitly secure this plan, it is noted that the draft decision notice would require development in accordance with approved plans and documents.

22 Having regard to the consideration above, and the advice of TfL, GLA officers are satisfied that the application complies with London Plan policies 6.3, 6.9, 6.10, 6.13 and 6.14.

Public consultation

23 Westminster City Council publicised the application by sending notifications to 611 addresses within the vicinity of the site, 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 Mayor.

Responses to neighbourhood consultation

24 Following the neighbourhood consultation process (which was re-run following the submission of revised plans) Westminster City Council received a total of 19 responses of objection. In summary, the points of objection raised in response to the neighbourhood consultation relate to: land use (loss of employment use, displacement of existing businesses; sustainability of the cultural facility and uncertainty regarding the cultural facility end user); housing (absence of affordable housing); design (increased height, quality of new cladding, loss of original fabric, impact of alterations on the significance of the Listed Building, impact on existing on-site garden space, insufficient public access to proposed garden area and insufficient security of proposed open spaces); amenity impacts (loss of light, privacy and outlook, increased noise and general activity outside existing office hours); impacts on local infrastructure (including social and transport infrastructure); transport (insufficient car parking); and, construction impacts (including noise and general pollution, and risks to existing trees).

25 Late objections were also received from Vincent Square Ward Councillors Harvey, Chalkley and Summers. The Councillors sought to emphasise concerns of residents with respect to local amenity issues.

26 The issues raised as part of the neighbourhood consultation process are considered in detail within Westminster City Council's committee report of 12 April 2016.

Responses from statutory bodies and other organisations

Historic England (historic buildings)

27 Historic England initially raised an objection to the scheme, expressing the view that the cumulative impact of the proposal would cause substantial harm to the special architectural and historic significance of the Listed Building. Notwithstanding this, following the submission of revised plans, Historic England expressed the view that the degree of harm proposed had been reduced (to less than substantial harm). Historic England recommended that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme - notably, the requirement to secure a long term viable use for the Listed Building.

Historic England (archaeology)

28 Historic England raised no objection to the scheme subject to the inclusion of planning conditions to conserve potential archaeological assets.

Twentieth Century Society

29 Twentieth Century Society raised an objection to the scheme with respect to the proposed increase in height, the re-cladding strategy, infilling of the podium courtyard and extent of demolition. The Society nevertheless stated that it did not object to the proposed change of use or internal alterations. The Society did not comment on the revisions to the application.

Council for British Archaeology

30 The Council for British Archaeology raised an objection to the scheme expressing the view that: the Listed Building should be retained in office use; the re-cladding system would adversely alter the appearance of the building; the additional height at Millbank Tower would harm the Listed Building and negatively impact on views from the Houses of Parliament and along the Thames; and, the infilling of the podium courtyard would have a detrimental impact on the significance of the Listed Building. The Council for British Archaeology did not comment on the revisions to the application.

Thorney Island Society

31 Thorney Island Society raised an objection to the proposal for the following reasons: loss of office floorspace; loss of open podium courtyard; widening of front podium; additional height to buildings; absence of affordable housing; design treatment of south podium; re-cladding design; loss of spiral car ramp; and, servicing via Thorney Street. Following the submission of revised plans, the Society expressed the view that its objections to the change of use, height, cladding system, loss of spiral car ramp and absence of affordable housing remained. The Society nevertheless welcomed the retention of the open courtyard.

Westminster Society

32 Westminster Society welcomed the proposed landscaping strategy and stated that it had no objection to the proposed change of use, residential mix, or increase in height. However, the Society expressed concern with respect to coach parking arrangements, and the absence of affordable housing. Following the submission of revised plans the Society maintained its objection to the absence of affordable housing.

Environment Agency

33 Environment Agency raised no objection to the application, but recommended that finished floor levels be ideally 300mm above the flood breach level. The Agency also recommended that the emergency planning team is consulted to ensure that mitigation measures are implemented in case of a flood.

Port of London Authority

34 Port of London Authority raised no objection to the application, but commented that the travel plan should seek to increase use of river bus service by construction workers, residents and visitors to the site. The Authority also stated that a River Licence would be required if the applicant wishes to discharge into the River Thames. Following the submission of revised plans, Port of London Authority expressed support for the proposed river source heat pump, but commented that there was still little in the way of specific measures to promote riverboat usage as part of the travel plan or construction logistics plan.

Metropolitan Police

35 Metropolitan Police identified a potential resilience issue associated with servicing arrangements via Thorney Street. Following the submission of revised plans, the Metropolitan Police noted that servicing arrangements had been revised (addressing this issue). Furthermore, noting the proposed provision of CCTV at the Thorney Street site entrance, the Metropolitan Police confirmed that there are no outstanding concerns or objections.

Thames Water

36 Thames Water raised no objection to the application, but made recommendations with respect to surface water drainage, piling, effluent consent, ground water discharge.

Tate Britain

37 Tate Britain summarised work it is currently undertaking with respect to the development of a public realm strategy for the area, and expressed broad support for the principle of mixed use development at this site (particularly the proposed cultural use). Tate Britain also indicated that it may provide further comments in relation to potential daylight impacts on the gallery. Tate Britain did not comment on the revisions to the application.

Lambeth Council

38 Lambeth Council raised an objection to the proposal for the following reasons: loss of employment floorspace; lack of affordable housing; increased height of tower (due to impacts on the composition of the Vauxhall Cluster, LVMF views and the setting of the Palace of Westminster World Heritage Site). Lambeth Council did not comment on the revisions to the application.

Response to public consultation – conclusion

39 It is noted that, having considered the above representations and consultation responses, Westminster City Council has proposed various planning conditions within the draft decision notice that address these issues.

40 Moreover, GLA officers are satisfied that the statutory and non-statutory responses to Westminster City Council's consultation process do not raise any material planning issues of strategic importance that have not already been considered at consultation stage, and/or in this report.

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

41 Under Article 7 of the Order the Mayor could take over this application provided the policy tests set out in that Article are met. In this instance Westminster City Council has resolved to grant permission with conditions and a planning obligation, which satisfactorily addresses the matters raised at consultation stage, therefore, there is no sound planning reason for the Mayor to take over this application.

Legal considerations

42 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 6 to direct the local planning authority to refuse permission for a planning application referred to him under Article 4 of the Order. He also has the power to issue a direction under Article 7 that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application and any connected application. The Mayor may also leave the decision to the local authority. In directing refusal the Mayor must have regard to the matters set out in Article 6(2) of the Order, including the principal purposes of the Greater London Authority, the effect on health and sustainable development, national policies and international obligations, regional planning guidance, and the use of the River Thames. The Mayor may direct refusal if he considers that to grant permission would be contrary to good strategic planning in Greater London. If he decides to direct refusal, the Mayor must set out his reasons, and the local

planning authority must issue these with the refusal notice. 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

43 Should the Mayor direct refusal, he would be the principal party at any subsequent appeal hearing or public inquiry. Government Planning Practice Guidance emphasises that parties usually pay their own expenses arising from an appeal.

44 Following an inquiry caused by a direction to refuse, costs may be awarded against the Mayor if he has either directed refusal unreasonably; handled a referral from a planning authority unreasonably; or, behaved unreasonably during the appeal. A major factor in deciding whether the Mayor has acted unreasonably will be the extent to which he has taken account of established planning policy.

45 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 City Council to do so) and determining any approval of details (unless the City Council agrees to do so).

Conclusion

46 The proposed refurbishment and conversion of this Grade II listed CAZ office to provide a residential-led mixed use scheme incorporating culture and hotel uses is supported in strategic planning terms. Furthermore, issues with respect to affordable housing, historic environment, strategic views, inclusive access, sustainable development and transport have now been resolved, and the application complies with the London Plan.

for further information, contact GLA Planning Unit (Development & Projects Team):

Senior Manager – Development & Projects

@london.gov.uk

Strategic Planning Manager (Development Decisions)

@london.gov.uk

Senior Strategic Planner (case officer)

@london.gov.uk
