

Motspur Park Gasholder Site

Local Planning Authorities: Kingston upon Thames and Merton
LPA references: 25/02562/FUL (Kingston upon Thames) and 25/P2859 (Merton)

Strategic planning application stage 2 referral

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

The proposal

Cross-boundary residential-led redevelopment to provide 586 residential units (35% affordable by habitable room) in buildings up to 20-storeys in height with landscaped open space and associated works.

The applicant

The applicant is **Berkeley Homes** and the architect is **Maccreeanor Lavington**.

Key dates

GLA pre-application meetings: 30 April 2025 (Level 1 in principle pre-application) and 18 September 2025

GLA stage 1 report: 1 December 2025

LPA Planning Committee decision: 11 March 2026

Strategic issues summary

Having regard to the details of the applications, the matters set out in the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames Council (RBK) committee report and draft decision notice as well as other relevant matters, it is considered that the proposal would have a significant impact on the implementation of the London Plan policies on housing and affordable housing, and that there are sound reasons for the Mayor to intervene in this particular case and issue a direction under Article 7 of the Order 2008.

The Council's decision

In this instance RBK has resolved to refuse planning permission, whilst the London Borough of Merton (LBM) has failed to determine the application within the statutory determination period.

Recommendation

That a Direction is made pursuant to Article 7 of the 2008 Order and that both the RBK and LBM be advised that the Mayor will act as the local planning authority for the purposes of determining this application.

Context

1. On 22 October 2025 and on 18 November 2025, the Mayor of London received documents from the RBK and LBM) 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:
 - **Category 1A:** *“Development which comprises or includes the provision of more than 150 houses, flats, or houses and flats”*; and
 - **Category 3D:** *“Development (a) on land allocated as Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land in the development plan, in proposals for such a plan, or in proposals for the alteration or replacement of such a plan; and (b) which would involve the construction of a building with a floorspace of more than 1,000 square metres or a material change in the use of such a building”*.
2. On 1 December 2025, the Deputy Mayor for Planning, Regeneration and Skills, acting under delegated authority, considered planning report GLA/2025/0919/S1 and GLA/2025/0979/S1¹ and subsequently advised both Kingston and Merton Councils:
 - **Land use principles:** The residential-led redevelopment of this previously developed MOL site is strongly supported in principle. The scheme would meet the NPPF para. 154(g) exceptions test and would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the MOL albeit there would be some greater visual impacts. Benefits associated with the scheme, including affordable housing and biodiversity and ecological improvements could justify this additional impact.
 - **Affordable housing:** The proposal would deliver 175 affordable housing units (35% by habitable room) with a tenure split of 50% Affordable Rent / 50% Shared Ownership. Subject to acceptable affordable tenures, this offer complies with Policies H4 and H5 and would be eligible to follow the fast-track viability route.
 - **Urban design:** The proposed layout, scale and massing are generally supported; however, further information and scheme refinements are required in relation to the access strategy into the site with a focus on public safety. Mitigation and ecological enhancement as identified in the Ecological Appraisal should be secured by condition to ensure impacts on SINC are appropriately mitigated.
 - **Transport:** Concerns regarding the access routes into the site should be further considered to ensure the development can be safely accessed.
 - Other issues on energy, whole life-cycle carbon, circular economy, sustainable urban drainage, and air quality also require resolution prior to the Mayor’s decision making stage.

¹ <https://planapps.london.gov.uk/planningapps/25-02562-FUL>

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

Council decisions

4. The application site measuring 2.97ha is located within RBK and LBM. The majority of this (2.83ha) sits within RBK, with the northern access to the site (0.14ha), to the north of Beverley Brook, contained within LBM. This is a cross-boundary proposal for which identical planning applications have been submitted to both RBK and LBM.

Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames

5. On 11 March 2026, RBK decided that it was minded to refuse planning permission for the application, against officer recommendation to grant planning permission, and on 26 March 2026, advised the Mayor of this decision. RBK's draft Decision Notice sets out the following reasons for refusal:
 - 1) The proposed development, by reason of its cumulative bulk, scale and height, would result in substantial harm to the openness of the Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and accordingly would constitute inappropriate development within the MOL, failing to meet the exceptions test as defined by Paragraph 154(g) of the NPPF. The proposal would accordingly fail to comply with Policy G3 of the London Plan which seeks to protect MOL land from inappropriate development.
 - 2) The proposal, by reason of its layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, would constitute an incongruous and discordant form of development, that would be out-of-character with the prevailing built form in the surrounding area, failing to respect local distinctiveness, and failing to comply with the provisions of Policy D3 of the London Plan. The development would not constitute good design and accordingly fail to comply with Policies DM10 and CS8 of the Kingston Core Strategy, the Kingston Residential Design SPD, Chapter 12 of the NPPF and Policy D3 and D9 of the London Plan.
 - 3) The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure on-site affordable housing, as well as secure contributions towards employment development, training and business support, site specific transport requirements, energy efficiency, biodiversity requirements and associated monitoring fees and would be contrary to Policies CS1, CS5, CS6, CS7, DM15, DM3, DM6, DM8, DM9 and IMP3 of the Kingston Core Strategy, Kingston's Planning Obligations SPD (2017) and Policies H4, GG5, T4, G6 and SI 2 of the London Plan.
6. 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 RBK under Article 6 to refuse the application; or, issue a direction to RBK 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 8 April 2026 to notify the Council of his decision and to issue any direction.

London Borough of Merton

7. The proposed development within LBM comprises works to existing vehicle access onto West Barnes Lane, including hard and soft landscaping and new public realm and associated ground works, to provide pedestrian and cycle route with access for emergency vehicles only, new pedestrian/cycle access routes to Marina Avenue and Sir Joseph Hood Memorial grounds. The northern site access is integral to the scheme and is required to enable the proposed development.
8. The statutory 16-week determination period for application LPA ref: 25/P2859 within the London Borough of Merton has expired on 22 January 2026 without a resolution. No extension of time for determining the application has been agreed between the applicant and the Council.
9. Under the provisions of Article 7 (5) of the Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 (“the 2008 Order”), where an authority has failed to determine an application within the statutory determination period, and an applicant has submitted a request, the Mayor may issue a direction that he is to act as the Local Planning Authority for the purposes of determining the application and any connected application.
10. On 27 March 2026, Lichfields, on behalf of the applicant Berkeley Homes, wrote to the Mayor making a request pursuant to paragraph 7(6) of the 2008 Order that the Mayor become the local planning authority for this application. The Mayor has until 9 April 2026 to notify the Council and applicant of his decision and to issue any direction.
11. The environmental information for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 has been taken into account in the consideration of this case.
12. The decision on this case, and the reasons, will be made available on the GLA’s website:<http://www.london.gov.uk/https://planapps.london.gov.uk/planningapps/25-02562-FUL>

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

13. In order to exercise the power to direct that he is to be the local planning authority and to determine a PSI application (within Categories 1 and 2 of the schedule to the Order 2008), the Mayor must be satisfied that certain statutory tests set out in Article 7(1) of that Order are met. These tests relate to a decision as to who the decision maker in respect of the application should be, and not whether planning permission should ultimately be granted or refused.
14. The tests consist of the following parts, all of which must be met in order for the Mayor to take over the application:
 - a. Significant impact on the implementation of the London Plan;

- b. Significant effects on more than one borough; and,
 - c. Sound planning reasons for his intervention.
15. Tests (a) and (b) identify the impact an application would have on the Mayor's policies and the geographical extent of the impact, whilst test (c) deals with the reasons for the Mayor's intervention, having regard to the Council's draft decision on the application. These tests are intended to ensure that the Mayor's powers of intervention are exercised only in respect of the most significant applications referred.
16. This report considers the extent to which the statutory tests under Article 7(1) apply in this case and whether, therefore, the Mayor should direct that he is to be the local planning authority.
17. Article 7(3) of the 2008 Order requires the Mayor, when considering whether to exercise his power to become local planning authority in respect of an application of potential strategic importance (PSI), to take account of certain matters. Where the proposed development falls within Category 1A of the Schedule to the 2008 Order, the Mayor is required to take account of the extent to which the relevant London Borough is achieving and has achieved its targets for new housing including affordable housing, and in respect of all categories of PSI application, the Mayor is required to take account of whether the London Borough is achieving and has achieved any other relevant development plan targets.

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

18. Article 7(1)(a) concerns whether the Mayor considers that the development or any of the issues raised by the development is of such a nature or scale that it would have a significant impact on the implementation of the London Plan.

Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames

19. Policy H1 of the London Plan seeks to increase housing supply in London to meet the identified need for 66,000 net additional homes per year. In doing so, it sets the ten-year targets for net housing completions for each borough. For the period 2019/20 - 2028/29, RBK has a target of 9,640 net housing completions which is equivalent to an average 964 dwellings per year.
20. Further on, Policy H4 of the London Plan sets out strategic affordable housing targets, seeking to meet the identified need for circa 43,500 affordable homes per year. RBK's Local Housing Needs Assessment (September 2024) provides evidence of an urgent need to increase affordable housing provision with a gross annual need of circa 1,171 affordable homes per year in the borough. The affordable housing delivery over the period 2019-24 has been running at an average of 81 affordable homes per year.²
21. The proposal would deliver 586 residential units, comprising 175 affordable housing units which equates to 35% affordable housing by habitable room. This equates to 60% of RBK's current annualised housing target of 964 net housing

² Kingston Local Housing Needs Assessment (September 2024).

completions and 14.9% of the current annualised affordable housing need of 1,171 units.

22. In August 2023, RBK published a statement confirming that the borough cannot demonstrate a five-year land supply for housing as required by the NPPF. Consequently, the Council has been accumulating a shortfall in housing completions against London Plan targets.
23. Having regard to the above, and RBK's shortfall against London Plan housing targets and RBK's Local Housing Needs Assessment (September 2024), the proposal would make a substantial contribution towards meeting RBK's housing targets, including affordable housing, and meeting London's strategic targets for net housing completions in line with Policies H1 and H4 of the London Plan. Consequently, the proposal's potential contribution towards London's housing targets would have an important and significant impact on the implementation of the London Plan, and therefore it is considered that the test set out in Article 7(1)(a) of the Order 2008 is met.

London Borough of Merton

24. The proposed development falling within the administrative boundary of LBM relates to vehicle access onto West Barnes Lane, including hard and soft landscaping and new public realm and associated ground works. The works are essential for enabling the proposed residential development within RBK. In the absence of a resolution on the application from LBM, the residential proposal cannot be brought forward.
25. As argued above, the proposal's potential contribution towards London's housing targets would have an important and significant impact on the implementation of the London Plan, and therefore it is considered that the test set out in Article 7(1)(a) of the Order 2008 is met.

Policy Test 7(1)(b): Significant effects on more than one borough

26. This application is for up to 586 residential units. Article 7(4) of the Order sets out that where a development falls within Category 1A of the Schedule, namely that over 150 residential units will be delivered, part (b) does not apply. As such, only parts (a) and (c) of the statutory tests are engaged in respect of the present application.

Policy Test 7(1)(c): Sound planning reasons for intervening

27. Article 7(1)(c) of the policy test concerns whether the Mayor considers there to be sound planning reasons to exercise his power to become local planning authority in respect of determining this application.
28. The proposal would deliver a significant quantum of housing, including affordable housing; a comprehensive landscaping and public realm strategy, including provision of play space (on-site and in the nearby Sir Joseph Hood Memorial Playing Fields), and improved accessibility to Beverley Brook; ecological improvements to the site and adjacent SINC; transport improvements and financial contributions, and CIL contributions.

29. While the majority of the proposal falls within the jurisdiction of RBK; the proposed development comprises access works, landscaping and public realm works as well as improvements to play areas within LBM. Subject to appropriate planning conditions and S106 obligations being secured, the proposal could bring benefits to both RBK and LBM, and to London more generally.
30. Having regard of the details of this application, it is considered that there are sound planning reasons for the Mayor to intervene and become the local planning authority in respect of the application. This will provide him with the opportunity to give further consideration to the application and determine it himself.
31. Policy tests (a) and (c) have been met, and therefore and it is considered that there are sound planning reasons for the Mayor to issue a direction under Article 7 of the Order 2008.

Article 7(3): Matters the Mayor must take into account

32. In accordance with Part 7(3) of the Order, where the application falls within Categories 1 and 2 of the Schedule to the Order 2008, the Mayor must take account of the Council's current and past performance against development plan targets for new housing, including affordable housing. The Mayor must also take account of any other targets set out in the development plan which are relevant to the subject matter of the application.
33. In this case, the relevant development plan targets relate principally to supply of net additional homes and net additional affordable homes; the relevant targets are set out below.

Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames

34. RBK has a 10-year target of 9,640 net housing completions which is equivalent to an average 964 dwellings per year. The most recent published housing completion figures are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Residential completions RBK (Source: Planning London Datahub (GLA London Datastore)³

Year	Completions	Target	% of target
2024/25	429	964	45%
2023/24	1,037	964	108%
2022/23	353	964	37%
2021/22	394	964	41%
2020/21	-147	964	-23%

³ <https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/residential-approvals-dashboard-e5now/>

35. As shown above, cumulatively, over the period 2020-2025, new residential completions within RBK have been significantly under target with the exception being 2023/24 when the Council has delivered above target.

London Borough of Merton

36. The deliverability of the proposal is dependent on the approval of the northern access point into the site, which is within LBM. In the absence of a resolution on the application from LBM, the residential proposal cannot be brought forward, and this would therefore impact on the delivery of housing within RBK.

Conclusion

37. For the Mayor to issue a direction that he is to be the local planning authority, all relevant tests must be met. For the reasons set out above, it is considered the development is of a nature or scale that it would have a significant impact on the implementation of the London Plan and it is considered that there are sound planning reasons for the Mayor to issue a direction under Article 7 of the Order 2008.

Response to neighbourhood consultation

Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames

38. RBK publicised the application by sending 513 notifications to local addresses, and issuing site and press notices. The relevant statutory bodies were also consulted. Copies of all responses to public consultation, and any other representations made on the case, have been made available to the GLA.
39. Following the neighbourhood consultation process RBK received a total of 1,103 responses (1,049 in objection, 46 in support, and 8 were neutral). The reasons for objection and support raised as part of the neighbourhood consultation process are collectively summarised below.

Neighbourhood objections

- Traffic congestion, highway capacity and access;
- Inadequate parking provision;
- Excessive height, scale and density;
- Pressure on local infrastructure and services;
- Harm to character, townscape and amenity;
- Impact on residential amenity (noise, light, privacy and pollution);
- Harm to Metropolitan Open Land and ecology;
- Design and layout concerns;

- Construction impacts;
- Safety and crime concerns;
- Flood risk and environmental hazard concerns; and
- Consultation and engagement concerns.

Neighbourhood support

- More housing is needed

Representations to the Mayor

40. At the time of finalising the report, a total of 133 responses (all objections) were received through the GLA's PlanApps website. The issues raised in objection to the proposal are similar to those raised previously, and are summarised as follows:

- Overdevelopment: inappropriate height, scale and massing;
- Visual impact on Metropolitan Open Land;
- Impacts on existing infrastructure, including GP surgeries and schools;
- Impacts on existing transport infrastructure and potential road congestion;
- Concerns regarding the provision of car parking which will result in parking overspill and impact on surrounding residential streets;
- Impacts on biodiversity; and
- Concerns regarding the public consultation process.

Responses from statutory bodies and other organisations

Natural England

41. No objection.

London Borough of Sutton (LBS)

42. The proposal has the risk of displacing parking for existing residents and LBS residents needing to pay for parking permits as a result of the development. The developer will need to pay these costs.
43. LBS residents are not convinced that the proposal wouldn't result in excessive congestion on Green Lane.
44. Potential contaminated material may need to be moved from the site. Soil hospitals will be required and should form part of the Construction Management

Plan. Tracking diagrams show potential conflict on LBS roads for construction vehicles and the developer must engage proactively with LBS to resolve these conflict points.

45. The site is within MOL, Green Chain and has a SINC area of which these designations suggests that development should be refused. The development would be inappropriate development within the MOL and has not been designated as a site for tall buildings.
46. Concerns around parking controls, which cannot be resolved as it would relate to parking that occurs on private land, including the Hamptons Estate and hardstanding by the school on Green Lane.
47. The site is within MOL and the London Plan treats MOL as green belt. The Mayor does not consider grey belt to apply to MOL and the proposal would be contrary to their policy position on MOL.
48. Proposal would be overdevelopment on a site with suboptimal access. The height, bulk and massing of the towers would fundamentally change the character of the area which would be harmful. Openness of the MOL would be lost, which is also harmful. If the application is approved, LBS requests s106 obligations and conditions.

Health and Safety Executive (HSE) - Gateway One

49. No objection

London Borough of Sutton and Royal Borough of Kingston Shared Environment Service (Contaminated Land)

50. No objection subject to pre-commencement conditions relating to the submission of and approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority of an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan; Landscaping and planting schedule; and a Landscape Management Plan.

Thames Water

51. No objection. Conditions recommended

Metropolitan Police (Designing Out Crime)

52. No objection. Conditions relating to a lighting plan, CCTV plan, and Secure by Design have been recommended.

Network Rail

53. No objection. Further engagement during construction is requested. Additionally, NR wish to explore the development providing a contribution towards additional secure cycle storage at Motspur Park station, as some occupiers may choose to cycle if they reside towards the southern end of the site.

Environment Agency (EA)

54. The EA initially raised an objection in relation to this application. The objection was subsequently withdrawn subject to the inclusion of a number of conditions and informatives agreed with RBK relating to flood risk assessment, maintenance access to Beverley Brook's river bank; land contamination investigation and remediation strategy; and landscape and ecological management plan.

Station Estate Residents Association (SERAK)

- Traffic and Highway Safety: Worsening congestion along onto residential streets to the south and Green Lane School
- Poor public transport accessibility
- Residents will rely on cars regardless of the underprovision of car parking
- Loss of MOL and Biodiversity
- Height and massing is against the low-rise character of Motspur Park
- Affordable Housing Viability
- Impact on local infrastructure - doctors, dentists, schools
- Flood Risk
- Toxins from the decommissioning phase of the development
- Misleading visual representation of the development
- Harmful impacts on the residents that back onto the southern entrance to the site - light pollution and separation distances
- ASB
- Noise levels created from southern access
- Inadequate modelling of the Green Lane/Central Road junction.

London Borough of Merton

55. Planning application LPA ref: 25/P2859 has not yet been considered at committee. The statutory and non-statutory responses to the public consultation received by LBM have not been made available to GLA officers at this stage.

Response to public consultation – conclusion

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

Update

57. Since consultation stage GLA officers have engaged in joint discussions with the applicant, the Council and TfL officers with a view to addressing the above matters. Furthermore, as part of the Council's draft decision on the case, various planning conditions and obligations have been secured. An update against the issues raised at consultation stage is set out below, having regard to responses to the public consultation and representations made to the Mayor.

Relevant policies and guidance

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

- National Planning Policy Framework (Draft – published December 2025)
- A Written Ministerial Statement regarding a package of targeted and temporary emergency support measures to drive up housebuilding in London was issued on the 23 October 2025 by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government. Following a period of consultation a final joint point Policy Statement with the Mayor of London 'Support for Housebuilding in London package of support' was published 25 March 2026 [available here](#).⁴
- Support for Housebuilding LPG published 25 March 2026.

Land use principles

Development on Metropolitan Open Land

59. The site is designated as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) as set out in the Kingston Core Strategy (2012) and the London Plan. At Stage 1, GLA officers concluded that that because the site is currently occupied by three redundant gasholders and associated structures and hardstanding, it would constitute previously developed land (PDL) as defined in the NPPF.

60. With regard to the proposal, GLA officers considered that it would meet the NPPF para. 154(g) exceptions test, specifically "limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt."

61. Regarding impacts on the openness of MOL, GLA officers concluded that, when considering the existing situation on site, the height, scale and massing of the proposed scheme would not substantially change the existing skyline in views from the MOL directed into the site and therefore it was considered that the additional impact on the openness of the MOL would not be substantial, albeit there would be some greater visual impacts. Benefits associated with the scheme,

⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/support-for-housebuilding-in-london-package-of-support>

including affordable housing and biodiversity and ecological improvements could justify this additional impact.

62. As part of their recommendation to approve the application, RBK officers concluded that, in taking the proposal as a whole, the harm identified would not amount to ‘substantial’ harm to the visual openness of the MOL and that the development would meet the exceptions test outlined by Paragraph 154(g) of the NPPF and therefore it would not be considered to be inappropriate development.
63. Notwithstanding the above, it is noted from the reasons for refusal that Kingston Council considers that the proposal – by reason of its cumulative bulk, scale and height – would result in substantial harm to the openness of the MOL, and therefore it would constitute inappropriate development within MOL, failing to meet the exceptions test as defined by Para. 154(g) of the NPPF. These matters will be fully considered by the Mayor should he take over the application for his own determination.

Affordable housing

64. The proposal would deliver 175 affordable housing units (35% by habitable room) with a tenure split of 50% Affordable Rent / 50% Shared Ownership. While the affordable tenure mix is not compliant with RBK’s Local Plan, the applicant has provided a financial viability assessment to justify the proposed housing mix and tenure split. This has been accepted on balance by RBK, and the proposal is eligible to follow the Fast Track Route. The proposed tenure mix is provided in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Proposed tenure mix

Category	Tenure	Total Units	Percentage (%)	Total Habitable Rooms	Percentage (%)
Low-cost rent	London Affordable Rent	72	12.5%	281	17.7%
Intermediate sale	London Shared Ownership	103	17.5%	275	17.3%
Market	Build for Sale	411	70%	1,032	65%
All	Total	586	100%	1,588	100%

65. Should the Mayor take over the application, the proposed affordable housing offer, including tenure mix, affordability levels and review mechanisms would need to be appropriately secured by S106 agreement.

Urban design

66. At Stage 1, the proposed layout, scale and massing were generally supported. Overall, the proposed public realm and landscaping strategy was also supported. Further information relating to the safety of the access routes into the proposal

were requested. Subsequently, the applicant has provided additional details within the “Access and Safer Routes” document prepared by Farbrik (date December 2025) which details safety and security measures informing the proposal.

67. Because the site is not within an area identified as suitable for tall buildings in the Local Plan, GLA concluded that the proposal does not meet the locational requirements of Policy D9 Part B of the London Plan, and therefore a detailed assessment of the visual, functional, environmental, and cumulative impacts has been undertaken to confirm the acceptability of the proposal, in line with Policy D9 Part C.
68. At consultation stage, GLA officers stated that mitigation and ecological enhancement as identified in the Ecological Appraisal should be secured by condition to ensure impacts on SINC are appropriately mitigated.
69. The fire safety statement submitted at consultation stage was acceptable, subject to compliance being secured by condition.
70. Should the Mayor take over the application, further consideration will be given to urban design matters, including public realm, landscaping and ecological improvement measures as well as appropriate suite of mitigation measures, conditions and obligations.

Transport

71. At Stage 1, transport concerns were raised regarding the access into the site (from a personal safety perspective) and the quality of the proposed cycle parking. Additional information has been provided regarding the accesses to the site and concerns have been addressed. Concerns regarding the details of the cycle parking quality were noted and agreed to be addressed via condition.
72. A suite of contributions towards improvements to the cycling and walking infrastructure within the vicinity of the site, including a new crossing on West Barnes Lane; Controlled Parking Zone within the London Borough of Merton, funding the signal timing for the SCOOT region have been agreed between TfL and the applicant.
73. The following contributions were noted within the RBK committee report:
 - Upgrade of junction to the south to a priority junction, connecting the development to Kingshill Avenue through a s278 agreement;
 - Stage 1 Road Safety Audit;
 - Electric Vehicle Charging Points (20% Active, 80% passive);
 - 1 x On-site Car Club Bay, 2 x offsite Car Club Bays (north and south);
 - Implementation of the Travel Plan;
 - Travel Plan Monitoring: £3,040;

- Controlled Parking Zone: £50,000 (London Borough of Sutton);
 - Controlled Parking Zone: £50,000 (Royal Borough of Kingston);
 - A commitment to cover LB Sutton's reasonable expenses for condition surveys of Green Lane;
 - Transport Infrastructure Improvements: £250,000 (London Borough of Sutton); and
 - Transport for London Green Lane SCOOT Region Review: £25,000.
74. The following matters raised at Stage 1 have not been resolved: Provision of a contraflow cycle lane on Station Rd from West Barnes Lane to Motspur Park station. This is important because it encourages cyclists to use the road and not the pavement. Vehicle left hand turn road marking would need to be removed. This will require agreement with the highways authority.
75. Should the Mayor take over the application, further discussions would be required with the applicant and TfL officers regarding the above matters. Moreover, details of a Parking Design Management Plan, EVCP provision, Construction Logistics Plan, Delivery and Servicing Plan, Travel Plan, and detailed cycle parking arrangements are expected to be appropriately secured by conditions or S106 obligation.

Environmental and sustainable infrastructure

Energy strategy

76. At Stage 1, further information was requested in relation to various elements of the energy strategy, including proposed energy efficiency measures, justification for the proposed the use of Exhaust Air Heat Pumps (EAHP) within all residential units, maximisation of PV provision, and details of the cooling hierarchy. Additional information and revised assessments were provided which partially addressed these matters. Conditions and obligations are required to secure compliance with the Be Lean, Be Clean, and Be Seen requirements of the London Plan.
77. The energy strategy demonstrates that the residential scheme will achieve an overall onsite reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of 77% over Part L of the 2013 Building Regulations. This falls short of the zero-carbon target set out in Policy SI2 of the London Plan but exceeds the 35% minimum reduction required by this policy.
78. The planning obligations included in the RBK committee report include a carbon offset payment of £328,363 and Be Seen energy monitoring. These matters, including exploring further opportunities to improve the sustainability credentials of the proposal as well as suggested conditions and obligations, will be fully considered by the Mayor should he take over the application for his own determination.

Whole Life-cycle Carbon

79. The WLC assessment reviewed at Stage 1 did not comply with Policy SI2 of the London Plan and further information was requested. The applicant has provided an updated WLC assessment spreadsheet in responses to the matters raised at consultation stage. The additional information adequately addresses the matters raised at Stage 1.
80. The submission of a post-construction assessment to report on the actual WLC emissions would need to be secured by condition, should the Mayor decide to take over the application for his own determination.

Circular Economy

81. The circular economy statement reviewed at Stage 1 did not comply with London Plan Policy SI7. Further information was required on estimated demolition waste quantities, the reporting in the Bill of Materials as well as the Recycling and Waste Reporting tables.
82. The Circular Economy matters would be fully assessed should the Mayor decide to take over the application for his own determination.

Urban greening, biodiversity, and Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation

83. As stated at Stage 1, the proposal would achieve an Urban Greening Factor score of 0.53 which exceeds the target set by Policy G5 of the London Plan. Measures to secure the biodiversity net gain would need to be secured by condition.
84. Mitigation and ecological enhancement measures, including long-term maintenance, relating to the adjacent Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), as detailed within the Ecological Appraisal, would need to be appropriately secured by condition should the Mayor decide to take over the application for his own determination.

Flood risk, sustainable drainage and water efficiency

85. At Stage 1, further information was sought in relation to the Flood Risk Assessment, sustainable drainage strategy, and water efficiency measures. Subsequently, the applicant has provided further information, and all outstanding matters have been adequately addressed. Appropriate conditions relating to the sustainable drainage strategy and water efficiency measures would need to be secured by condition, should the Mayor decide to take over the application for his own determination.

Air quality

86. At Stage 1 GLA officers concluded that the proposal would be air quality neutral. An Air Quality Positive Assessment had been undertaken which concludes that the proposal would likely not lead to adverse impacts on air quality and conditions for future occupiers. Appropriate mitigations should be secured.

Legal considerations

87. Under the arrangements set out in Article 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor has the power under Article 7 to direct that he will become the local planning authority for the purposes of determining the application. The Mayor may also leave the decision to the local authority, or direct the local planning authority to refuse permission. In directing refusal, the Mayor must have regard to the matters set out in Article 6(2) of the Order. 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

88. 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 approval of details (unless the Council agrees to do so).

Conclusion

89. Having regard to the details of the application and other relevant matters, it is considered that the development is of a nature and scale that would have a significant impact on the implementation of the London Plan policies, in particular on housing and affordable housing, and it is considered that there are sound planning reasons for the Mayor to issue a direction under Article 7 of the 2008 Order. The tests set out in Article 7(1) are therefore met, and it is recommended that the Mayor issues a direction under Article 7 that he becomes the local planning authority for the purposes of determining the application.

For further information, contact GLA Planning Unit (Development Management Team):
Carmen Campeanu, Senior Strategic Planner (case officer)
email: carmen.campeanu@london.gov.uk

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