

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

26 February 2008

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 18th COMMITTEE MEETING
Held on 12 February 2008 at 18.00

Old Town Hall, Stratford, 29 Broadway, London E15 4BQ

Present: Lorraine Baldry Chairman

Local Authority Members:

Cllr Rofique Ahmed LB Tower Hamlets
Cllr Conor McAuley LB Newham
Cllr Geoff Taylor LB Hackney

Independent Members:

Mike Appleton
Celia Carrington
William Hodgson
Janice Morphet
Dru Vesty

Officers in attendance:

Vivienne Ramsey	ODA, Head of Development Control
Anthony Hollingsworth	ODA, Chief Planner Development Control
Kathryn Phillipson	ODA, Planning Decisions Team
Richard Griffiths	ODA, Legal adviser, Planning Decisions Team, (Pinsent Masons)
Vanessa Brand	ODA, Committee Secretary

**1. APOLOGIES
(AGENDA ITEM 1)**

1.1. Apologies were received from David Taylor and Councillor Terry Wheeler who were unable to attend the meeting.

**2. UPDATES, ORDER OF BUSINESS, AND REQUESTS TO SPEAK
(AGENDA ITEM 2)**

2.1. The Chairman drew attention to the update in respect of Item 6

Item 6: Update

- Additional Consultation Responses
- Analysis
- Revised recommendation

2.2. The order of business was unchanged.

2.3. There were no requests to speak.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM 3)

3.1. The Secretary read the following statement:

'Members of this Planning Committee need to declare personal interests relevant to the agenda at the beginning of each meeting of the Planning Committee.

'Members will see that the paper for Item 3 which has been circulated lists interests which they have declared which appear to be personal interests relating to Item 6.

'Would Members please confirm that the declarations of personal interests listed in the paper for Item 3 are correct; and state if there are any other interests you wish to declare?'

'Personal interests are prejudicial if a reasonable member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would conclude that the nature of your personal interest is such that your judgement of the public interest is likely to be affected. If, by virtue of your personal interest you have been involved in decisions about these proposals, you may have a prejudicial interest. In that circumstance you would need to leave the meeting during the consideration of that item. In light of the agenda before you this evening, please state whether or not any of the interests declared are prejudicial interests?'

Members confirmed that the personal interests read out were correct. None of these personal interests were considered prejudicial.

4. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING (AGENDA ITEM 4)

4.1. The Committee

AGREED the Minutes of the 17th Planning Committee Meeting.

4.2. In relation to the Actions Arising from the Minutes, Members noted that

4.2.1. para 5.5 The Head of Development Control confirmed that the statistics on returns about compliance with national standards for determining

applications within a set number of weeks will be provided to the Committee as soon as they are available. She was waiting for the software to be activated.

4.2.2. Para 5.6 The revised Development Control Manual will be brought to the Committee in March or April 2008.

4.2.3. Para 7.7 The Head of Development Control confirmed that she had written to the Chairs of the Stratford City Review Panels established under the S106 Agreement requesting that they should submit comments formally for the Committee's consideration in future

5. LOCAL MEMBER REVIEW BOARDS PROPOSALS UNDER THE PLANNING REFORM BILL (AGENDA ITEM 5)

5.1. The Legal Adviser introduced the item. He explained that the Planning Bill currently being debated in Parliament proposes to introduce Local Member Review Boards, which would be set up by local planning authorities and be composed of locally elected Councillors. The purpose of the Board would be to review (at the request of the applicant only) planning decisions of minor planning applications where that decision was determined by an officer using delegated powers. The extent of the Board's remit would be defined in subsequent secondary legislation but it was worth noting that Urban Development Corporations would probably not be affected due to the threshold level of applications that can come before them. As the ODA planning authority does not have a threshold level, the ODA planning authority could receive a minor planning application. To cater for these minor applications, the ODA planning authority has entered into a Service Level Agreement with the London Borough of Newham, which provides for Newham to process certain minor planning applications on behalf of the ODA.

5.2. Irrespective of the Service Level Agreement with Newham, if the ODA planning authority is not exempt from the requirement within the Planning Bill to set up a Local Member Review Board, then members will be required to form that Board to review delegated decisions. The ODA planning authority will not be able to delegate that function to another body. Given the uncertainty within the legislation over the types of applications that could be referred to the Local Member Review Board and the purpose of the ODA planning authority established under the Olympic Delivery Authority (Planning Functions) Order 2006, Members were recommended that representations should be made to seek an exemption from the requirement to create a Local Member Review Board.

5.3. After discussion Members agreed that it would not be appropriate for the ODA Planning Authority, which had been established primarily to have regard to the preparations for the Olympic Games, to set up a Local Member Review Board. They therefore agreed that representations should be made to the government that the ODA Planning Authority should be exempted from the legislation. They also agreed that they did not wish to comment on the principle involved.

5.4. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED unanimously that:

The Committee:

- a. AGREED not to comment on the principle of creating Local Member Review Boards
- b. AGREED that the ODA Local Planning Authority should be exempt from any requirement to set up a Local Member Review Board given its specific function and limited-life nature, and that on this basis:
- c. AGREED that representations to this effect be made on behalf of the ODA as Local Planning Authority

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

6. PLANNING APPLICATION 07/90235/AODODA

Submission of an Urban Design and Landscape Framework as required by Condition OD.0.9 Of Planning Permission Dated 28th September 2007, Ref 07/90010/OUMODA

- 6.1. A planning officer gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report and took into account the Update which had been circulated including the revised recommendation. The application had been submitted to satisfy the first part of condition OD.0.9 which required approval of an Urban Design and Landscape Framework (UDLF) before the Olympic Development is commenced. The UDLF set out the generic design principles which would govern the creation of the Olympic Park for the Games and in Legacy Transformation up to 2014 by when it was due to be transferred to the LDA. An Appendix would be submitted by 31 March 2008 to meet the more detailed requirements of the condition.
- 6.2. A number of the issues raised by the original consultation had been resolved by amendments included in the revised document already circulated to the Committee. Those bodies who had responded had been reconsulted and their additional responses were discussed in the Update report. Discussions were in train with the applicant about making further amendments. In some cases the consultee was in a position to require amendments directly from the applicant: for example, British Waterways could control changes to the waterways affecting navigation. However, there was a need to engage stakeholders, particularly those with conflicting concerns: the balance between protecting and promoting wildlife and plants, which would form part of the Biodiversity Action Plan, and promoting use of the waterways, which would be addressed in the Waterspace Masterplan, was one such issue.
- 6.3. Following the representations received about the need to review the UDLF and to take account of the Legacy Masterplan Framework (LMF) so far as possible, planning officers were now recommending a condition requiring the review of the UDLF once the various related strategies had been submitted. Some information about progress on the LMF would then also be available and the

review would ensure that all the documents were consistent with one another and reflected any information available about likely future proposals.

- 6.4. During discussion Members identified a number of concerns which should be addressed. They considered that the document did not always make clear the extent to which details were illustrative and might be changed. For example, references to the treatment of the Valley Rim had been modified only in relation to the North Park but this treatment might need to be modified in relation to the development of individual sites throughout the Park. Members also recognised that the ecological elements would need to be protected but considered that the balancing factors were not yet sufficiently articulated. It was important that the principles adopted in the UDLF did not prejudice future proposals in the LMF. Since stakeholder and public consultation on the future development and use of the Olympic Park would be beginning imminently, they welcomed the proposal to review the UDLF later so that the emerging results of that consultation could be taken into account.
- 6.5. Members commented that the document appeared more detailed at some points than at others. This unevenness would need to be addressed by the Appendix. For example, no methodology was included for the selection of environmentally sustainable materials. They noted that a condition defining the contents of the Appendix was no longer recommended. They requested that the Appendix should be required to cover the points raised during their discussion and noted that it would remain open to the Committee to require additional information when the Appendix was submitted.
- 6.6. Members noted that the proposals for the amount of overall open space were consistent with the outline planning permission. They hoped that the transformation stage would be implemented quickly after the Games and were reminded that there was an aspiration to bring the Olympic Park back into use as quickly as possible. The outline planning permission for Legacy transformation set 2014 as the end date for completion of that stage of development.
- 6.7. In relation to maintenance and management of the public realm Members noted that details would have to be submitted in the future to discharge condition LTD5, and agreed that an informative should be included in the permission to cross-reference this. They also considered that maintenance should be included as a critical design factor in relation to Sustainability, Foundation Stone 5.
- 6.8. Councillor Geoffrey Taylor commented that the principles outlining the design of structures within the Park were unspecific. He remained concerned about the visual and economic impact of the IBC/MPC which he would wish to consider when the reserved matters were submitted. It would be a very large structure and its long-term use was important for increasing employment opportunities in Hackney. He noted that the principles of a building fit for purpose and constructed to a high quality design could refer to either a high quality office building or to a shed which might later be converted for use as warehousing. He requested that his comment should be attributed in the record.

6.9. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED unanimously in accordance with the recommendations as revised that:

The Committee

- a) AGREED to the discharge of the first part of condition OD.0.9 insofar as it related to the submission and approval of an Urban Design and Landscape Framework prior to the commencement of the Olympic Development subject to the condition and informatives set out below
- b) NOTED that final discharge of the condition would follow the submission and approval by the Committee of the UDLF Appendix, which will include typical design details and a palette of materials to be used in the development of the parkland and public realm as well as those matters agreed by the Committee
- c) DELEGATED authority to the Head of Development control to agree revisions to the UDLF
 - i. to incorporate amendments arising from the second round of consultation
 - ii. to cover the points raised during the Committee discussion including: flexibility within the UDLF to ensure a balance between flora and fauna and future recreational use of the Olympic park and public realm; principles for future management and maintenance, including cross-referencing to Condition LTD.5; sustainable design principles; flexibility on the application of the valley rim treatment; and the content of the Appendix that is to be submitted prior to 31 March 2008
 - iii. to correct typographical and factual errors before formally discharging the first part of the condition.

Condition:

1. Within one month of the approval of the last of the following documents or submissions- Waterspace Masterplan, Biodiversity Action Plan, Inclusive Access Strategy, Lighting Strategy and the Reserved Matters submission for the Park and Public Realm - the UDLF and its Appendix shall be reviewed to ensure that its Design Principles are consistent with the content of these associated documents; and a revised UDLF document shall be submitted to the local planning authority for consideration of proposed amendments and approval in consultation with relevant statutory bodies.

Reason

To ensure that clear and consistent design and landscape guidance is available to inform the Olympic development

Informatives

- a. The second clause of condition OD.0.9 requires the submission of the Appendix to the UDLF by 31st March 2008, unless otherwise agreed by the local planning authority. It will include typical design details and a palette of materials to be used in the development of the parkland and the public realm. **(Informative to be modified as necessary by the Head of Development Control under the agreed delegation)**
- b. London City Airport must be consulted before scaffolding or cranes higher than planned development are erected.
- c. You are recommended to seek the advice of the Metropolitan Police Crime prevention Officers when drawing up further detail.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS
(Agenda Item 8)

7.1. There was no other business.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 7.35 pm

Signed: 

Chairman

Date: 8/4/2008

