

**OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY**

**ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 61<sup>st</sup> COMMITTEE MEETING**

Held on 23 February 2010 at 18.00

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

---

**Present:**

Lorraine Baldry	Chairman
David Taylor	Deputy Chairman

**Local Authority Members:**

Cllr Geoffrey Taylor	LB Hackney
Cllr Rofique Ahmed	LB Tower Hamlets
Cllr Terry Wheeler	LB Waltham Forest
Cllr Conor McAuley	LB Newham

**Independent Members:**

Mike Appleton  
Celia Carrington  
William Hodgson  
Janice Morphet

**Officers in attendance:**

Vivienne Ramsey	ODA, Head of Development Control
Anthony Hollingsworth	ODA, Chief Planner Development Control, Planning Decisions Team
Liz Fisher	ODA Planning Decisions Team
Alex Savine	ODA Planning Decisions Team
Chris Lelliott	ODA Planning Decisions Team
Nathan Te Pairi	ODA Planning Decisions Team
Allan Ledden	ODA Legal Adviser, Planning Decisions Team (Pinsent Masons)

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

1.1. There were no apologies.

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

2.1. There were updates for Items 6, 7 & 8.

2.2. The order of business was unchanged.

## **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM 3)**

3.1. The Head of Development Control 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 Items 5 and 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?'

Janice Morphet declared a personal interest in item 6. Members confirmed that the other personal interests recorded were correct and that none were considered prejudicial.

## **4. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING (AGENDA ITEM 4)**

4.1. The Committee:

**AGREED** the Minutes of the 60th Planning Committee Meeting.

## **5. Waltham Forest Core Strategy Preferred Options Report (AGENDA ITEM 5)**

5.1. A Planning Officer gave a presentation to the Committee on the report. The broad spatial strategy for Waltham Forest was welcome from an ODA planning authority perspective, with sufficient reference made to the role that the Olympic Park, the staging of the Games, and the development of Stratford City

would have in contributing to the regeneration and growth sought for the area. There was a focus in the strategy on transport connections and renewable energy. Minor comments were proposed to strengthen some aspects of the strategy.

- 5.2. A member suggested that the strategy could contain more about local links across borough boundaries.
- 5.3. There being no questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee unanimously RESOLVED that:

the Committee

- i) AGREED the comments set out in the report
- ii) AUTHORISED the Head of Development Control to provide final written comments to the London Borough of Waltham Forest as set out in this report and incorporating any additional views or amendments that the Committee wishes to make and to make any further minor amendments considered necessary.

## **6. 09/90395/REMODA - Stratford City Zones 3-6 Public Realm (AGENDA ITEM 6)**

Approval of Reserved Matters for the Public Realm within Zones 5-6 & part of Zones 3 & 4 pursuant to conditions B1 & B8 of outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA, being details of the siting, design, external appearance, access & landscaping (in accordance with Q1 & Q4) including:

- i. Creation of landform to finished levels including any associated earthworks & retaining structures;
- ii. Installation of in-ground services (including foul & surface water drainage and outfall) and associated earthworks;
- iii. The location, layout & quantum of open spaces;
- iv. The location & quantum of play space areas including Neighbourhood Equipped Areas of Play (NEAP), Local Equipped Areas of Play (LEAP) & Local Areas of Play (LAP);
- v. The location, layout and design of the attenuation lake, ponds, water features & wetland areas; semi natural habitat areas (SNHA) & semi natural habitat strip (SNHS);
- vi. Details of materials including colour & transitions associated with paved areas & pedestrian routes, cycle routes & shared surfaces;
- vii. The siting, design & appearance of pedestrian footpaths & cycleways;
- viii. The location of planting;
- ix. The location of street furniture;
- x. The location & design of lighting elements;
- xi. The location of a toilet block;
- xii. The siting of a maintenance building in Stratford Wetlands.

Together with approval in writing to carry out development that exceeds the parameters defined in Parameter Plan 5 (Open Space), pursuant to conditions A4 & D7/D9a of the outline planning permission.

*Zones 3-6, Stratford City Development, Stratford, London, E15*

- 6.1. Craig Beconsall and Tim Urquhart (Lend Lease) spoke in favour of the proposals on behalf of the applicant. They noted that the streetscape had already been approved, and that the public realm would knit the buildings in Stratford City together. During the revision of the design, following design review, they had conducted extensive consultation, including a three day community consultation event in Stratford Shopping Centre.
- 6.2. There was now more useable open space, and the water features had been refined. 95% of the public realm would be delivered before the Games. After the Games the play areas would be added and the vacant plots would be developed. .
- 6.3. A Planning Officer gave a presentation explaining that this reserved matters application covered the parts of zones 3 to 6 which would be developed for Games Time. It did not cover temporary landscaping or courtyards, and did not include the final details of the street furniture, planting or hard landscaping. The application satisfied the S106/part 8 requirements, and the open space requirements. An interim landscape management plan would be required.
- 6.4. Members expressed a preference for the tactile materials used at crossings to be minimised and where necessary not be red in colour, and suggested that gates at playgrounds should be automatic. A member queried whether there was sufficient space for ball games in the proposals. The applicant explained that there were a number of areas suitable for ball games, that were not formal play areas. It was suggested that these areas be signed as suitable for ball games, for the clarity of all users.
- 6.5. It was suggested that when the management and maintenance plan was developed for the area that it should be outcome rather than input focussed.
- 6.6. The choice of trees was queried by a member. The applicant explained that the varieties of oak and scots pine that would be used were disease resistant. A member asked about the sourcing of the Yorkstone paving to be used in some areas of the public realm, and the environmental impact of it. It was confirmed that it would be UK-sourced. A member confirmed that quality of public realm paving should be considered alongside the sustainability of the material. The access routes to the housing blocks in PR10 and PR11 was discussed. It was explained that they had access through the front door, and through loading bays and basement car parks. Officers agreed to review the access arrangements for these plots as it was not clear from the drawings.
- 6.7. Overall members welcomed and commended the high quality of the design. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee unanimously RESOLVED that:

the committee

APPROVED the reserved matters, subject to the conditions and informatives in the report and update report.

**7. 09/90387/FUMODA - Underpass U03/U07  
(AGENDA ITEM 7)**

Full planning application for the siting, design, structure, external appearance and materials for the construction of underpasses U03 and U07 for Games and Legacy modes in accordance with the submitted details.

*Olympic Park Planning Delivery Zones 2 And 8. Proposed Underpasses U03 And U07 Pass Beneath The Great Eastern Railway Within The London Borough Of Newham.*

- 7.1. Simon Fraser (Allies and Morrison) spoke in favour of the proposals on behalf of the applicant. He presented the proposed design and lighting of U03 and U07. U03 would be used for back of house access during Games Time, and U07 would form part of the Southern access route for spectators into the Park. U07 would have a 12m wide temporary deck during Games Time, which would be reduced to around 4m in legacy. U03 would be retained for public use in the legacy transformation phase.
- 7.2. A Planning Officer explained that the Environment Agency had objected to the loss of a reed bed, of which only a proportion could be reinstated in the same location in legacy transformation. The recommended conditions included a requirement to provide replacement provision elsewhere within the Olympic Park. Other updated conditions required the submission of materials and finishes and to provide a CCTV strategy.
- 7.3. A member asked who would be responsible for maintaining the lighting and fences. A Planning Officer explained that it was expected that after the Games OPLC would have responsibility but that this was not yet confirmed. There were already conditions in place requiring management and maintenance strategies for the Olympic Park as a whole and this was secured for this 'slot-in' application.
- 7.4. A member asked whether a decision had been made about whether the public would be able to enter the Park during Games time if they did not have tickets for an event. It was confirmed that this had not yet been decided, but that the crowd modelling had allowed for all ticketing scenarios.
- 7.5. A request was made for the type of tactile paving provision to be reviewed. Members discussed the provision of a 1.1m handrail and noted that the recommended height for cyclists was 1.4m. PDT officers explained that a 1.4m rail height would increase the sense of enclosure to the underpass spaces and a 1.1m parapet was preferable. The risk to cyclists had been assessed and on balance, officers were satisfied that the proposal was acceptable. A condition to increase the height to 1.4m could be added if members were so minded. A member noted that LB Newham had not received a copy of the risk assessment for this. PDT officers confirmed that this could be shared with LB Newham.
- 7.6. A member noted that there was a narrow gap between the parapet and the edge in the images provided, which could be difficult to rescue someone from. Planning Officers agreed to clarify this with the applicant to ensure that the risks to the public were identified and resolved. It was agreed to add this as an informative to the recommended permission.

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

the Committee:

**APPROVED** application 09/90387/FUMODA subject to the conditions and informatives in the report and the update report.

**8. 09/90405/AODODA - Ruckholt Road  
(AGENDA ITEM 8)**

Partial discharge of conditions OD.0.20 (details of other engineering works) and OD.0.40 (temporary highway access) of planning permission 07/90010/OUMODA for junction and highway works along Ruckholt Road required for the Games.

*Ruckholt Road Located Within PDZ's 7 And 15*

- 8.1. James Lough (Arup) spoke in favour of the proposals on behalf of the applicant. He explained that the objectives included provision of new access to the Olympic facilities, improved street scene, and minimal tree loss.
- 8.2. A Planning Officer gave a presentation to the Committee. He explained that the proposed street furniture and signage was Urban Design and Landscape Framework compliant. The legacy transformation highway application was currently with the Planning Decisions Team, and included Ruckholt Road. Condition 2 would be amended to require the final details of paving materials and tactile paving to be submitted for approval.
- 8.3. A member queried what the pavement material would be. It was confirmed by the applicant that it would be asphalt, as this would allow for changes to the highway in legacy transformation phase. It was also the material that had been requested by LB Hackney. Concerns were raised about the impact that this would have on the appearance of the road and on the average speed of traffic. Planning Officers explained that they would continue to work with the boroughs to agree materials that were an acceptable quality and how these would relate to the look and feel of the Olympic Park highways.
- 8.4. A member queried the removal of vegetation on the central reservation, as this would urbanise the road further. It was explained that this had been at Hackney's request, due to maintenance costs, and that trees could not be planted there due to the location of services below. Planning Officers agreed that options to 'green' the whole of the road corridor would be considered as part of the legacy transformation scheme, but that there were limited options within the central median because of services. Additional tree planting would have to be accommodated at the edges of the highway, such as in Eton Manor.
- 8.5. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee unanimously RESOLVED that:

the Committee:

**APPROVED** details submitted in relation to the Highway and Junction

Works proposed to Ruckholt Road as a partial discharge of conditions OD.0.20 and OD.0.40 of the Olympic Facilities and their Legacy Transformation Planning Permission 07/90010/OUMODA.

**9. 09/90423/106ODA - Greenway Link  
(AGENDA ITEM 9)**

Greenway to Victoria Link Submission pursuant to Paragraph 4 of Schedule 12 (Greenway Link Feasibility Study) of 07/90010/OUMODA.

*Link Between The Greenway And Victoria Park*

9.1. A Planning Officer gave a presentation on the proposed pedestrian and cycle improvements from the Greenway to Victoria Park. These works were a requirement of the Olympic planning permissions section 106 agreement and recognised that this was a key route to the Olympic Park for both Games and legacy phases. The works identified satisfied the S106 requirements and would deliver an improved pedestrian and cyclist experience.

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

the Committee:

- i) AGREED that the 'core scheme' submitted satisfied the requirements of the section agreement 106 with respect to the Greenway to Victoria Park link
- ii) AGREED that PDT should write to the ODA giving its approval for the scheme in accordance with Schedule 12 of the section 106 legal agreement.

**10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS  
(AGENDA ITEM 10)**

10.1. A Planning Officer confirmed that there would not be a Committee meeting on 9 March, and that therefore the next meeting would be on 23 March. Briefings were planned on the Olympic Orbit, Olympic Park Legacy Company update, Western Bridge Links and Fish Island.

*There being no other business the meeting closed at 8:15pm.*

Signed:



Date:

*24/8/2010*

Chair

