OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY
Planning Decisions Team

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: **MINUTES OF 83rd COMMITTEE MEETING**
Held on 14 June 2011 at 18.00

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

Present:

Lorraine Baldry	Chairman
David Taylor	Deputy Chairman

Local Authority Members:

Cllr Terry Wheeler,	LB Waltham Forest
Cllr Geoffrey Taylor,	LB Hackney
Cllr Conor McAuley,	LB Newham
Cllr Judith Gardiner	LB Tower Hamlets

Independent Members:

Celia Carrington
William Hodgson
Janice Morphet
Dru Vesty

Officers in attendance:

Vivienne Ramsey	ODA, Director of Planning Decisions
Anthony Hollingsworth	ODA, Chief Planner Development
Richard Griffiths	ODA Legal Adviser, Planning Decisions Team (Pinsent Masons)
Saba Master	ODA Board Secretary

1. APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 1)

1.1. There were apologies from Mike Appleton.

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

2.1 There was an Update for Item 5.

2.2 The order of business was unchanged.

2.3 There were requests to speak from, Byron Davies of Westfield, Kym Jones of Applied Landscape and Mark England of WSP, for Item 5. There were requests to speak from Chris Jopson of Populous and Neil Smith of LOCOG and Alice Kirby from LOCOG, for item 6.

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 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?'

The remaining Members of the Planning Committee confirmed that the declarations of personal interests recorded on the paper for Item 3 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 82nd Planning Committee Meeting.

5. Stratford City Public Realm 08/90184/REMODA

Reserved Matter application pursuant to conditions B1, B2, B8 and Q4 of outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA for the Public Realm of Zone 1 (excluding residential area and Angel Lane), including roads, public/pedestrian areas, and hard and soft landscaping.

5.1 **Meridian Steps/Town Centre Link Bridge Steps**

5.2 The applicant showed diagrams of the paving colour palette for the Town Centre Link Steps. In addition, diagrams of the context, images of lighting on the steps and clear route lighting was shown.

5.3 The applicant explained that there would be a pole and balustrade lighting concept for the Town Centre Link Steps. The pole mounted ambient lighting will be required at various points across the steps with the addition of a blue illumination feature to the top of each pole to carry a similar design language througout the bridge. The optional bespoke lighting would be integrated into the balustrade supports.

5.4 Stratford Zone 1 - The applicant highlighted the following:

5.4.1 **Design Strategy** – Identity and connectivity through establishing a hierachy of spaces and creating a memorable experience;

5.4.2 **Linkages** and

5.4.3 **Coordination** – This is on going with Lend Lease and the ODA and includes a cycle strategy, integration between zones and compliance with ZMP, material continuity, colours, types and sizes.

5.5 The applicant used illustrative diagrams to show the move away from the previous wave design and how they have moved on to improve legibility, define spaces, direct pedestrian flows and create a canvas for people, the community and their activities through to a coordinated hard landscape scheme, soft works layouts and artwork strategy to create an integrated public realm.

5.6 The applicant showed photographs of the paving materials, bollards, litter bins, benches, handrails, bus shelters, tree surrounds, vehicle gates, cycle stands and cycle demarcation. In addition, photographs of the Avenue tree planting, the key space tree planting and the shrub planting were shown.

5.7 Road Network - The applicant explained that the layout is very similar to that agreed with TfL/LBN in 2009 and that the modelling had been agreed with TfL. .

5.8 Cycle Parking - The applicant showed diagrams and highlighted the secure cycle parking. Locations of the visitor and employee secure cycle zones were shown to the Committee.

5.9 Olympic Delivery Overlay – Boulevard de-cluttering – The applicant showed diagrams of the Boulevard for Centre opening, for Games Time and the de-cluttering of the Southern Boulevard

5.10 A PDT officer gave a presentation and explained that this revised Reserved Matters application seeks approval for all areas of the Public Realm within Zone 1 of Stratford City, with the exception of the application site area for the CCHP as well as the Cherry

Park and Angel Lane sites for future residential development. The application has been submitted pursuant to Conditions B1, B2, B8 and Q4 of the outline planning approval, and with the exception of those details specifically identified in the report which require further information, full details of the public realm have been submitted for consideration.

5.11 The PDT Officer explained that this revised application has been submitted following the selection of an alternative conservation concrete paving product, which is proposed in lieu of York Stone within Zone 1 and across Zones 3-6.

5.12 The PDT Officer reported that the detailed proposals within this revised application address all of the key public spaces within Zone 1, including all of the soft and hard landscaping, the highways network, cycle parking, retaining walls, substations, public art, way finding, decluttering proposals for the Zone 1 development during the Olympic Games and well as proposals for 10 retail kiosks within the public realm.

5.13 The PDT Officer reported that PDT considers the proposals to be in accordance with the approved Parameter Plans, Site Wide Strategies, including the Open Space Strategy, and Zonal Masterplan for Zone 1. The detailed proposals in terms of decluttering are considered to be acceptable. A number of detailed matters still need to be resolved such as lighting, external seating areas, and CCTV, where further information will need to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. These matters will be addressed by way of suitable planning conditions. In terms of design, visual impact and integration with the rest of the Stratford City development it is considered that these revised proposals will fulfil the aspirations to create a high quality public realm for the benefit of visitors, employees and future residents of the development.

5.14 The PDT Officer explained that the application has been delegated to the London Borough of Newham to determine, on behalf of the ODA, in accordance with the Agreement between the Planning Authorities with respect to Zone 1 Stratford City proposals. This application is expected to be presented at Newham's Strategic Development Control Committee on 21st June 2011.

5.15 The Update report informs Members that Lend Lease have withdrawn their objection to the proposal. LBN Transportation have requested further information in respect of cycle parking and signals at pedestrian crossing adjacent to the Eastern Egress Route; as well as securing enhanced waiting shelters within the new bus station. Additional conditions are required for cycle parking (2 conditions), signal details for pedestrian crossing (1 condition), and for the bus station (1 condition).

5.16 A member asked if the proposed should also include a clear, for reinstatement of those public realm elements removed to enable Games time crowd flows. A PDT Officer explained that the current condition relating to decluttering would be amended to include a reinstatement provision. Another member reiterated the issue, with particular concern for landscape reinstatement..

5.17 A member asked for clarification on the waste management strategy given the removal of litter bins in the public realm during Games to enable crowd movement (7.6.2). The applicant reported that this issue was still being discussed with LOCOG and that a waste management plan would be produced. The applicant stated that they would accept a condition which required the submission of a Games time waste management strategy. .

5.18 A member questioned why the speed limit in the traffic capacity model was 30mph and not, 20mph. The member felt that that applicant had ignored previous comments of the Committee that the highways should be designed for a 20mph limit. The applicant and officer commented that 30mph had been modelled in all previously work on the public realm to date.

5.19 A member expressed concern regarding the proposed guard railings as this demonstrates that the highways have been designed for high road speeds. . The member felt that, again, the applicant had ignored previous concerns of the Committee. A PDT officer pointed out that route AV4 would be for delivery access only and not a public highway route, resulting in the requirements for guard railing on each side of the carriageway.

5.20 A member asked how the saturation would be affected if the speed limit was lowered from 30mph to 20mph. The applicant stated that there would be minimal difference.

5.21 There being no further questions, the Committee took a vote (8 Yes and 2 abstentions) to:

i) **AGREED** the recommendation that the London Borough of Newham be advised that the ODA Planning Committee has no objections to the grant of permission and;

ii) **AGREED** to the deviations and proposed amendments pursuant to conditions A4 and D9 of the Outline Planning Permission, and that these matters can be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, but ask that the London Borough of Newham consider the imposition of conditions and informatives to cover the conditions outlined in the report and as supplemented by Members in the debate with respect to Games time waste management arrangements and a programme for the re-instatement of public realm post Games.

6. LOCOG Stadium Back of House 11/90168/AODODA

Approval of details pursuant to condition OG.3 of permission 07/90010/OUMODA, in respect of temporary buildings at the Stadium Back of House area.

6.1 The applicant gave a presentation. The focus was on the Back of House (BoH) surface material use of tarmac and the visual impact of the retained temporary site offices, both previous concerns of the Committee. The applicant explained that that the ODA remediation strategy required positive drainage and an impermeable surface. LOCOG operations will involve intensive vehicle movements, pedestrian accessibility line and arrow demarcation. Emergency access will be required by the fire brigade, ambulances and police vehicles. Only vehicle grade tarmac as specified would be able to accommodate all of the requirements for this surface during the Games.

6.2 The applicant showed diagrams and photographs of the structures to be retained, of the Greenway and of the existing vegetation. The applicant reminded the Committee that the Greenway would in part be closed to the public during Games time.

6.3 In addition, the applicant explained that the Back of House retained structures addresses the LOCOG "look" principles of Front of House focus, with the Back of House visually

receding into the background. Elevation diagrams of the scale of the BOH in relation to the Stadium were shown.

6.4 A PDT officer gave a presentation and explained that this application had previously been reported to the Planning Committee, on the 24 May 2011, for approval for the Stadium BOH and the Warm-up track Games phase overlay. This application had been deferred by the Committee subject to further information being sought on the visual impact of the retained site office buildings and vehicle grade tarmac surfacing for the Stadium BOH. The Warm-up track application had now been made as a separate submission and is to be determined under delegated powers as per the Committee's previous resolution on that element.

6.5 The PDT officer showed the Committee diagrams of the site plan and the South view of the Stadium BoH, the view from the Stadium podium and the view from the Greenway Western Pedestrian Screening Area.

6.6 The PDT officer explained that there was a requirement for vehicle grade tarmac throughout the compound due to the impermeable surface. This is to prevent infiltration/groundwater contamination and ensure effective site drainage. There would also be intensive use by delivery and service vehicles throughout pre Games and Games phases. In addition, the recycling of tarmac addressed is pursuant to condition OG.5 of the 2007 permission (Environmental management during the Games) and this is addressed by Informative 2 of the Sustainability Management Plan.

6.7 In conclusion, the PDT officer stated that the development is considered acceptable subject to the proposed Condition 3 to require consideration of options for visual enhancement of retained building. Further design details of all new temporary buildings and lighting, is required as a further submission pursuant to Condition OG.3 (this application seeks only a partial discharge of OG.3).

6.8 A member expressed concern regarding the railings at the top of the BOH retained office buildings and requested that the feasibility study in the recommended condition 3 address this. This was supported by other members of the Committee. Another member pointed out that there were alternatives to the use of railings to ensure public safety and that this must be investigated. An informative was recommended, pursuant to condition 3, making clear that the Planning Committee would wish to see the removal of the handrail as part of proposals to enhance the appearance of the retained buildings.

6.9 A member expressed concern about how the applicant would ensure that screening of the retained temporary site office buildings from front of house on the stadium podium concourse is effective. In addition, the member raised concern about how any potential Wrap for the Stadium would be incorporated. Following a discussion with officers, it was proposed that an informative be drafted by officers stating that the proposed stadium FOH buildings will be expected to perform a screening function.

6.10 A member expressed concern that the pale grey colour of the retained site office buildings was still in stark contrast to the dark backdrop. The member suggested that the retained buildings would be more like to be recessive in the backdrop if they were to be painted a darker colour. . Members questioned whether the removal date for BOH buildings should be earlier than the end of 2013 date required by condition LTD.2 of the 2007 Olympic planning permissions. Officers confirmed that as this was an approval of details application it would not be appropriate to amend the date set out in condition LTD.2 of the 'parent' 2007 planning permission.

6.11 There being no further questions the Committee took a vote and unanimously:

i) AGREED to the partial discharge of condition OG.3 of permission 07/90010/OUMODA subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report as amended and updated at the meeting as follows:

- Amendment to informative 2 to confirm that LOCOG's Sustainability Management Plan should include details with respect to the recycling of tarmac surfaces not required after the Games;

- A new informative pursuant to condition 3, stating that the removal of the handrail on the roof of the retained site office buildings should be pursued as a significant enhancement to its appearance. In addition the colour and appearance of the parapet treatment should be reviewed and consideration be given to a darker colour or tone for the retained buildings.

- A new informative confirming the LTD.2 date for removal of all temporary buildings and hard surfaces by the end of 2013.

- A new informative which confirms that all relevant new front of house buildings on the stadium podium should be designed to screen views of the retained site office buildings.

7. Any Other Business

There being no other business the meeting ended at 19.30.

Date of next meeting: 28 July 2011 – Site Visit only.

Signed: Chair

Date: 13/9/2011