

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 88th COMMITTEE MEETING

Held on 22 November 2011 at 17.00

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

Present:

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Lorraine Baldry | Chairman (Item 1-4) |
| David Taylor | Deputy Chairman (Chairman for Items 5 and 6) |

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:

Mike Appleton
Celia Carrington
Janice Morphet
Dru Vesty

Officers in attendance:

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Vivienne Ramsey | ODA, Director of Planning Decisions |
| Anthony Hollingsworth | ODA, Chief Planner Development Control, Planning Decisions Team |
| 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 William Hodgson.

**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 Matt Beasley (Lend Lease).

**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.

'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?'

Lorraine Baldry declared a prejudicial declaration of interest as Chair of LCR and agreed to leave the meeting during the consideration of Item 5.

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 88th Planning Committee Meeting.

The Chair left the meeting for the consideration of Item 5. The Deputy Chair then chaired the meeting.

5. 11/90463/AODODA & 11/90464/NMAODA – Stratford City Zone 2 ZMP

11/90463/AODODA - Submission of details pursuant to condition A1 of the Stratford City outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA - Zone 2 Zonal Masterplan

11/90464/NMAODA - Application under section 96A for non-material amendments to the Stratford City outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA, being the revision of Parameter Plans 6 (Access and Circulation), 7 (Development Heights) and 11 (Composite Drawing) and to vary conditions D2 & U1 to allow for an additional 2000sqm of retail floorspace and an increase in the housing density for Zone 2.

5.1 The applicant gave a presentation and explained that “The International Quarter” would be a 9 hectare site within the Olympic Park and would create in excess of 15,000 jobs.

5.2 The applicant went through the concept and zonal masterplan proposal with visual images of Arrivals Park, Balcony Park, the International Square and Carpenter’s Square.

5.3 The applicant reported that the first Reserved Matters application would be submitted in late 2012. Zone 2 is being utilised during the Olympic Games and will be handed back by ODA to LCR in the first quarter of 2013. Construction would therefore take place between 2013 and 2027, with the first building being occupied in late 2014.

5.4 A PDT Officer gave a presentation. The PDT Officer explained that the proposal before Members was formed of two applications. First a non-material amendment application to amend Parameter Plans 6, 7 and 11 and conditions D2 and U1 (specifically in relation to the amount of complementary retail floorspace and the density of residential development). Second, the zonal masterplan application itself.

5.5 The PDT Officer explained that the non-material amendments included:

5.5.1 **Parameter Plan changes.** The amendment to Parameter Plan 6 involves the relocation of the connection to road S1 northwards of the Woolwich Line Enclosure. The amendments to Parameter Plan 7 involve increasing the height of development in the north western part of the Zone, increasing the height of development in the southern part of Plot 03 within Zone 2 and decreasing the height of development in the southern part of Plot 04 within Zone 2.

5.5.2 **Amendments to condition D2 and U1.** It is proposed to amend condition D2 to permit an additional 2,000sqm of complementary retail floor space, whilst the

amendment to condition U1 would increase residential density in Zone 2 from 727 habitable rooms per hectare to 1266 habitable rooms per hectare.

5.6 The Officer then explained the Zonal Masterplan proposals. Commercial office floorspace would be developed on Plots P01, P02 and P04 in the northern part of Zone 2 and also on the northern part of plot P03. A total of 11,940sqm of open space would be provided. Residential development would be carried out on the southern part of Plot P03 with community facilities located close by, whilst retail floorspace would be distributed in small units through the development.

5.7 The PDT Officer reported that the Update Report contained comments received from LB Newham who had no objections to the non material amendments but objected to the proposed Zonal Masterplan, with the main concerns being:

5.7.1 The impact of development plots on the primary access route from Zone 1 across Zone 2 to the Olympic Park- The applicant has addressed concerns at the extent of the gap between plots P02 and P03 resulting in amended plans being received (this is set out in paragraph 7.7.12 of the report).

5.7.2 Open Space Distribution and Typology – The amount of open space is a little less than originally proposed but is considered to meet the needs of the development in both the locations and intended purposes. The provision of a number of smaller spaces can be more easily linked to the phasing of the development over the build out period. Care will be taken to ensure that the resultant proposals are of the highest quality in terms of hard and soft landscaping.

5.7.3 Development in relation to Westfield Avenue – Almost 40% of the commercial frontages will be active uses together with 30% of the residential area at the southern end of the site, resulting in 58% of the overall length. The consideration of the detailed design of plots through the submission of reserved matters will ensure that activation along this frontage is maximised. The Officer noted that a late response had been received from LB Newham just before Committee. In this response, Newham commented that whilst it noted the applicant's response to Newham's concerns, Newham considered that the response did not address its previous concerns and therefore Newham retains its objection.

5.7.4 Design Concept – The applicants have undertaken design testing that has demonstrated that a range of office building typologies can be developed within the revised parameters. This complements the initial research undertaken in respect of Zone 2 Office Marketing Strategy which has been submitted pursuant to clause 10.13 of the Zones 2-7 s106 legal agreement.

5.8 The Officer noted that whilst LB Newham welcomed the applicant's attempt to set back buildings to open up the view to the Aquatics Centre, LB Newham still had concerns over the supporting columns.

5.9 In addition, the PDT Officer reported that Stratford City Development Ltd (SCDL) had withdrawn previous comments in relation to Plot P03 following the revisions to the plot boundaries and the effects this would have on the route between the Olympic Park and Zone 2. SCDL are now fully supportive of the high quality design proposed.

5.10 The PDT Officer reported that there are no new or different significant environmental effects in comparison with the development approved under the outline planning permission. The variation to the alignment of road S2 proposed in the amendment to

Parameter Plan 6 would foreshorten the length of the road by moving the junction with First Avenue to the north of the Woolwich Line Enclosure. This would secure the centre of the site as a pedestrian area. In addition, variation in the height of the development heights (proposed in the amendments to Parameter Plan 7) to the northwest, would allow greater flexibility in the design of blocks and increase light penetration to open space at the centre of the zone. In the south this increase would allow the maximum amount of housing proposed in the Site wide Housing Strategy to be built on a site restricted by constraints.

- 5.8 The PDT officer explained that the amendments to condition D2 allowed additional retail floor space to serve the needs of office workers and residents. This would assist in activating frontages through Zone 2. The increase in complementary retail floorspace is less than a 1% increase in Zone 2 floorspace or 1.5% of all retail floorspace in Stratford City. The amendment to condition U1 would result in residential density being comparable with other parts of Stratford City at Zone 1 across Westfield Avenue.
- 5.9 Additional issues and considerations to the Zonal Masterplan include connectivity, blocks and spaces, access and inclusion, secured by design, landscaping, environmental compliance and phasing and implementation (as set out in section 7 of the report).
- 5.10 In conclusion, the PDT Officer reported that the proposed Zonal Masterplan for Zone 2 together with the consequent proposed changes to the parameter plans, Conditions D2 and U1 are acceptable and would create a well planned, high quality development on this part of the Stratford City site. The development would complement the predominantly commercial development of Zone 1 and consolidate the residential offer of the southern development zones.
- 5.11 A member asked about the heads of terms for the proposed S106 modification as referred to in the Recommendation. A PDT Officer and Legal Adviser explained that the modification is required to ensure that the parks proposed in the Zonal Masterplan are secured in Part 8 of the Zones 2-7 Section 106 Agreement.
- 5.12 A member pointed out that public transport was not the only issue in relation to density and asked what assurance there was that higher density would not result in a lower quality of residential amenity.. A PDT Officer explained that the Environmental Compliance Report had used the massing of the proposed density in the assessment of daylight and sunlight and wind conditions.. The amount of residential floor space adheres to space standards regarding dwellings of suitable size. The space standards adhere to the current London Plan and the actual amount of floor space will remain the same but over a smaller area. However, reserved matters can also be used to cover the issues of the wind tunnel and the daylight testing.
- 5.13 A member asked if the applicant had confirmed if the building on plot P03 could be cantilevered and whether it would be possible to secure the principle of a cantilever building now. A PDT Officer reported that it would not be appropriate to secure a cantilever building on the approval for the Zonal Masterplan. It was made clear to the applicant that Officers' preference for the building to be of a cantilever structure, and that at the reserved matters stage Officers would examine the building's impact on the viewing capacity to the Aquatics Centre to ensure that the design protected the view appropriately.

5.14 There being no further questions, the Committee, unanimously;

- i) **AGREED**, in respect of application 11/90464/NMAODA to the non-material amendments to Conditions D2 and U1 and to the revised Parameter Plans 6, 7 and 11
- ii) **APPROVED**, in respect of application 11/90463/AODODA, the Zonal Masterplan, and delegated power to the Director of Planning Decisions to grant approval subject to:
 - (a) completion of the S106 Modification and the grant of the non-material amendment in respect of the transfer of Plot S25 from Zone 2 to Zone 1;
 - (b) completion of modification agreement to the S106 legal agreement that binds Zone 2 to vary the appropriate obligations of Part 8; and
 - (c) the conditions set out in the report and amended in the Update report

6. Any Other Business

There being no other business the meeting ended at 17.45

Date of next meeting – 13 December 2011

Signed:



Chair

Date: 24/1/2012