

**OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY**

**ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

13 November 2007

**SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 13<sup>th</sup> COMMITTEE MEETING**  
Held on 23 October 2007 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 Terry Wheeler	LB Waltham Forest
Cllr Geoff Taylor	LB Hackney

**Independent Members:**

Michael Appleton  
Celia Carrington  
William Hodgson  
Janice Morphet  
Dru Vesty

**Officers in attendance:**

Anthony Hollingsworth	ODA, Chief Planner, Development Control
Janet Stewart	ODA Planning Decisions Team
Richard Ford	ODA, Legal adviser, Planning Decisions Team, (Pinsent Masons)
Matthew Foy	ODA Legal adviser, Planning Decisions Team (Pinsent Masons)
Betty Morgan	ODA, Committee Secretary

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

Apologies were received from David Taylor, who was unable to attend the meeting.

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

2.1. In respect of Item 5 the Chairman drew attention to updates to the report as circulated:

### Update

- Note of consultation responses and copies of letters received from Lea Valley Regional Park Authority, Metropolitan Police and London Borough of Waltham Forest
- Clarification to Committee Report regarding site size and building composition, Land Use, noise, flood risk, car parking, lighting and sustainable measures, and in relation to paragraphs 7.2.6, 7.2.7, 7.5.6, 7.7.4, 7.7.5 and 9.1
- Update to reasons for approval and summary of relevant development plan policies
- Amended and additional conditions and informatives

2.2. The order of business was unchanged.

2.3. There was a request to speak by Mr Jeff Chambers of JC Planning Consultants on behalf of the Applicants.

## **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 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?'

3.2. Members confirmed that the personal interests read out were correct and that there were no additional interests to be declared.

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

4.1. The Secretary pointed out that paragraph 4.1 of the Minutes of 28 August was incomplete and should be amended to read: "A Member requested clarification be made to the minutes of 14 August 2007 to clarify that the start up and close down recommendations of the report, that a half hour period for both start up and close down be imposed, were approved."

4.2. The Committee

AGREED the Minutes of the 12<sup>th</sup> Planning Committee Meeting subject to this amendment.

4.3. There were no matters arising.

#### *PLANNING APPLICATIONS*

#### **5. PLANNING APPLICATION 07/90141 FUMODA Temple Mills Lane – Development of Bus Depot**

5.1. The Committee considered the report and took into account the Updates which had been circulated. A planning officer gave a presentation to the Committee describing the application and explaining the Updates (including the update dealing with reasons for approval and summary of relevant development plan policies). The planning officer also summarised consultation responses from the Lea Valley Regional Park Authority, the Metropolitan Police and the London Borough of Waltham Forest and the officers' recommendations. The London Borough of Waltham Forest objected to permission being granted on the basis that insufficient off-street parking is provided but indicated that this should be treated as a holding objection which could be resolved if a travel plan could demonstrate how cars can be parked on site as buses vacate the depot in the morning and with the added requirement of a S106 agreement to secure payment of £10,000 from the developer covering the cost of the introduction of "at any time" waiting restrictions along both sides of Temple Mills Lane carriageway in the vicinity of the site. The Lea Valley Regional Park Authority and the Metropolitan Police did not object to permission being granted but suggestions had been made for the imposition of conditions and informatives.

5.2. The planning officer summarised how the application related to the relevant policies in the development plan and reasons for approval.

5.3. The application before the Committee sought full planning permission for use of the Temple Mills site as a bus depot. First Capital North Bus Company currently operated from a site in Waterden Road in the London Borough of Hackney. The Waterden Road site was to be incorporated into the Olympic Park necessitating the relocation of the bus depot.

5.4. Mr Jeff Chambers of JC Planning Consultants addressed the Planning Committee on behalf of the Applicants. He pointed out that timing was critical in relation to the application and that a requirement to put into place a S106 agreement as requested by LB Waltham Forest would cause major programming difficulties and in any event may not be appropriate. Mr Chambers stated that the technical issues raised by LB Waltham Forest could be dealt with as part of the Green Travel Plan. Richard Ford advised the Committee that when the Green Travel Plan is submitted to discharge the condition, a decision can be taken as to whether a S106 ought to be put into place at that time. If an obligation of £10,000 is to be required then, as a matter of law, the figure would have to be fairly and reasonably related to the development.

5.5. Mr Chambers answered questions from the Committee and gave the following clarifications:

5.5.1. there were currently about 240 parking spaces currently being used in relation to the site, of which about 100 spaces were to do with the bus station which would be moving;

5.5.2. the dwelling nearest to the site was approximately 100 metres away;

5.5.3. the existing section of palisade fencing which was good would stay and inadequate fencing would be repaired; the fencing is industrial palisade fencing; on the Temple Mills Lane side the area of screening and fencing was several metres high;

5.5.4. there were 4 bus routes serving the site, routes 308, W15, W14 and a night route;

5.5.5. there would be no entrance at the northern end of the site because of security issues;

5.5.6. appropriate precautions including an interceptor would prevent petrochemical emissions to drain

5.5.7. the flood risk was 1.3 metres high at worst; the top of the fuel storage tanks was 2.5 metres;

5.5.8. regarding condition 19 the Applicant had submitted 2 reports to the Environment Agency and Capita had submitted a detailed assessment; the Applicant was awaiting confirmation from the Environment Agency and LBWF to confirm that the Applicant had complied with condition 19.

5.6. The Committee considered the following:

5.6.1. One Member sought further assurance that officers were satisfied that the appearance of the building was satisfactory. Officers confirmed that on balance, the appearance of the building was acceptable given the site context. Two Members stated concerns about the appearance of the boundary palisade fencing which is proposed to be retained and where necessary repaired, together with site landscaping proposals. Officers confirmed that these concerns could be dealt with by way of conditions requiring the submission for approval of details of boundary treatment and site landscaping. An informative was also proposed which confirmed that the proposed retained boundary fence is not acceptable and that an alternative boundary treatment should be pursued in discussion with PDT officers.

5.6.2. One Member sought assurance that the provisions for dealing with construction noise were sufficient. Officers advised that there were sufficient controls in the Code of Construction Practice. Richard Ford advised the Committee that the wording of the condition relating to noise was appropriate.

5.6.3. William Hodgson expressed concern that the application was not satisfactory: the proposed development represented the lowest common denominator in terms of design quality and did not meet the regeneration aims of the Olympic programme which he considered should govern all applications. Another Member pointed out that the ODA was under a responsibility to ensure that there is 'proper' preparation for the Games and that the relocation from Waterden Road cannot be delayed

5.7. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED in accordance with the recommendations and subject to the imposition of an additional condition dealing with approving satisfactory fencing and having taken into account the matters referred to above, they:

- a) AGREED the reasons for APPROVAL
- b) GRANTED approval for the application subject to the conditions as set out in the report, amended as set out below and subject also to the additional conditions set out below and with the amended and additional informatives set out below

Amended conditions:

Condition 5

First sentence to be amended to read:

"Prior to the commencement of the use as a bus depot an amended Green Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.,,"

Condition 11

Condition 11 to be deleted.

Condition 20

Correction of the last sentence of Condition 20 to be amended to refer to Condition 19 instead of Condition 4.

Additional Conditions

Condition 25

Prior to commencement of the use of the building full details of measures to sound insulate the workshop areas of the building shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented fully in accordance with the approved details prior to the workshops being used

Reason: to protect neighbouring occupiers and to ensure compliance with policy WPM10 of the UDP.

Condition 26

Prior to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2007, a detailed Sustainable Measures Strategy shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented in accordance with such approval. Details shall include set targets for reduction in carbon emission; and water demand and what renewable energy measures will be incorporated into the building.

Reason: to ensure compliance with policy WPM 21 of the UDP.

New Fencing Condition

An additional condition dealing with approving fencing at the site to be imposed.

Reason: to ensure the development enhances the environmental quality of the area in accordance with policy SP2 of the UDP

Amended Informative:

Informative 11

Informative 11 to be amended to read:

This planning permission does not give consent to the telecommunications mast shown on drawing numbered 437 – 035 revision B. A separate planning application will be required for the mast and associated equipment.

*There being no other business the meeting closed at 7.00 pm*

Signed: Z Balam  
Chairman

Date: 11/12/2007