

**OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY**

**ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 82<sup>nd</sup> COMMITTEE MEETING**

Held on 24 May 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
	(Item 1-5 only)
Cllr Geoffrey Taylor,	LB Hackney
Cllr Conor McAuley,	LB Newham
Cllr Judith Gardiner	LB Tower Hamlets

**Independent Members:**

Mike Appleton  
Celia Carrington  
William Hodgson  
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 no apologies.

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

2.1 There were Updates for Item 5 and Item 7.

2.2 The order of business was unchanged.

2.3 There were requests to speak from Alex Kirby, LOCOG, for Item 5; Chris Jopson, Populous, for Items 5, 6 and 7; Neil Smith, LOCOG, for Items 5, 6 and 7; John Paul Robertson, Tyco Electronics for Item 7 and Mary Jo Craddock, 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, 6 and 7.

'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 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 Director of Planning Decisions reported that the LOCOG "Kit of Parts" document had been circulated, in the form of a CD, to Members.

4.2. The Committee:

**AGREED** the Minutes of the 81<sup>st</sup> Planning Committee Meeting.

#### **5. Stadium Back of House and Warm-up track.**

5.1 A PDT Officer gave a presentation and referred the Committee to the Update Report for this item. The Officer explained that this application was an approval of details application pursuant to conditions OD.0.17 and OG.3 of the 2007 Olympic Facilities and Legacy transformation permission and condition 38 of permission 10/90331/OUTODA.

5.2 The PDT Officer referred the Committee to diagrams, which showed the design and appearance of the two existing buildings, which would be retained/reused. In addition, photographs in the Update Report showed how the planted trees would be used as a screen.

5.3 Issues surrounding the design included the design intent to meet the functional requirements while minimising the amount of overlay and integration with the surroundings, the consistency with the LOCOG "Kit of Parts" document and the visibility of the PDZ3A structures, which are more visible than the warm-up track. The PDT Officer pointed out that even though the ceremonies compound, the most prominent part of the Stadium BOH, was visible from PDZ2 and bridge H04, PDT considered this acceptable given the screening and consistency with the "Kit of Parts" approach.

5.4 The PDT Officer explained that the principle of development was established by the 2007 Olympic and Legacy Facilities permission. In terms of sustainability, all structures would be procured from the hire market and the warm-up track would be re-used post Games. In conclusion, the PDT Officer considers that the development is acceptable subject to submission of further design details as set out in the report and the Update Report.

5.5 A member expressed concern about the Stadium Back of House ("BOH") site offices remaining visible from the Greenway and the lack of camouflage and integration into the surrounding area. The applicant explained that the Stadium BOH offices were consistent with the BOH offices for the Aquatics venue. In addition, the Greenway would be closed at this point during Games and the adjacent section of the Loop Road would not be used by spectators. In addition, the F14 temporary bridge would provide screening to this area from the Stadium western drop off to the north. The use of the site offices as BOH offices was also a sustainable solution, as something is needed during the Games and offices would be needed for construction workers during the legacy transformation phase. The BOH site offices may therefore be used in association with Legacy transformation construction work and be removed

post Transformation. A PDT officer reported that the site offices should be seen in the context of the other temporary buildings (generators/overlay etc), which would reduce the starkness of the BOH site offices.

- 5.6 A member requested clarification about the different types of boundary fencing found in the LOCOG "Kit of Parts". The applicant reported that the LOCOG "Kit of Parts" addresses the overlay across the whole Games experience. The 12 different types of fencing in the "Kit of Parts" refer to fencing inside and outside of the Olympic Park, (such as Earls Court etc).
- 5.7 A member questioned the applicant's lack of reassurance that the view from the Stadium podium would be acceptable and the lack of alternative options for erecting additional overlay next to the Stadium. The member pointed out that the original intention behind the view from the Stadium podium was about linking the Stadium to the rest of London, and now that view is being obstructed by buildings and is becoming cluttered.
- 5.8 A member questioned the use of tarmac for the surface of the BOH areas. The member stated that it appeared that tarmac was the applicant's default BOH material. Given that the BOH areas are only there for four weeks, the use of tarmac appeared, to the member, to be excessive especially as there appeared to be a well rolled surface already in place. A PDT officer reported that the level of tarmac cover is required due to the number of vehicle movements, the weight of the vehicles and the associated loading and unloading. In addition, the applicant reported that it was necessary to ensure the surfaces remain clean, weatherproof and able to sustain drainage.
- 5.9 Various members questioned whether an alternative material option to using tarmac had been considered and referred the applicant to 7.4 of the report relating to Sustainability. Members expressed the view that the applicant had not provided sufficient responses to questions over the use of tarmac and also questioned whether the environmental impact of using tarmac and subsequently removing it post Games had been assessed.. A PDT Officer explained that LOCOG requires the use of tarmac and condition OG.5 will address Games phase sustainability issues including reuse of tarmac through submission of a Sustainability Management Plan.
- 5.10 A member questioned why there had been no attempt to mitigate the colour or darken the elevations of the BOH site offices and if this was due to cost. The applicant pointed out that the generators at the BOH site offices would be dressed / screened and that an informative had been put in place. In addition, the applicant stressed that it was not LOCOG's intention to diminish the spectator view. A PDT Officer reiterated that there were limitations on what could be done to temporary BOH site offices. On previous applications, a feasibility study has been required to see what can be done to upgrade the offices. However, LOCOG have made it clear that they have no intention of upgrading the site offices and so any additional conditions/informatives would not, in PDT's opinion, be worthwhile. From PDT's point of view, painting the site offices would not make a difference. The PDT officer also stated that the impact on spectator experience would not be that great and so would not warrant refusal. Further, BOH site offices have been accepted by the Committee elsewhere on the Park and PDT/the applicant were trying to manage views as best as possible. Dressing may draw more attention to the

site offices than if they were left as submitted. Further, dressing could make it difficult for the site offices to be re-used.

- 5.11 A member asked how long the BOH offices would be retained for. A PDT officer reported that condition LTD.2 of the 2007 OLF permission requires removal of temporary buildings by the end of December 2013. The member concluded that as the BOH offices would be visible for a number of years and that LOCOG were not prepared to consider any alternative options that the proposal was unacceptable. A PDT officer reiterated that LOCOG could be asked to provide further information/visuals of the views of this area from the podium but that this may be a substantial cost for little return.
- 5.12 The Committee agreed to adjourn to have a private discussion about the various options.
- 5.13 On the Committee's return, there being no further questions:

The Committee took a vote and:

1. **AGREED to DEFER** the application but confirmed that they would be minded to approve the warm up track details and, given the start on site requirements for the warm up track, indicated that they are content for the Director of Planning Decisions to determine these details if submitted as a separate application, under delegated powers.
2. **Deferral was based on the receipt of further information on:**
  - i) Visual impact of the Stadium BOH offices, in particular:
    - a) A visualisation (CGI; sketch; photomontage or similar) of the Games phase views of the Stadium BOH offices from the Stadium podium and other key public views (e.g. Greenway PSA);
    - b) Photographs of the site offices/buildings are taken from the Stadium podium.
    - c) Consideration of the options which could be reasonably undertaken to improve the appearance of the building;
3. **Vehicle grade tarmac throughout the concourse;**
  - ii) The requirement vehicle grade tarmac for this across the whole of the concourse, with reference to operational requirements, servicing, drainage, contamination remediation etc and why an alternative less permanent finish would not be acceptable;
  - iii) Extract from the sustainability management plan regarding proposals for the recycling of the tarmac.

## 6. **LOCOG Eton Manor**

- 6.1 A PDT Officer gave a presentation and explained that this application considers the submitted LOCOG overlay details for Eton Manor, with Front of House (FOH) and Back of House (BOH) buildings and fencing, and BOH surfacing being proposed. The application is submitted pursuant to three conditions of the slot-in permission for the Eton Manor venues relating to temporary buildings and landscaping. All of the buildings are temporary and would be removed post Games to allow the reorganisation of the site into the approved post-Games Transformation facilities and parkland. The January 2010 permission for the Eton Manor venues agreed the principle of temporary overlay buildings. The scale and types of buildings proposed are the same as the temporary overlay approved elsewhere on the Olympic Park.
- 6.2 The PDT Officer reported that the responses from the statutory consultees raised no objection or has included comments which have been included in the proposed informatives.
- 6.3 The PDT Officer reported that the main issues of consideration were;
- 6.3.1 **Metropolitan Open Land** – the need for temporary structures for Games operations;
- 6.3.2 **Design and layout** - The layout of the structures is considered to be acceptable in FOH and BOH areas, and the structures would be compliant with the LOCOG "Kit of Parts" document to tie into other overlay structures across the Olympic Park.
- 6.3.3 **Amenity** – detailed noise reports on procured plant will be submitted later;
- 6.3.4 **Sustainability** - details to come forward pursuant to condition EMOG.5;
- 6.3.5 Other issues for consideration relate to drainage and remediation. Further information is required in respect of the detailed appearance, colours and materials to fully discharge the conditions.
- 6.4 A member highlighted the wording in section 7.10 regarding the "Look and Feel" as being "outstanding", and the need for Members to be consistent with the earlier debate on the BOH building appearance.
- 6.5 A member expressed concern that there was no evidence in the application to support the use of tarmac as the surfacing material. The applicant informed Members that tarmac was necessary for contamination reasons, as the surface had to be an impermeable membrane to avoid penetration to the remediated land below the surface. Members noted that this information had not been provided to them during the debate on Item 5.
- 6.6 A member asked if surface tarmac would be used underneath the tennis courts at Eton Manor. The applicant explained that tarmac is being used to ensure that the surface is water impermeable to allow suitable fast surface water drainage. This was a requirement of the laying of the tennis courts.

6.7 There being no further questions:

The Committee took a vote and voted (1 abstention) to:

**APPROVE** the application and allowed conditions EMOD.21, EMOD.66 and EMOG.3 to be partially discharged subject to the conditions and informatives, as set out in the report with one alteration to the wording regarding EMOG.3 to add that the details of the queuing structures to the west of Court 1 (and Court 3) are outstanding.

## **7. LOCOG Telecommunications Statement**

7.1 A PDT Officer gave a presentation and explained that the report considers the Telecommunications Statement which has been submitted pursuant to Condition OD.0.24 (Telecommunications) and outlines the proposed telecommunications strategy for the provision of cellular services on the Olympic Park. The document has been agreed with the OPLC and LOCOG.

7.2 The PDT Officer explained that the 2007 OLF planning permission granted temporary planning permission for the telecoms masts in the various PDZs as outlined in the report and that condition OD.0.24 secured the provision of a Telecommunications Statement to determine the final location and number of the temporary mast provision in order to address the objections received in 2007.

7.3 The Telecommunications Statement submitted proposes 9 temporary masts and a further 4 temporary masts along the River Lea/Waterworks River. The PDT Officer highlighted the reduction in the height and the scale of all masts, (from 30m to an average of 18m) compared with the 2007 submission, together with the general design and appearance of the masts and less antennae being used which all results in an acceptable visual appearance.

7.3 Provisions for telecommunications equipment in Legacy phase are restricted in planning terms with Condition OD.0.24 requiring the removal of temporary masts by December 2013. The PDT Officer highlighted to members the ability of a telecommunications operator to seek to retain the masts through its rights under the Telecoms Code and referred members to paragraph 7.34 of the report for a summary of the legal position.

7.4 The PDT Officer explained that consultative responses were received from LB Hackney, LB Tower Hamlets, LB Newham, Lea Valley Regional Park Authority, English Heritage and the Environment Agency. The Update Report provided further consultation responses from LB Newham concerning the final choice locations of the free standing masts along the River Lea/Waterworks River. PDT have concluded that further information is required and that any approval of the Statement should exclude the approval of the 4 temporary River Lea/Waterworks River telecommunications sites which addresses LB Newham's concerns. In addition, the PDT Officer referred members to a statement from the operator which sets out the intention of the operator to remove the temporary masts by 31 December 2012, a year earlier than the requirement under the OLF Permission.

7.5 The PDT Officer explained that the submitted Telecommunications Statement had been assessed against the following key issues;

- compliance with OD.0.24 OF 07/90010/OUMODA and Overview;
- Visual impact of Individual Mast Locations and Alternative Locations: PDZ 1, 5 and 7;
- Visual Impact of Individual Mast Locations and Legacy Implications: PDZ 15;
- "Indicative" River Lea/Waterworks River Locations;
- Streetscape and Concourse Cluttering;
- ICNIRP (Certificate of No Impact on Health etc) and;
- Flood Risk and Remediation Impacts of Proposed Locations.

7.6 In conclusion, the PDT Officer reported that when taking into account the updated Masterplan context, evolved design and appearance of the current telecommunications proposals, all locations, with the exception of those shown in the River Lea and to the east of the Lea Navigation, are acceptable.

7.7 A member asked for confirmation that there was a requirement for the masts to be established and queried the significance of the submission of an ICNIRP. A PDT Officer explained that there would be a need for additional capacity during Games phase in terms of coverage due to the volume of spectators on site during Games phase and PDT is satisfied that all the masts identified are required. A PDT Officer explained that telecommunications operators certify that their equipment and installations will be in compliance with public exposure guidelines (to certify no impact on health) by submitting an ICNIRP Declaration.

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

**AGREED to:**

- i) the partial discharge of condition OD.0.24 of planning permission 07/90010/OUMODA (the submission of a Telecommunications Statement) and partially APPROVE the Telecommunications Statement on the terms set out in the report.

**8. Any Other Business**

*There being no other business the meeting ended at 19.30.*

Signed: Z Bledmy Chair

Date: 13/8/2011