OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 46th COMMITTEE MEETING
Held on 9 June 2009 at 18.00
Old Town Hall, Stratford, 29 Broadway, London E15 4BQ

Present:
Lorraine Baldry Chairman
David Taylor Deputy Chairman

Local Authority Members:
Cllr Rofique Ahmed LB Tower Hamlets
Cllr Geoffrey Taylor LB Hackney
Cllr Terry Wheeler LB Waltham Forest

Independent Members:
William Hodgson
Janice Morphet
Dru Vesty

Officers in attendance:
Vivienne Ramsey ODA, Head of Development Control
Anthony Hollingsworth ODA Chief Planner Development Control, Planning Decisions Team
Alex Savine ODA Planning Decisions Team
Rowan Conway ODA Planning Decisions Team
Chris Lelliott ODA Planning Decisions Team
John Gardener ODA Planning Decisions Team
Richard Ford ODA, Legal adviser, Planning Decisions Team (Pinsent Masons LLP)
Kate Dance ODA Planning Decisions Team (Pinsent Masons LLP)

1. APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 1)
   1.1. Conor McAuley
   1.2. Mike Appleton
   1.3. Celia Carington
2. UPDATES, ORDER OF BUSINESS, AND REQUESTS TO SPEAK
   (AGENDA ITEM 2)

2.1. There were no updates.

2.2. The order of business was unchanged.

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 Items 5 to 10.

   ‘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?’

   Members confirmed that the personal interests recorded were correct. None of the personal interests were considered prejudicial.

   Geoff Taylor declared an interest as a member of the London Borough of Hackney.

4. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING
   (AGENDA ITEM 4)

4.1. AGREED the Minutes of the 45th Planning Committee Meeting

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

5. LMF CONSULTATION STRATEGY REPORT
   (AGENDA ITEM 5)

5.1. A Planning Officer gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report. The proposals were for the revised consultation strategy outlining the
approach that ODA PDT will take to future post-application consultation. The strategy will replace the existing strategy agreed in 2006 and will form part of the revised development control manual which is programmed to be reported to Committee on 23 June 2009.

5.2. Members welcomed the report but expressed concern in relation to the time scales provided in the consultation timeline. Members accepted that the timeline in the report was for internal purposes and that the general public would have 6 weeks to respond to the consultation papers.

5.3. Members also accepted that the community and public engagement in the report had already commenced and the connection with all parties at all venues will be repeated.

5.4. Members expressed concern with the relationship between the ODA PDT and the boroughs. Members were concerned about the ‘Duty to Inform’ and how the consultation process has taken this into account.

5.5. The members noted that the statutory requirements and the extra offers provided by ODA PDT need to be refined and re-ordered to ensure the correct process is implemented.

5.6. Members wanted clarification on the Panels and Groups that would be included in the consultation process and noted that the normal Statutory Consultation process will be followed and the Panels/Groups will be clearly defined. The members accepted that there will be a Consultative Panel Day to broaden our reach and involve groups which may or may not have been involved in the pre-application consultation stage. They accepted that this will be carried out in a controlled and managed way.

5.7. Members were concerned about the procedures used to explain the reasons for consultation, the visibility of both the response process and how feedback is considered in the revised documents. They were also concerned about the notification of important dates (i.e. planning committee meetings) for applications and whether consultees were correctly informed.

5.8. Members accepted that the scale of explanation relies on the scale of the planning application and that the Legacy application consultation process would include a leaflet summarising the additions and amendments and would be issued to consultees. They also accepted that under the current procedures notices are issued for planning committees.

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

the Committee

a) AGREED the need to establish additional legal requirements pursuant to the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.

b) Subject to establishing the additional legal requirements detailed in (a) above, they APPROVED the revised consultation strategy outline.
6. **APPLICANT NO: 08/90102/REMODA (AGENDA ITEM 6)**
   F02/F03 Temporary Elements
   Reserved Matters application for the construction of Temporary Bridges F02 and F03 as a discharge of Conditions OD.0.19 (details of bridges) and OD.0.59 (foundations details) in respect of the Olympic Facilities and Legacy Transformation Application (07/90010/OUMODA).
   **Olympic Park Planning Delivery Zones 5 & 6. Proposed Temporary Bridges F02 and F03 Cross the River Lea to the North of the East London Line and South to the A12.**

6.1. James Lough (Arup) and Mike Needham (Gifford – Bridge Designer) gave a presentation on behalf of the applicant detailing the bridge and foundation information in relation to Temporary Bridges F02 and F03.

6.2. A Planning Officer then gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report. The proposals were for the construction of Temporary Bridges F02 and F03. Approval was sought for discharge of details required by condition OD.0.19 (submission of details for bridges) and condition OD.0.59 (foundation details) of the Olympic and Legacy Facilities planning permission (07/90010/OUMODA).

6.3. Members welcomed the report and noted that Bridges F02 and F03 were consistent with the approved bridges to be removed in Legacy.

6.4. A member was concerned with the quality of the design elements of the temporary section of the bridges and that the contrast with the well designed permanent section would create an incoherent structure. Members noted that some good principles have been incorporated in the application, for example the use of recycled steel.

6.5. The members noted that the abutments were well designed and this would be reflected in Legacy.

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

   the Committee

   a) **APPROVED** the application for the reasons given in the report.

7. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS (AGENDA ITEM 11)**

7.1. The Deputy Chairman gave members some informal comments on the Beijing Olympic Park following a recent visit outlining his thoughts on the current usage and quality of some of the key buildings and public realm.

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

Signature [Signature]

Date 25/10/2009

Chair