

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 62nd COMMITTEE MEETING
Held on 23 March 2010 at 18.00

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

Present:

Lorraine Baldry	Chairman
David Taylor	Deputy Chairman

Local Authority Members:

Cllr Geoffrey Taylor	LB Hackney
Cllr Rofique Ahmed	LB Tower Hamlets
Cllr Terry Wheeler	LB Waltham Forest
Cllr Conor McAuley	LB Newham (to item 5)

Independent Members:

Mike Appleton
Celia Carrington
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
Mick Gavin	ODA Planning Decisions Team
Liz Fisher	ODA Planning Decisions Team
Catherine Sherwin	ODA Planning Decisions Team
Anne Ogundiya	ODA Planning Decisions Team
Richard Griffiths	ODA Legal Adviser, Planning Decisions Team (Pinsent Masons)

**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 Items 5, 6, 7 and 8.

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 8.

'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?'

Conor McAuley declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 6 and his intention to withdraw from the consideration of this application and the remainder of the Committee. William Hodgson declared a personal interest in item 7, which following advice from the PDT Legal Advisor, was not considered to be prejudicial.

4. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING (AGENDA ITEM 4)

4.1. The Committee

AGREED the Minutes of the 61st Planning Committee Meeting.

5. 10/90059/AODODA - Stadium Service Pods (AGENDA ITEM 5)

Submission of details pursuant to condition OG.3 Olympic Legacy & Facilities permission 07/90010/OUMODA in respect of provision of service 'pods' at Stadium Podium.

Stadium Island, PDZ3a, Olympic Park, London

- 5.1. A Planning Officer gave a presentation to the Committee on the report. He explained that the service pods (SPODs) were coming to the Committee before the LOCOG pod villages because the services were being laid, and would need protection from the weather. They would be constructed with GRP, which enabled a smooth finish, and would be white, to give flexibility to LOCOG over the final finish.
- 5.2. Members queried the recessed design of the door, which interrupted the curve of the pod. Tom Jones (Populous) explained that options for a non-recessed cover had been explored. A top-fixed articulated cover for the door would have been too expensive, and a roller shutter door would have required a track on top, which would have also spoiled the smooth profile to the structure. The other pods would also have entrances, so would have a similar appearance to the SPODs. It was explained that the surfaces would be tapered towards the door. Having reviewed the plan layout of the SPODs, Members were satisfied that there was a slight curve to the door fitting which overcame their concerns.
- 5.3. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee unanimously RESOLVED that:

the Committee

APPROVED the application 10/90059/AODODA and partially discharged condition OG.3 of OLF permission 07/90010/OUMODA, subject to the conditions as amended and added in the update report.

6. 09/90403/REMODA - Plot N11 Health Centre and Multi Use Facilities (AGENDA ITEM 6)

Application for the approval of reserved matters of a four storey building to provide a Health Centre (Polyclinic) of 4058 sq.m gross external floor area and Multi-use Community Facilities (to include a gym, café, pharmacy, youth centre and flexible training/enterprise/meeting space or any other use falling within Class D1) of 1572 sq.m gross external floor area; together with additional lower ground floor parking for cars, cycles and motorcycles and servicing area; vehicular and pedestrian access from Henrietta Street and provision of cycle parking, two disabled persons parking bays, a visitor drop-off/collection bay and vehicle loading bay/patient transport drop-off all within highway limits pursuant to conditions B1 and B8 of outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA, being details of layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping; together with approval in writing to permit development that exceeds the maximum floorspace for health and community facilities, pursuant to conditions D2 and D2A of the outline planning permission.

Plot N11, Zone 4, Stratford City Developments, Stratford, London

- 6.1. Paul Hartmann (ODA) introduced the application. Mark Roe (Penoyre-Prasad Architects) presented the proposals on behalf of the applicant. He explained that since the previous presentation to the Committee the design had been developed in response to consultation. The reception and wayfinding in the building had also been further developed. Up to 3000 visitors a day were expected to the centre, of which 70% were expected to arrive either on foot or

by bicycle. There was a drop off zone and two on-street blue badge parking spaces.

- 6.2. Simon Mills and Mary Clegg of LB Newham PCT explained that they were satisfied that the design would meet the needs of the legacy community. The Games had provided an opportunity to deliver a greater proportion of services in the community. Over the next few years they would work to develop the service specification and to procure the services for the building. They were working with the Newham Polysystems Group, which included GP's in the membership.
- 6.3. A Planning Officer gave a presentation to the Committee. She noted that this was a reserved matters application, and explained that the floor space deviated from the outline consent. The amount of floorspace for both healthcare and community facilities was greater than the amount set out in the outline planning permission and s106 agreement, but was considered to be justified by enabling the provision of a larger range of facilities than had been originally envisaged, which would be of benefit to the existing and proposed communities. It was acknowledged that the larger building on this plot would result in less available on-site parking space. However the impact had been judged as negligible, as a result of the location of the plot at a point convenient for both existing and proposed communities and good availability of public transport within 5 minutes walk.
- 6.4. LB Newham had expressed concerns about the intensive use of Henrietta Street. A road safety audit had been carried out and LB Newham were satisfied with the measures that were being taken. The centre was located near a number of bus stops, and a Travel Plan would be developed for staff, patients and visitors.
- 6.5. A member noted that the report stated that there would be pressure on space in the building due to the number of users by year three. The PCT explained that the standard NHS London modelling had been used. The report included generous patient times that they expected to reduce as efficiencies from the shared service model were realised. In addition the spaces were designed to be flexible, so they could be adapted in response to demand.
- 6.6. Members were concerned at the level of disabled visitor and patient parking spaces. The PCT stated that two blue badge spaces were expected to be sufficient, based on previous experience, but could be reviewed if they proved not to be sufficient. Alec Prince (WSP Transport) explained that there were also three blue badge spaces within 200m of the centre.
- 6.7. The amount of standard on-street spaces was queried by a Member. It was explained that those spaces that were classed as "temporary parking bays" would only be required for use by services at set times, and would otherwise be available to the public for parking. Drivers using the drop off bay would be able to continue on to the roundabout at the end of the road. A Member suggested that electric pool cars for staff would be a good idea.
- 6.8. A member welcomed the discussions with the community and the National Community Development Trust, in preparation for the establishment of the Community Development Trust, and suggested that the financial impact of the

usage of the space be carefully considered, in particular the number of receptions, as these would increase staff costs.

6.9. Members queried the use of red on the facade of the building, which would deteriorate, and would not be visible to the visually impaired. The architect confirmed that they wanted to use a vibrant shade on the façade, but were flexible about which colour was used. Members also questioned what type of signage would be applied to the exterior of the building. A Planning Officer suggested that an additional condition could be applied to require details of signage to be approved before it is fixed to the building.

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

the Committee

- a) APPROVED the deviations from floorspace limits, pursuant to conditions D2 and D2A
- b) APPROVED the reserved matters, subject to the conditions in the report and update report, and with an additional condition, as follows;

Prior to the application of any signage to the exterior elevations of the building hereby permitted, details of that signage including materials to be used and method of fixing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Following approval the signage shall be displayed and maintained at all times in accordance with the approved details, unless other minor variations are agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a high quality appearance to the exterior of the building is maintained at all times in the interests of visual amenity.

**7. 10/90009/AODODA to 10/90011/AODOA - Lighting & Art for Bridges and Underpasses
(AGENDA ITEM 7)**

10/90009/AODODA

Partial discharge of Condition OD.0.20 of planning permission ref. 07/90010/OUMODA in respect of art work proposes to Bridge F03 and F11 and partial discharge of Condition OD.0.35 of planning permission ref. 07/90010/OUMODA in respect of lighting installations proposed to Bridges F02, F03, F07, F08, F09, F11, F17, H01, H04, H05, H06, H07, H17, L03A, L03B and U05.

London Olympic Site - Land North Of Stratford Town Centre, East Of The Lea Valley Navigation, South Of Eastway And The A12 And West Of The Lea Valley Railway.

10/90010/AODODA

Details of Under Bridge Lighting and Artistic Treatment for Underpass U01 as a partial discharge of Condition 1 (Lighting and Artistic Treatment only) pursuant to planning permission ref. 08/90347/REMODA.

Olympic Park - Planning Delivery Zones 6 And 7 - Under Bridge U01 Passes Under The A12 In The North East Corner Of The Park Within The London Boroughs Of Newham And Waltham Forest.

10/90011/AODODA

Details of Lighting and Artistic Treatment for Bridge F11 as a partial discharge of Conditions PPR.18 and PPR.31 pursuant to planning permission ref. 08/90311/FULODA.

Olympic Park - Planning Delivery Zones 2 And 3 - Bridge F11 Passes Over The Waterworks River To The East Of The Olympic Stadium And To The West Of The Olympic Aquatics Centre Within The London Borough Of Newham.

- 7.1. Simon Fraser (Allies and Morrison) spoke in favour of the proposals on behalf of the applicant. He explained that different artists had worked on the proposals for bridges and underpasses in the north and the south of the Park. The designs were integrated with the lighting strategy.
- 7.2. A Planning Officer gave a presentation to the Committee, and explained that there were three applications, which covered both Games time and Legacy. The Environment Agency had initially objected to the lighting of bridge soffits on the River Lea and Old River Lea, so these had been removed.
- 7.3. Members asked about the planned management and maintenance of the lighting. It was explained that the ODA would be responsible for the maintenance prior to handover to OPLC. Conditions on the Olympic planning permission require the details of management and maintenance of the public realm to be submitted for approval. Access for maintenance had been embedded in the design process. The use of LED's would ensure that the lights had a long life, and their common fittings would make the maintenance easier for subsequent maintaining authorities. Officers confirmed that the ODA was putting together hand-over material on maintenance of infrastructure as part of its proposed exit strategy..
- 7.4. The applicant confirmed that they had liaised with the Metropolitan police about CCTV and defence against vandalism, and they were satisfied that the designs were sufficiently robust.
- 7.5. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee unanimously RESOLVED that:

the Committee

APPROVED applications 10/90009/AODODA, 10/90010/AODODA and 10/90011/AODOA subject to the conditions contained in the report and as amended in the update report.

8. 09/90424/AODODA to 09/90433/AODODA - Games Phase Hard Landscaping (AGENDA ITEM 8)

09/90424/AODODA

Hard Landscape design proposals submitted for approval under the following conditions attached to permission 08/90310/FULODA: - Condition PPR21

(Emissions and Renewable Energy).. Hard Landscape design proposals submitted for **partial** approval under the following conditions attached to permission 08/90310/FULODA: - Condition PPR14 (Submission of Details), - Condition PPR18 (Surfacing Details), - Condition PPR25 (Foundation Details), - Condition PPR31 (Details of PPR Lighting),

Bound N By Proposed Olympic Loop Road; E By Proposed Bridge L02 Footpath S Proposed Bridge F03, Channelsea River Down NW Corner Of Proposed Olympic Village & Stratford City Boundary; S By Proposed Bridge 13A; & W By Proposed Concourse PDZ5.

09/90425/AODODA

Hard Landscape design proposals submitted for approval under the following conditions attached to permission 08/90312/FULODA: - Condition PPR18 (Emissions and Renewable Energy), Condition PPR13 (Submission of Details), - Condition PPR14 (Tree Planting and Seating). Hard Landscape design proposals submitted for **partial** approval under the following conditions attached to permission 08/90312/FULODA: - Condition PPR15 (Surfacing Details), - Condition PPR22 (Foundation Details), - Condition PPR28 (Details of PPR Lighting),

Bound E By Proposed Olympic Loop Road W In PDZ10; SE By Proposed Olympic Loop Road In S Of PDZ6; W By Edge Of Proposed Concourse W Of PDZ6; & N By Middle Of Concourse Between Proposed Velodrome & Proposed Basketball Venue.

09/90426/AODODA

Hard Landscape design proposals submitted for approval under the following conditions attached to permission 08/90313/FULODA: - Condition PPR14 (Tree Planting and Seating), - Condition PPR18 (Emissions and Renewable Energy). Hard Landscape design proposals submitted for **partial** approval under the following conditions attached to permission 08/90313/FULODA: - Condition PPR13 (Submission of Details), - Condition PPR15 (Surfacing Details), - Condition PPR22 (Foundation Details), - Condition PPR28 (Details of PPR Lighting)

Bound To North By The Olympic Loop Road To North In PDZ5; To East By The Boundary Of The North Central Parklands Application Boundary; To South By The Olympic Loop Road In PDZ5 And To West By The Olympic Loop Road In PDZ5.

09/90427/AODODA

Hard Landscape design proposals submitted for **partial** approval under the following conditions attached to permission 07/90010/OUMODA (and subject to informatives attached to permission 08/90316/AODODA): - Condition OD.0.35 (Lighting) (Informative INF4), Condition OD.0.28 (Further Details) (Informative INF2), - Condition OD.0.20 (Surfacing and Street Furniture) (Informative INF3) PDZs5 & 6 (part). Land Within PDZ5 Bounded N Olympic Loop Rd; W Handball Landscape Planning Application Boundary; E Edge Of Proposed Concourse; & S North London Line Railway. Land Within PDZ6 Bounded N Embankment Of A12; S Olympic Loop Rd.

09/90428/AODODA

Hard Landscape design proposals submitted for approval under the following conditions attached to permission 08/90276/FUMODA: - Condition VOD.53 (Handrails). Hard Landscape design proposals submitted for **partial** approval under the following conditions attached to permission 08/90276/FUMODA: -

Condition VOD.19 (Foundation Details), - Condition VOD.21 (Landscape and Planting Details)

Land Within Planning Delivery Zone 6 Of The Olympic Park. Bound To The North By The A12; To The East By Temple Mills Lane; To The West By The River Lea And To The South By The Channel Tunnel Rail Link.

09/90429/AODODA

Hard Landscape design proposals submitted for **partial** approval under the following conditions attached to permission 08/90328/FUMODA: - Condition HOD.16 (Foundation Details), - Condition HOD.18 (Landscape and Planting Details)

Land Within The Olympic Park Planning Delivery Zone 5; North Of The North London Railway Line (London Overground), East Of The River Lee Navigation And West Of The Former Alignment Of Waterden Road.

09/90430/AODODA

Hard Landscape design proposals submitted for approval under the following conditions attached to permission 08/90311/FULODA: Condition PPR 17 (Location of seats in 2012 Gardens), - Condition PPR54 (Step Details)

Hard Landscape design proposals submitted for **partial** approval under the following conditions attached to permission 08/90311/FULODA: - Condition PPR14 (Submission of Details), - Condition PPR18 (Surfacing Details), - Condition PPR25 (Foundation Details), - Condition PPR31 (Details of PPR Lighting)

Bound N Proposed N London Line Railway Bridge Over River Lea; E Waterworks River; S Olympic Loop Rd & City Mill River & Inc. Land W Of PDZ3a 'Stadium Island' Bound River Lea & Eastern Edge Of Concourse In PDZ4; & W Edge Of Concourse In PDZ4.

09/90431/AODODA

Landscape design proposals submitted for **partial** approval under the following conditions attached to permission 07/90010/OUMODA (and subject to informatives attached to permission 08/90315/AODODA): - Condition OD.0.28 (Further Details) (Informative INF2), - Condition OD.0.20 (Surfacing and Street Furniture) (Informative INF3), - Condition OD.0.35 (Lighting) (Informative INF4) PDZ1 (Aquatics Centre). *Land Bounded To The North And East By The North London Railway Line; To The South By The Great Eastern Railway Line; And To The West By The Centre Line Of The Waterworks River.*

09/90432/AODODA

Hard Landscape design proposals submitted for **partial** approval under the following conditions attached to permission 08/90314/FULODA: - Condition PPR13 (Submission of Details), - Condition PPR15 (Surfacing Details), - Condition PPR22 (Foundation Details), - Condition PPR22 (Foundation Details), - Condition PPR28 (Details of PPR Lighting)

Bound To The North By The North London Line Railway And The Olympic Loop Road; To The East And To The South By The Edge Of The Proposed Concourse; And To The West By The Loop Road.

09/90433/AODODA

Hard Landscape design proposals submitted for **partial** approval under the following conditions attached to permission 08/90346/FULODA: - Condition BAOD.16 (Surface Details), - Condition BAOD.24 (Landscape Details)

Land Within Planning Delivery Zone 6 Of The Olympic Park. Bounded By The Loop Road To The South And East, To The West By The River Lea, The Proposed Velodrome To The North And A12 Further To The North.

- 8.1. John Hopkins (ODA Project Sponsor for Parklands and Public Realm) introduced the application for Games phase hard landscape materials including all concourse paving and footpath finishes; benches, steps and seating; handrails; and lighting to the parklands and public realm. A schedule of materials proposed was provided for ease of reference.
- 8.2. A Planning Officer gave a presentation to the Committee. She explained that the proposals were for Games phase only. There were a total of ten applications to discharge the relevant conditions, and the submitted details were broadly in line with the design intent as set out in the Design and Access Statement for the earlier PPR Games phase approvals. The soft landscape had been approved for the north of the park, but not for the south. This was due to be done soon under delegated powers.
- 8.3. Members queried the use of hardwood timber from Brazil (Cumaru hardwood) for the seating throughout the Park. The applicant explained that the procurement was within ODA and government guidelines, and confirmed that the timber was FSC certified and would be tracked from the source. Timber had been identified as the best material to use for the seating, and alternatives to hardwood had been explored, however European hardwood alternatives had not met all of the ODA's selection criteria on appearance, sustainability, inclusive design and management and maintenance. The hardwood from Brazil was expected to last 100 years and would not require treatment. It was also very resistant to vandalism and fire.
- 8.4. It was also explained by the applicant that the proposed length of the benches was a challenge to achieve with alternative timber sources. They were designed to seat 8-12 people, and European hardwood options that were long enough were not sufficiently durable. Members suggested that the benches could be made shorter to increase the options for the material. Members stated that they were not convinced that the Cumaru hardwood was a sufficiently sustainable material and requested that the applicant undertake further work with respect to the sustainability of this and alternative timber sources. They also suggested that options for sustainable materials other than timber should also be considered.
- 8.5. One Member stated that the quality of the materials of the park was a key consideration and that a balanced view should be taken in light of all the criteria used for selection and not just on sustainability alone. Other Members stated that the material selected should be clearly and robustly based on sustainable practices as well as design quality. They asked the applicant to review the options for the material to be used for the benches, as well as other design options including the use of shorter benches. Members requested that such a review should be reported to the Committee for consideration.
- 8.6. Other than the selection of timber for the benches and seating, Members commended the quality of the proposals. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee unanimously **RESOLVED** that:

the committee

APPROVED all ten of the applications numbered 09/90424/AODODA to 09/90433/AODODA respectively, but excluded from these approvals the discharge of the details for all of the timber benches and seating terraces subject to the conditions and informatives contained in the report and the update report. Members resolved that the details of the timber benches and seating terraces not discharged by these approvals should be reported back to Committee for subsequent consideration.

**9. Any Other Business
(AGENDA ITEM 9)**

There was no any other business.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 8:40pm.

Signed:



Date: 24/8/2010

Chair