

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 63rd COMMITTEE MEETING
Held on 13 April 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

Independent Members:

Mike Appleton
Celia Carrington
William Hodgson
Janice Morphet
Dru Vesty

Officers in attendance:

Anthony Hollingsworth	ODA, Chief Planner Development Control, Planning Decisions Team
Richard Griffiths	ODA Legal Adviser, Planning Decisions Team (Pinsent Masons)
Saba Master	Committee 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 Items 5 and 6.

2.2. The order of business was unchanged.

2.3. There were no requests to speak.

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 6.

'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?'

Cllr Conor McAuley, LB Newham, declared a personal and prejudicial interest for Item 6 and his intention to withdraw from the consideration of this application and the remainder of the Committee.

Members confirmed that the other personal interests recorded 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 62nd Planning Committee Meeting.

**5. 10/90060/FULODA- Water Recycling Facility
(AGENDA ITEM 5)**

Construction of a water recycling plant including plant building, two partially buried tanks, hard-standing area, tree removal (10 individual trees and partial removal of four groups of trees) and associated works

PDZ3 (Old Ford Nature Reserve) north of the Greenway and east of the River Lea, Olympic Park, London

- 5.1. John Lyall of John Lyall Architects introduced the application and explained that the proposal was one of the first examples of large scale water recycling and would assist the ODA in achieving the required 40% reduction in potable water use. The application was a joint proposal by the ODA and Thames Water.
- 5.2. A Planning Officer then gave a presentation to the Committee. She noted that the London Borough of Tower Hamlets had objected to the application on six grounds and referred Members to the Update Report that summarised the grounds of objection and the applicant's response and PDT officer comments. The Officer considered that the key grounds of objection related to noise and air quality, but that these issues had been considered by PDT on the basis of advice from its environmental consultant, Hyder. Appropriate conditions were recommended to be attached to any planning permission granted which adequately dealt with the two issues. The Officer also noted that the application was wholly within the administrative area of the London Borough of Newham (although abutted the boundary with the London Borough of Tower Hamlets) and that the London Borough of Newham raised no objections to the application.
- 5.3. A member questioned why an Environmental Impact Assessment was not required. An Officer confirmed that the application had been screened for an Environmental Impact Assessment and the planning authority's independent environmental consultants, Hyder, considered that the application, with the proposed recommended conditions, did not give rise to any likely significant environmental effects and as such an Environmental Impact Assessment was not required under the Regulations.
- 5.4. A member voiced their concern over the suitability of the site chosen with its close proximity to residential housing. An Officer confirmed that a detailed analysis had been carried out by the applicant, which had been reviewed by the planning authority's independent consultants, Hyder, which assessed the suitability of alternative sites. Whilst it was acknowledged that the proposed site was a sensitive site due to the nature reserve and proximity to residential properties, it was a good site in terms of its proximity to the black water source, proximity to the Olympic Park and deliverability. All alternative sites considered had constraints, such as requiring more infrastructure to pump the black water to the plant or the fact that the site would need to be handed back to the owner post Games, which would not assist in reaching the 40% reduction in potable water target attached to the Olympic Planning Permissions. Overall and having carefully assessed the alternative sites, and that the likely impacts of the proposal on the biodiversity and open space value of the site could adequately be mitigated, it was considered by the planning authority that the proposed site is the most appropriate location for the application.

- 5.5. The Officer also explained that a report concerning odour from the application site had been undertaken to alleviate the concerns of Tower Hamlets. The report showed that the parameters regarding odour were acceptable and that the proposed conditions requiring a further report which would ensure that the equipment to be used within the building would meet these parameters, would further protect residents.
- 5.6. A member questioned the proposed turquoise colour of the two tanks and whether this was the most appropriate colour given the location of the site. An Officer agreed that a subtle colour which would be appropriate for the site would be sought and confirmed that a condition was proposed to approve the colour.
- 5.7. A member questioned the use of Somerset Limestone over the use of concrete recycled from the Olympic park site in the gabion baskets which are proposed to clad part of the building. A discussion then took place amongst all members who weighed up the pros and cons of using each material. Following a vote amongst Members, it was agreed that Somerset Limestone, which was recommended by Officers, was the most appropriate material.
- 5.8. A member reported concern over the replacement of the trees on the sites. An Officer agreed that an amendment would be made to proposed condition WOD19 to ensure that semi mature trees are used in the replacement planting.
- 5.9. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED that:

the Committee:

AUTHORISED the Head of Development Control to approve the application subject to necessary and consequential amendments to the conditions in the main report and the inclusion of the new conditions in the update report provided together with the amendment to condition WOD19 as discussed at the Committee and a new condition relating to gas protection.

**6. 09/90328/REMODA - Plot M6A, Stratford City Zone 1.
(AGENDA ITEM 6)**

Application for the approval of reserved matters for access, external appearance, layout and scale of building M6A with a total floor space of 4013sqm retail, 2711sqm of commercial use and 1207sqm of community/health uses, pursuant to conditions B1 and B8 of the outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA.

Plot M6A, Zone 1, Stratford City Developments, Stratford, London

- 6.1. A Planning Officer presented the Committee Report to Members, reminding Members that the application had been delegated to the London Borough of Newham and that the views of Members were being sought which would be passed to the London Borough of Newham.

- 6.2. A member asked for clarification on the community uses within the building. An officer confirmed that the community uses were a retail academy, public service and security offices, health centre and small business space, all of which were required under the Section 106 Agreement.
- 6.3. Overall members welcomed and commended the high quality of the design. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee unanimously RESOLVED that:

the Committee:

ADVISE the London Borough of Newham that the Committee has no objections to the grant of planning permission but ask the London Borough of Newham to consider the conditions and informatives set out in the Committee Report.

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

- 7.1 The Chair informed the Committee that a Site Visit of the Athletes Village would take place prior to the next Planning Committee meeting which was scheduled for 27 April 2010. Details would be circulated to the Committee once finalised.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 19.15pm.

Signed: 

Date: 24/8/2010

Chair

