OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: FINAL MINUTES OF 68th COMMITTEE MEETING
Held on 27 July 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 Terry Wheeler LB Waltham Forest
Cllr Conor McAuley LB Newham

Independent Members:

Mike Appleton
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
Matthew Foy ODA Legal Adviser, Planning Decisions
Team (Pinsent Masons)
Saba Master Committee Secretary

1. APOLOGIES
(AGENDA ITEM 1)

1.1. There were apologies from Cllr Rofique Ahmed, LB Tower Hamlets, Cllr Geoffrey Taylor, LB Hackney and Celia Carrington
2. UPDATES, ORDER OF BUSINESS, AND REQUESTS TO SPEAK
(AGENDA ITEM 2)

2.1. There was an updates report for item 5 and a copy of a letter from the OPLC
was circulated in connection with item 6.

2.2. The order of business was unchanged.

2.3. There was a request to speak from Simon Fraser (Allies and Morrison for Item
5.

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 and 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?’

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 67th Planning Committee Meeting.
5. **10/90208/FULODA- T12 Stratford High Street Crossing (AGENDA ITEM 5)**

*Application for the approval of construction of a temporary pedestrian footbridge over Stratford High Street with a signalised straight at-grade crossing and associated landscaping and street furniture (Games time only).*

5.1 A presentation was given by Simon Fraser (Allies and Morrison). He informed members that the provision of a crossing during Games and Post Games phases by the ODA is a requirement of Schedule 13 of the 2007 Olympic Section 106 Agreement. He also explained that the submitted proposals follow on from the production of the feasibility report in 2009. The option proposed for Games phase and submitted for approval is for a temporary bridge and an at-grade signalised straight crossing. He explained to members that the proposal for the Post Games transformation crossing had not been submitted as it was still subject to design review with the relevant highway and planning authorities.

5.2 A PDT Officer gave a presentation on the application and summarised the key points from the committee report. Overall, the officer explained that it was considered that the proposal embraced the principles of PPS1 for a high quality sustainable approach to design. He noted that the rationale for a Games time bridge has been accepted by PDT, LB Newham and TfL on the basis of crowd modelling and minimising the impact on the operation of the High Street, which is part of the Olympic Route Network during the Games phase. The officer also drew attention to the proposed condition which requires the ODA to submit full details of the management arrangements for the Games Time at-grade crossing.

5.3 The Update Report contained six amended conditions (number 6, 24, 27, 28, 30 and 33). The officer noted that the reference to condition 31 should be to condition 33. The officer also pointed out that condition no 29 required a further amendment to ensure that it covered remediation works on both sides of the bridge.

5.4 A member asked about the status of work to date on the legacy crossing. A PDT officer explained that the ODA would be responsible for delivering the legacy crossing. It was also noted that although the applicant preferred the use of a staggered crossing, the PDT, LB Newham and TfL require further justification for this arrangement as they all would generally prefer a straight crossing. It was believed that a staggered crossing had been suggested because of the width of the road. It was pointed out that the bridge is temporary and will be removed post Games.

5.5 A member asked about how the bridge and crossing would be marshalled and how pedestrians would be directed to either the bridge or the crossing. The applicant reported that the design of the bridge followed extensive crowd modelling and that these results had been set out in details in the feasibility study. It was also noted that as the event licensee/organiser, it would be LOCOG's responsibility to have a management plan to deal with movement of crowds from one area to another. An officer also drew the attention of members to the proposed marshalling condition and explained that overall the intention was to direct the main flow of pedestrians to the bridge.
5.6 There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED that:

The Committee:

**APPROVED** full planning permission subject to:

- The conditions listed in the committee report with the removed, amended or replaced conditions as discussed and noted in the Update Report.
- The informatives listed in the committee report;
- An amendment of Condition 29 to ensure that it covers remediation on either side of the bridge.

6. **OPLC Land Transfer/Strategic Delivery Body Supplemental Deed (AGENDA ITEM 6)**

6.1 The Head of Developmental Control, circulated a letter which had been received from the Director of Planning OPLC, to the ODA, which explained the OPLC’s aims and objectives and suitability as a Strategic Delivery Body. She then explained the need to enter into a Supplemental Deed to the existing 2007 S106 Agreement which is necessary as a consequence of the establishment of the OPLC and the proposed transfer of the majority of the LDA’s land ownership in the Olympic Park to the OPLC. The Supplemental Deed also contains modifications to the existing 2007 S106 Agreement, including, amongst others revised dates for the submission of the Legacy Masterplan Framework.

6.2 The Head of Development Control also updated the Committee on discussions with the ODA (Promoter side), LDA and OPLC over the drafting of the Deed since the completion of the Committee Report. These discussions centred around ODA concerns over the wording of the direct OPLC covenant in the Deed to PDT to ensure that the ODA complied with its obligations and commitments in the S106. She asked members to confirm that they wished the Deed to contain a direct covenant between OPLC and PDT ensuring that the ODA S106 commitments and obligations are complied with.

6.3 Members asked for further clarification of the land in the Olympic Park being retained by the LDA. The Head of Developmental Control agreed to send an email to the Committee members with these details.

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

The Committee

i) **AGREED** to enter into a deed supplementing and modifying the existing 2007 S106 Agreement relating to the Olympic Park and Legacy Transformation consents covering the matters outlined in this report.

ii) **AUTHORISE** delegated authority to the Head of Developmental Control to agree the final form of the Deed and complete it.
iii) CONFIRMED that they wished the modification deed to contain a
direct covenant from the OPLC to the PDT covering the ODA
obligations and commitments.

7. Any Other Business
   (AGENDA ITEM 7)

7.1 Future Planning Committee meeting

7.1.1 The next Planning Committee meeting would take place on the 24 August
2010.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 19.10.

Signed: [Signature]

Chair

Date: 25/11/2011