

**OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY**

**ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 85th COMMITTEE MEETING**

Held on 13 September 2011 at 18.00

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

---

**Present:**

Lorraine Baldry                      Chairman

**Local Authority Members:**

Cllr Terry Wheeler,      LB Waltham Forest  
Cllr Geoffrey Taylor,    LB Hackney  
Cllr Conor McAuley,    LB Newham

**Independent Members:**

Mike Appleton  
Celia Carrington  
William Hodgson  
Dru Vesty

**Officers in attendance:**

Vivienne Ramsey                      ODA, Director of Planning Decisions  
Anthony Hollingsworth              ODA, Chief Planner Development  
Control, Planning Decisions Team  
Emma Bennett                          ODA Legal Adviser, Planning Decisions  
Team (Pinsent Masons)

**1. APOLOGIES  
(AGENDA ITEM 1)**

- 1.1 Apologies were received from David Taylor, Cllr Judith Gardiner and Janice Morphet.

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

2.1 The order of business was unchanged.

## **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM 3)**

3.1. The Director of Planning Decisions 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 Committee:

**AGREED** the Minutes of the 84<sup>th</sup> Planning Committee Meeting.

## **5. IBC Screen: 11/90427/AODODA (AGENDA ITEM 5)**

*Submission of details of games phase temporary plant (illustrative details), gantry treatment and Games phase screening of the eastern gantry elevation and details of Games phase lighting (lights fixed to IBC gantry) pursuant to conditions IBC.3 and Site Wide 5 of Reserved Matters approval ref.09/90059/REMODA.*

- 5.1 John Gardener (PDT Officer) presented the proposals and explained that a planning condition attached to the Reserved Matters approval for the detailed design of the IBC required approval of Games Phase screening of the eastern elevation in order to screen the plant installed on the gantry. Details of street lighting to be attached to the gantry were also presented for approval.
- 5.2 The PDT Officer explained that the proposal was for 32 vertical PVC white fabric mesh screens to be attached to each bay, with three up-lighters. Ten street lights were to be attached to the gantry, 10m above ground level. These are proposed instead of erecting separate street lighting columns on this stretch of road.
- 5.3 The PDT Officer showed illustrative views of the plant and explained that the generator flues shown were for illustrative purposes only and would come forward in a separate application.
- 5.4 The PDT Officer reported that the following were considered:-
- 5.4.1 Design and appearance** – the proposed method of screening is considered appropriate, and provides a visually appropriate backdrop to public areas and the Hockey facilities closest to the IBC area.
- 5.4.2 Sustainability issues** – the PVC mesh is manufactured in accordance with the relevant EU standards for PVC manufacture. The material supplied has a 50% recycled content and after use the material will be further recycled.
- 5.4.3 Maintenance** – the material is washable and will be installed immediately prior to the Games so that will be in good condition for the Games.
- 5.4.4** The PDT Officer explained that the requirement for screening in the Reserved Matters approval still continues to be necessary given the size and prominence of the eastern elevation. The proposals would effectively screen the temporary plant while providing a visually appropriate backdrop to public areas and the Hockey venue. The street lighting on the gantry is considered acceptable. In conclusion, the PDT Officer reported that Officers recommend the Committee to approve the details subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.
- 5.5 A member commented on the screen, observing that the screen links the IBC to the Basketball venue and the screen around the Stadium, hence uniting the Park.
- 5.6 A member asked what the eastern elevation would look like with the street lighting turned on, reference was made to the illustrative view in the Officer's presentation demonstrating this.
- 5.7 A member questioned the colour of the up-lighting. The PDT Officer explained the final colour had not yet been decided and would be conditioned. The PDT Officer explained that there would be no conflict with the colour of the street lighting. The PDT Officer explained that a study on colour was being undertaken by the ODA together with LOCOG to investigate whether to present a coloured backdrop to the Hockey venue. Enough is not yet known about the look and feel of the Hockey venue to make a decision. The

Applicant explained that provision for colour had been made in the lighting elements. The final colour choice would require approval pursuant to the condition.

- 5.8 A member queried whether the uplighters were contributing to light pollution, and questioned whether a 'top down' option had been considered. The applicant responded by explaining that the source of light would be seen in a top down provision. The un-even distribution of the lighting was also questioned; the applicant confirmed they were confident the un-even distribution would ensure that light pollution would be minimised.
- 5.9 A member asked what the realistic expectation of the duration of the lights would be. The applicant responded that the lighting had a decorative function only, and would only be in place for the duration of the Events.
- 5.10 There being no further questions the Committee (unanimously):

**APPROVED** the application and approved the details as partial discharge of conditions IBC.3 and Site Wide 5 of Reserved Matters Approval 09/90059/REMODA subject to the conditions and informatives set out in paragraph 10.1 of the Committee Report.

**6. OPTEMS Strategy 2011 11/90543/106ODA  
(AGENDA ITEM 6)**

*Submission of 2011 OPTEMS Strategy pursuant to Schedule 4 of the September 2007 Section 106 Agreement.*

- 6.1 Victoria Crosby (PDT Officer) presented the submission and explained that this application is to approve the Olympic Park Transport and Environmental Management Scheme (OPTEMS) Strategy 2011 submitted pursuant to Schedule 4 of the September 2007 Section 106 Agreement.
- 6.2 The 2007 Transport Assessment concluded that the construction, operation and Transformation of the Olympic Park will have Transportation Effects. Schedule 4 of the September 2007 Section 106 Agreement sets out a process to monitor these Transportation Effects and to bring forward mitigation measures and requires an annual OPTEMS Strategy.
- 6.3 The PDT Officer explained that this was the fourth annual Strategy to be submitted for approval and gave a brief outline of the previous three Strategies. The PDT Officer explained this Strategy gives an update on the 28 schemes included in the 2010 Strategy and the one urgent measure, 24 of which are continued into the 2011 Strategy, and gives details of the 12 new schemes included in the 2011 Strategy. Nearly £9m has been committed to the 2010 schemes. The new schemes are aimed at improving connectivity to and from the Olympic Park for pedestrians, cyclists and buses, way finding and Hackney Wick station improvements. The PDT Officer reported that 6 of these new schemes are due to be completed prior to the Games.

- 6.4 The Committee were shown two plans, one of the continued 2010 Strategy schemes and a plan of the 2011 Strategy illustrating the locations of the additional proposed schemes.
- 6.5 The PDT Officer reported that although £5.3m had been allocated in principle for additional schemes approved for the 2011 Strategy this amount was flexible, and the OPTEMS member proposing the scheme will have to justify in terms of the OPTEMS criteria the level of funding requested. A contingency of approximately £3m to £3.5m exists. This contingency could be used as a contribution towards the London cycle hire scheme extension if proposed, to fund urgent schemes, provide additional funding to the new schemes where the amount was reduced for that originally sought, or to provide funding for new schemes to address new or unexpected Transportation Effects.
- 6.6 The PDT Officer explained in the presentation that two draft versions of the 2011 Strategy had been consulted on by all OPTEMS Members before the Strategy was agreed (with minor amendments) at the 1<sup>st</sup> August OPTEMS meeting.
- 6.7 Co-ordination with other transport projects by Stratford City, the ODA and others continues, with many schemes part-funded by OPTEMS. PDT Officers are satisfied with the proposed next steps for the Group over the next year, including a thorough review of each of the Transportation Effects to assess which of the construction and Games phase Effects have been successfully mitigated, and which of the post-Games Effects are expected to be mitigated, or whether any are still outstanding. The PDT Officer concluded that the 2011 Strategy complies with Schedule 4 of the September 2007 Section 106 Agreement, and therefore asked the Committee to approve the submitted 2011 Strategy.
- 6.8 A member noted that it was a shame that the community could not see that they were benefiting from new junctions etc as a result of the Olympic Games, and that publicity of the OPTEMS funding should be considered at the scheme locations for a short period to raise awareness.
- 6.9 Another member commented that this was a fantastic Strategy. The member asked whether the £3million contingency fund was a contingency fund solely for matters already approved rather than for all post-Games pinch-points that were as yet unknown. PDT's Transport Consultant explained that the contingency fund was to cover those unexpected situations as well as for schemes already approved for funding, but that generally schemes were found to be on budget so far.
- 6.10 A member noted that they were impressed by the process and progress of the Strategy, and that it had been a thorough process.
- 6.11 A member questioned whether Hackney Wick Station would be improved before the Games. The Director of Planning Decisions explained that Hackney Wick station would not be used at Games time. PDT's Transport Consultant explained further that Hackney Wick was not a good route to the Park, and that managing large crowds on the platforms currently at the station would not be a safe option for Games time.

6.12 There was some discussion amongst Members of the traffic speed on Stratford High Street and the resulting need for a new cycle lane set away from the north of the High Street, and the traffic calming scheme at Cadogan Terrace. This led to a query by a member whether there were lessons learned from the OPTEMS model about what makes a "good" transport scheme. It was noted that each Borough devised their own scheme for submission to OPTEMS; it was questioned whether OPTEMS and/or ODA should have devised its own schemes, however it was noted that this is likely to have incurred greater administration costs to OPTEMS which have so far been kept to a minimum.

6.13 There being no further questions:

The Committee voted (unanimously) to:

**APPROVE** the submitted 2011 OPTEMS Strategy.

**7. Any Other Business**

*There being no other business the meeting ended at 19.00.*

**Date of next meeting: 11 October 2011**

Signed: 

Chairman

Date: 25/10/2011