

**OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY**

**ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 86<sup>th</sup> COMMITTEE MEETING**

Held on 11 October 2011 at 18.00

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

---

**Present:**

David Taylor                Chairman

**Local Authority Members:**

Cllr Terry Wheeler,    LB Waltham Forest  
Cllr Geoffrey Taylor,    LB Hackney  
Cllr Conor McAuley,    LB Newham  
Cllr Judith Gardiner    LB Tower Hamlets

**Independent Members:**

Celia Carrington  
Janice Morphet  
Mike Appleton

**Officers in attendance:**

Vivienne Ramsey	ODA, Director of Planning Decisions
Anthony Hollingsworth	ODA, Chief Planner Development
Matthew Foy	ODA Legal Adviser, Planning Decisions Team (Pinsent Masons)
Saba Master	ODA Board Secretary

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

1.1. There were apologies from Lorraine Baldry, William Hodgson and Dru Vesty.

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

- 2.1 There was an Update for Item 5.
- 2.2 The order of business was unchanged.
- 2.3 There were requests to speak from, Rob Dixon, LOCOG, Oli Hayward, LOCOG and Neil Smith, LOCOG, 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, 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 remaining 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 83<sup>rd</sup> Planning Committee Meeting.

5. **LOCOG Common Domain**  
11/90449/AODODA, 11/90450/AODODA, 11/90451/AODODA, 11/90452/AODODA,  
11/90453/AODODA, 11/90455/AODODA, 11/90459/AODODA and  
11/90495/AODODA.

*Submission of details of temporary buildings and structures in connection with the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games including: Erection of temporary front of house structures, erection of temporary back of house structures, erection of temporary security and demarcation fencing of up to 3 metres, parameters (location, footprint and height) of 7 x Sponsor Showcasing structures and laying down vehicle grade tarmac in back of house areas within the application site.*

- 5.1 **McDonalds** - The applicant gave a presentation and informed the Committee that the McDonalds restaurant would be a two storey structure in Zone 4 of the Olympic Park. Access to the restaurant would be via a graded ramp and then a raised deck area. Images of the restaurant and access routes were shown to the Committee. The McDonalds restaurant would have external seating with screening and images of these were also shown.
- 5.2 **Common Domain** – The applicant gave a presentation and informed the Committee that the Common Domain Spectator Service Zones were allocated in Zones 2, 4, 5 and 6. Each of the Spectator Service Zones contain Spectator WCs, Catering Concessions, Public Information, Cash Machine, Merchandise Outlet, Medical Facility and Ticket Sales Office. Drawings of the Front of House, Back of House and Park Spectator entrances were shown.
- 5.3 The applicant explained that provision for primary, secondary and tertiary spectator circulation in the common domain and landscape areas had been prepared in conjunction with the ODA. The ODA would also be installing permanent trees on the hard concourse. Temporary potted trees would be introduced into Zone 2, Zone 6, PSA areas and the perimeter of the Hockey field to soften the landscape.
- 5.4 A PDT Officer gave a presentation and reminded the Committee that the 2007 Olympic planning permissions established the principle of the Spectator Support Areas (SSA); the Front of House (FoH); and the Back of House (BoH) facilities during Games phase within PDZs 2, 4, 5, 6 and 9.
- 5.5 The PDT Officer explained that OLF Games phase OG Conditions included:
- **Security arrangements** - Condition OG.1 requires further details of the proposed physical security arrangements to be installed for the Games.,
  - **Temporary Structures** - Condition OG.3 requires details of temporary buildings and structures to be submitted for approval prior to 31 December 2011, including all those within the identified Front of House and Back of House areas..
  - **Noise** - Condition OG.4 requires the prior approval of details of the noise levels associated with temporary plant and equipment.

- 5.6 The PDT Officer referred the Committee to section 7 of the report which showed the 2007 approved temporary overlay and the 2011 proposal. The 2011 proposal does not exceed the quantum approved in the 2007 proposal.
- 5.7 The PDT Officer reported that applications 11/90449/AODODA, 11/90450/AODODA, 11/90451/AODODA, 11/90452/AODODA, 11/90453/AODODA, 11/90455/AODODA, 11/90459/AODODA and 11/90495/AODODA would comprise of 4 Spectator Support Villages. These would comprise of Front of House temporary buildings with the applicant seeking approval of details of the siting, quantum, size and height parameters of structures. This included: catering concessions, merchandise stores, restaurants, accessibility hubs, visa kiosks and ATMs, public information points, pushchair storage and lost property facilities, retail pharmacies and medical facilities, wheelchair/mobility storage, ticket sales, spectator WCs and pin badge trading areas.
- 5.8 The PDT Officer reported that applications 11/90449/AODODA, 11/90450/AODODA, 11/90451/AODODA, 11/90452/AODODA, 11/90453/AODODA, 11/90455/AODODA, 11/90459/AODODA and 11/90495/AODODA would comprise of 3 Back of House temporary buildings and surfacing with the applicant seeking approval of details of the siting, quantum, size and height parameters of structures. These included: workforce check-in, refreshment, break and dining areas, cash office, catering, logistics, contractor and cash management offices, cleaning and waste offices and storage container, workforce WCs, food preparation areas, logistics, landscaping, waste, cleaning and plant compounds.
- 5.9 The PDT Officer reported the applicant for the McDonalds restaurant in PDZ4 was seeking approval for a restaurant arranged across two floors with a maximum height of 11m with dimensions of 35.7m x 61.4m, including external balconies, public facilities will occupy 1674.6m<sup>2</sup> of internal area and an addition external seating area of 1080m<sup>2</sup> is proposed and approximately 1650 seats are proposed. The structure comprises floors, walls and roof materials provided by a temporary building manufacturer from their standard kit of parts to be fully reusable. The structure will be visible from Bridge L03 to passing spectators. The inner 'shell' and balconies will be wrapped with a number of additional elements including a graphic wrap which is used to shroud the standard temporary building and reflect McDonald's brand image. The graphic will be applied to three elevations which will front onto the public domain, north, east and south.
- 5.10 The PDT Officer explained the considerations for the McDonalds application:
- The McDonald's design team has sought to 'wrap' the structure with additional balcony, timber and graphic elements to add modulation, visual interest and communicate the brand image of the company.
  - The submitted drawings provide a high degree of detail in respect of individual building elements, including balustrades, flooring and proposed seating which provide comfort in respect of the quality of finishes.
  - The submitted DAS explains amongst other matters, the re-use philosophy, access and internal circulation arrangements and lighting proposals to an appropriate degree of detail when taking into account the current stage of design development.
  - With the exception of setting out a requirement for the submission of additional details in respect of landscaping, specifically in reference to the interface with the

Common Domain, and further details of the proposed graphics and signage, DC CABE comments were largely positive.

- It is considered that the form, scale, modulation and design of the structure would be in accordance with relevant London Plan and LB Tower Hamlet Core Strategy policies and section 5(5)(a) of the Olympic Act.
- Consultation has raised no objection. DC CABE are supportive of the proposed scheme.

5.11 The PDT Officer then explained the considerations for the LOCOG Common Domain – Temporary Facilities applications:

- The need for temporary structures within the Concourse/Common Domain areas to provide spectator support services and support the operation of the public concourse areas during the Games has been recognised and accepted in previous approvals.
- These submissions relate to the general arrangements, height parameters and layout of the proposed temporary Common Domain overlay.
- Although there continues to be a lack of certainty in respect of the detailed appearance and design quality of LOCOG Overlay, Officers are satisfied that the principle, general arrangements and quantum of the proposed Spectator Support villages, Front of House and Back of House Areas are consistent with the approved 2007 OLF permissions and consequent slot-in permissions.
- The proposals are for development which supports the proper preparation of the Games in accordance with section 5(5) of the London Olympic Games and Paralympic Games Act 2006. The proposals would also generally comply with the relevant London Plan and LB Tower Hamlets, Hackney and Newham Unitary Development Plan policies.
- With regard to the temporary facilities as additional detailed information is required it is recommended that conditions should be partially discharged subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report and the Update report.
- No objections to the proposals were received after extensive consultation.

5.12 The Update Report for this item confirmed that the following details were still being considered :

- **Noise** – additional details are being considered by LBTH and PDT's consultants. However, from the information submitted the PDT Officer assessment is that noise levels would be unlikely to have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the nearest residential properties
- **Odour** – additional details are being considered by LBTH and PDT's consultants.
- **Piling Risk and remediation** – additional information required by PDT's consultants.
- **Landscaping and graphics** – Conditions recommended to deal with the further details required.

- 5.13 The Update Report made no change to the recommendation for either the : *LOCOG Common Domain Applications: 11/90449/AODODA, 11/90450/AODODA, 11/90451/AODODA, 11/90452/AODODA, 11/90453/AODODA, 11/90455/AODODA, 11/90459/AODODA* or to the PDZ 4 McDonald's application 11/90495/AODODA. A series of conditions for the McDonald's application were recommended.
- 5.14 In conclusion the PDT Officer reported that the principle for temporary structures with the Common Domain areas to provide spectator support services and support the operation of the public concourse areas during the Games had been established in 2007. This application therefore relates to the design and operational details of the proposed temporary overlay. Although there continues to be a lack of certainty in respect of the detailed appearance and design quality of LOCOG Overlay, PDT Officers are satisfied that the principle, general arrangements and quantum of the proposed Spectator Support villages, Front of House and Back of House Areas are consistent with the approved 2007 OLF permissions and consequent slot-in permissions. PDT consider that the proposals for the development supports the proper preparation of the Games in accordance with section 5(5) of the London Olympic Games and Paralympic Games Act 2006 and that the proposals generally comply with the relevant London Plan and LB Tower Hamlets, Hackney and Newham Unitary Development Plan policies.
- 5.15 A member asked in the lack of detail, particularly in relation to the proposed screening and seating arrangements for McDonalds and asked whether it was being controlled by condition. A PDT Officer replied that further details would still need to be provided as part of the a further application dealing with amongst other things the proposed graphics, signage and landscape strategy.
- 5.16 A member asked for further information on the Megastore. The applicant reported that the Megastore would be a 2 storey (ground and first floor with balcony on the front edge of the first floor) public facility. It would comprise of a mixture of bar and dwell space including a children's zone. The Megastore would be covered with a separate entrance and exit and operate separately to the retail facility below. Any branding would only be visible within the enclosed parts of the structure.
- 5.17 A member asked for clarification and reassurance that a children's play space and facilities have been considered in light of the comments from DC CABE. A PDT Officer reported that information on childrens play and Park animation would come forward pursuant to further briefings and where relevant submissions for approval.
- 5.18 A member asked for assurance that the servicing of the various elements would work successfully together, especially in the larger areas where the Megastore, McDonalds and other sponsor showcases were located. The applicant confirmed that this would come foward in detail as part of a future application but that all serving was from the Loop Road.
- 5.19 A member requested that the applicant (LOCOG) consider retaining a landcspe architect or designer in response to DC CABE's suggestion that the Public Realm look as visually pleasing as possible. The applicant confirmed that the ODA is delivering the public realm, with work on Look and Feel and overlay design being coordinated by LOCOG to ensure continuity.
- 5.20 Following comments from several members about wishing to see future applications for common domain structures brought back to committee, the PDT legal representative asked the the Committtee to clarify exactly which applications they wanted to

consider. The PDT officer confirmed that the OBS tower and prestige ticket buildings would be reported to Committee together with other principal structures and sponsor showcase buildings.

5.21 There being no further questions, the Committee took a vote and voted unanimously to **AGREE**:

- i) The **PARTIAL OR FULL DISCHARGE** of submissions 11/90449/AODODA, 11/90450/AODODA, 11/90451/AODODA, 11/90452/AODODA, 11/90453/AODODA, 11/90455/AODODA, 11/90459/AODODA, as identified for each case in the report and subject to the reasons and informatives set out in the report
- ii) **TO DELEGATE** authority to the Director of Planning Decisions to approve the application in respect of submission 11/90495/AODODA (McDonald's) subject to the resolution of the outstanding matters identified and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Update Report (subject to such refinement as the Director of Planning Decisions considers appropriate in resolving the outstanding matters identified).

## **6. Mayor of London's draft Olympic Legacy Supplementary Planning Guidance (OLSPG) Report**

6.1 A PDT Officer presented this report and explained that the OLSPG was prepared in consultation with the 4 affected boroughs, LTGDC and ODA PDT. The OLSPG is intended to provide the Mayor's vision for the area at a strategic/sub-regional level with the Mayor wanting the LPAs to take the document into account in making planning decisions and in developing planning policy.

6.2 The Committee is asked to provide views and comments on the proposed response to the OLSPG. Annex 1 sets out the figures from the OLSPG consultation document and Annex 2 sets out the Table of proposed comments on the Mayors Draft Olympic Legacy Supplementary Planning Guidance (August 2011).

6.3 The PDT Officer reported that the five sub areas identified were the Olympic Park, Stratford, Southern Olympic Fringe, Hackney Wick and Fish Island and the Northern Olympic Fringe. In general, PDT support the individual visions for each sub area, the scale of change and the development principles identified. However, there are a number of matters of detail that have been identified that need to be addressed:

6.3.1 **Olympic Park sub area** – suggests a need to revisit building height indications in one area, remove reference to a potential terrace of housing within the parklands and change an indication of residential development to one of mixed use in the area immediately to the south-east of the Aquatics Centre.

6.3.2 **Stratford sub area** – considers that there is a need to revisit some aspects of the development capacity figures identified for the sub area, particularly in relation to Stratford City and also suggests that an area of Chobham to the south of the CTRL Box should be shown as mixed use, and to the north of this a change in approach to the heights indicated.

6.3.3 **Southern Olympic Fringe** - The emphasis on a need for managed change is welcomed, while it is considered that a further element of the Pudding Mill Lane area

could be better indicated as 'mixed use' given the difficult conditions presented by new and existing infrastructure.

- 6.3.4 **Hackney Wick and Fish Island** - The vision is welcomed while clarification of the stated development capacity it sought compared to that indicated in adopted borough Core Strategies.
- 6.3.5 **Northern Olympic Fringe** - The vision is welcomed, while clarification and consideration of feasibility is sought in respect of the identified need for a green link between Leyton Mills and Eton Manor.
- 6.3.6 The complexity and scale of connectivity and transport issues are highlighted with the OLSPG proposed growth presenting one element of a wider sub-regional picture that needs to be addressed.
- 6.4 The PDT Officer reported that PDT broadly welcome the draft OLSPG as providing helpful and appropriate guidance for the identified OLSPG area. It is considered that the guidance includes a greater focus on the locations in its area that are beyond the core areas of change centred on the Olympic Park and should include greater acknowledgement of the diversity of type, scale and character of the different areas and places that go to make up the OLSPG area as a whole. The complexity and scale of connectivity and transport issues are highlighted with the OLSPG proposed growth presenting one element of a wider sub-regional picture that needs to be addressed. A range of specific comments and suggested changes are also made as summarised in this report and set out in detail at Annex 2. The PDT Officer pointed out that should the matters raised in the final response to the Mayor be adequately addressed in the final published version of the guidance, it is likely that the Planning Committee will be asked at a later date to formally 'endorse' the document and in so doing acknowledge the need to take it into account when making planning decisions.
- 6.5 A member expressed concern about the omission of Lea Bridge development from the Northern Olympic fringe. The member also pointed out the weakness of the connectivity between the Olympic Park and Walthamstow/Chingford and questioned the statement in the report on cost and complexity of the Leyton Mills link bridge.
- 6.6 A member expressed broad support for the draft OLSPG but raised the following comments:

#### **6.6.1 Context**

- The SPG does not explain the role that it is expected to play in achieving London Plan objectives..
- The SPG doesn't adequately link back to the assessment work which supports host Borough Core Strategies, .. There is a danger that this is set up as a 'policy island' treating the area covered by the SPG as having no relation to other places or adopted plans.
- The area covered by the SPG already has adopted planning policy and this area already has a role in delivering these requirements. There is no mention of this in the document.



- The role of neighbourhood plans in determining the future in any of the area needs to be addressed in the overview of the SPG.

### **6.6.2 Legal framework and risk**

- Any plan prepared needs to be prepared under the current planning regime rather than be based on anticipated changes or a combination of both.
- New consultation documents are appearing at regular intervals e.g. the recent document on CIL and the consultations on these are overlapping with the consultation on this SPG. This needs to be taken into account
- The intention not to undertake any integrated impact assessment could leave the document with limited application as any commitment of (public) plans, programmes and policies needs to be the subject to an impact assessment under EU requirements. Any delivery plan for this document would have no validity without this.
- Any SPG prepared without taking these legal context points into account could be at risk – as PPS 12 states, all DPDs and SPDs need to be capable of delivery.
- It would be sensible to undertake an assessment of the likely impact of expected national policy and legislation e.g. the Department for Education school funding policy revision, the duty to cooperate, housing rent regimes etc and also when these might take effect as part of a risk assessment.

### **6.6.3 Delivery and funding**

- Queried how this relates to the London Plan's Implementation and Delivery programme.
- Queried how the Mayor's mainstream budgets will be used to deliver this SPG.
- Queried how the post 2014 integrated EU funding regimes be used to deliver the SPD and whether there will be an integrated programme.
- Much of the programme will be delivered by the boroughs e.g. housing, schools, libraries etc – how are these commitments for the area being included in those funding programmes e.g. the Department for Education LIP.
- The new regime on CIL has not yet been finalised – not recognised in the SPG.

6.4 A member asked for clarification on the housing figures with ranges as opposed to exact numbers. The member also asked for assurance that there will be sufficient provision for schools.

6.5 A member expressed concern about:

6.5.1 The density of the housing proposed and that the Mayor should draw attention to how mixed tenure and high density is being used and successfully delivered in the Athletes Village. A PDT Officer reported that PDT had not seen any information that

underlies the modelling that has been completed to obtain the figures quoted for the numbers of homes and the hectares of land.

- 6.5.2 The methodology of the rising figures needs to be reinforced as there is a difference in numbers which LB Tower Hamlets has obtained and it is using the same model. The member requested that the figures were validated in terms of infrastructure and schools as the documentation on education was weak and no certainty had been provided.
- 6.5.3 The unclear linkages on the western side of the park in terms of connectivity issues from LB of Tower Hamlets.
- 6.5.4 The document contained a lack of reference to artistic and cultural provision.
- 6.6 A member commented that :
  - 6.6.1 Further information about the quality of the spaces in between structures would be expected and that the importance of where the schools were placed would have a clear impact on the development of the local community.
  - 6.6.2 Further information on design standards and expectations and biodiversity in the document would be helpful.
  - 6.6.3 PDT reported that that there is an unwritten assumption that where the SPG is silent the relevant London Plan policy applies.
- 6.7 A member reported that there was confusion with the hierarchy of planning policy documents and requested a note on this. It was agreed that a table/diagram which explains this would be circulated following the meeting. **ACTION: PDT**
- 6.7 There being no further questions, the Committee took a vote and unanimously:
  - i) **AGREED** the comments set out in the report and Annex 2 of the report and;
  - ii) **AGREED** to incorporate members' comments into the proposed response to the consultation and the overall letter to the Mayor of London.

## **7. Report for Noting and Information on decisions taken by officers under Delegated Authority from 1 April to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2011.**

- 7.1 This report was introduced by the Director of Planning Decisions who reported that this was the sixth report that members have received detailing the decisions taken by officers under delegated authority.
- 7.2 The Director of Planning Decisions reported that Appendix 1 gave an overall breakdown of the decisions made by officers in the broad categories and that this has increased significantly over the last year. The numbers during the last 6 months have increased by 50% on the numbers for the first half of 2011. Appendix 2 gives further details of each individual application decided by PDT officers. Appendix 3 lists the Article 19 Consultations.

7.3 The Committee:

- i) **NOTED** the Report and the attached schedules – Appendix 1-3 and;
- ii) **NOTED** that this report would be presented to the ODA Board at its meeting on the 24 November 2011.

**8. Any Other Business**

*There being no other business the meeting ended at 19.30.*

**Date of next meeting: 25 October 2011**

Signed: 

Chairman

Date: 25/10/2011

