

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY PLANNING COMMITTEE

26th July 2011

COMMITTEE UPDATE

Item No 7 - Applications numbers: 11/90313/VARODA, 11/90314/VARODA, 11/90315/VARODA, 11/90316/VARODA, 11/90317/VARODA, 11/90318/VARODA, 11/90319/VARODA, 11/90320/VARODA, 11/90321/VARODA, 11/90322/VARODA, 11/90323/VARODA, 11/90324/VARODA, 11/90325/FULODA and 11/90326/VARODA

Site Location: Olympic Park (and various individual sites within the Olympic Park)

Proposal: Variation of renewable energy conditions on the 2007 OLF permission and subsequent slot-in permissions. Slot in application for hard standing on the site of the approved wind turbine for Games phase. (See Officers' Report for full proposal details)

1. **Consultation responses** – responses from three organisations were received following the preparation of the Officers' report.

Lee Valley Regional Park Authority – The Authority raises no material consideration regarding the removal of the wind turbine from Eton Manor and provision of hard-standing during the Games phase. However, the Authority observes that the site of the wind turbine and area previously allocated for allotments could be used to create a large area for informal recreation in Legacy. The reasons for seeking the reduction of the onsite renewables target from 20% to 9% are understood. It is welcome that the 50% carbon reduction target can be met through the building retrofitting schemes, and the Authority is supportive of this approach.

London Borough of Tower Hamlets – raises a holding objection to the proposed wording of the renewable energy conditions. LBTH are disappointed that the pre-Games pledge to deliver a low carbon Olympics and legacy will not be fulfilled and the 20% renewable target will not be reached. LBTH considers these applications effectively exempt any legal obligation upon the OPLC and future developers to meet the 20% target, instead setting only a 9% target over a 25-year build out programme. With rapid advances in renewable technologies, LBTH consider it inappropriate for such conditions to be imposed in perpetuity and should instead be imposed via temporary (3 years), time limited consents. This would allow monitoring and assessment of the revised 9% target against policy and technological advances. All new development on the Olympic Park would be tracked and reviewed every 3 years over the 25 year built out period against the applicable standards. LBTH also suggest a

draft renewable energy feasibility update report is required at each time of renewal.

Officer response – the proposed variation of renewable energy targets would apply to Games phase and post-Games phase of the Olympic Park development as already consented, and the legacy phases of the venues. However, the proposed revised conditions would not apply to the OPLC's future Legacy Communities Scheme (LCS) within the Olympic Park. When assessing the LCS application, PDT will consider what renewable energy generation and carbon emissions reduction targets to set in line with planning policies, and how to secure them. PDT does not consider it appropriate to issue only temporary consents for the current applications. The off-site measures proposed mean that the 50% carbon emissions reduction target would be met, which is compliant with the policy direction in the London Plan, as set out in sections 7.5 and 7.17 of the Officers' report.

London Borough of Hackney – raises a concern with the proposed re-wording of the conditions, and asks for additional information regarding the off-site schemes. As the conditions will sit with the retained elements of the site post-Games, they would set a lower minimum benchmark for the future which could mean minimum targets are not updated to reflect the on-going development, operational programme for the site, and advances in technology over the 20-30 year legacy build out. LBH consider a mechanism for regular monitoring and review should be introduced. The target reduction should not set a new baseline for future planning applications which will need to set out a clear rationale, targets and monitoring mechanisms. LBH asks that the applicant provides a clear outline of its off-site energy contribution to RE:NEW and RE:FIT, and how the £1.5m was arrived at, and how the ODA will engage with the four boroughs to deliver the scheme in an equitable manner. It is important that the ODA works with the relevant parts of each borough to ensure delivery is included within existing programmes, and to understand how the ODA funding will address procurement factors with co-ordination from GLA/LDA and the boroughs. PDT should monitor the scheme's programme and progress, but delivery needs to be undertaken in conjunction with the boroughs.

Officer response – these revised conditions would not apply to the LCS scheme, which will be considered on its own merits and targets and monitoring set on any permission in line with planning policies. The ODA has provided information on the off-site scheme, its proposed operation, including engagement with the GLA and host boroughs, and funding. PDT agrees that monitoring and review of the implementation of the proposed off-site measures will be essential. The draft Heads of Terms at section 7.16 of the Officers' report include provision for monitoring and obligations to spend the full contribution on off-site measures.

2. Heads of Terms for the Section 106 agreement

Following discussions with the applicant, an additional clause would be added to the modification deed. This clause would prevent the ODA from submitting applications pursuant to conditions on the 2007 OLF permission and subsequent slot-in permissions, but submit only under these new revised permissions. The detailed wording of this clause would be secured by the Director of Planning Decisions in the on-going negotiations and completion of the deed.

3. **London Plan update** – the replacement spatial development strategy for London was published by the Mayor of London on 22 July 2011, after the Officers' report was published. The London Plan dated July 2011 replaces the policies in the London Plan (Consolidated with alterations since February 2004) published in February 2008, which therefore no longer carry any weight. Only the policies which were, at the time the Officers' report was published, in draft form (in the October 2009 consultation draft replacement Plan) and which are included in the published London Plan dated July 2011 have any weight. Some of the draft policies listed in the Officers' report have had changes made to their wording in the published London Plan dated July 2011, but these changes are not significant, and would not affect the recommendation to Members.