

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

8 January 2008

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 15th COMMITTEE MEETING
Held on 11 December 2007 at 18.00

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

Present: Lorraine Baldry Chairman
David Taylor Deputy Chairman

Local Authority Members:

Cllr Rofique Ahmed	LB Tower Hamlets
Cllr Conor McAuley	LB Newham
Cllr Geoff Taylor	LB Hackney
Cllr Terry Wheeler	LB Waltham Forest

Independent Members:

Michael Appleton	(Items 1-6)
Celia Carrington	
William Hodgson	
Janice Morphet	(Items 1-6)
Dru Vesty	

Officers in attendance:

Vivienne Ramsey	ODA, Head of Development Control
Anthony Hollingsworth	ODA, Chief Planner, Development Control
John Gardener	ODA, Planning Decisions Team
Angela Hughes	ODA, Planning Decisions Team
Richard Ford	ODA, Legal adviser, Planning Decisions Team, (Pinsent Masons)
Vanessa Brand	ODA, Committee Secretary

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

1.1. All Members were present

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

2.1. The Chairman drew attention to updates to the report as circulated in respect of Items 5, 7, and 8:

Item 5: Update

- amendments and updates to the report with additional correspondence
- additional condition
- reasons for approval and summary of relevant development plan policies

Item 7: Update

- Correction to para 7.1.3
- Additional consultation comments (copies attached to update)
- Applicant's response to concerns raised by ODA Transport

Item 8: Update

- Clarification to para 7.6.3
- Amended condition
- Correspondence with the applicant and archaeological report

2.2. The order of business was unchanged.

2.3. There was 1 request to speak on behalf of the applicant in respect of Item 5. This was agreed.

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, 6, 7 and 8.

There is one additional declaration in respect of Item 7:

Janice Morphet has declared that her daughter is currently working as a member of the Planning Team of Ashurst's, the solicitors who act for Westfield Shoppingtowns Ltd in relation to the Stratford City development. Although Janice's daughter has not worked on this development, Janice has decided to withdraw from discussion of Item 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?

3.2. Members confirmed that the personal interests read out were correct and that there were no additional interests to be declared.

4. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING (AGENDA ITEM 4)

4.1. Members agreed the Minutes. There were no matters arising.

4.2. The Committee

AGREED the Minutes of the 14th Planning Committee Meeting

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

5. PLANNING APPLICATION 07/90166/REMODA

Reserved matters applications for the construction of an electricity sub-station and perimeter fencing at 1 Waterden Road, Tower Hamlets

5.1. The Committee considered the report and took into account the updates which had been circulated and which specifically covered the external materials, design integration, lighting, noise, and sustainability. The Chief Planner gave a presentation to the Committee describing the application and explaining the updates. Permission had been granted for the construction of an electricity sub-station on 28 September 2007 as part of the Olympic and Legacy Facilities and Site Preparation consents. The application boundary was tightly drawn and excluded the access road to the west and areas of landscaping about which the London Borough of Tower Hamlets and the Metropolitan Police had commented. These would form part of a later application. The proposed sub-station was within the agreed parameters. It was proposed to construct weld mesh security fencing in accordance with the Electricity Regulations. This would be higher at the rear of the building, adjacent to the railway, where it would be the same height as the security perimeter fence around the Olympic Park. The Committee was recommended to agree the proposals subject to a number of conditions which would allow officers to approve details of the materials and other issues.

5.2. The applicant's architect, Alan Pert of NORD, explained the design rationale. The form of the building reflected its function and picked up datum levels and

details from the land bridge to the east and the retained building at King's Yard. The brown roof was designed to read as part of the hard landscape when viewed from above from adjacent buildings to be erected in legacy. In response to questions he explained that the weld mesh fence would be constructed to match the Olympic Park fence but would be coloured black. The steel doors to the building would also be black.

- 5.3. It had originally been proposed to reuse London stock bricks from the buildings demolished on the King's Yard site, but tests had shown that there were insufficient bricks of the required strength, and the applicant was unable to source similar bricks in the required timescale. It was therefore proposed to use a dark brick to echo the bricks used in window and door surrounds of the retained 19th century King's Yard building. The design of the building was supported by CABE, Tower Hamlets, Hackney, and the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority. CABE and Tower Hamlets did not object to the changed materials.
- 5.4. Members noted that a sample rough-textured black brick had been submitted but that officers were not satisfied with this sample. The applicant confirmed that the brick was locally sourced. Members regretted that the sample was not available at the meeting.
- 5.5. The sub-station would form one of a family of Utility buildings to be erected in the Park and was designed to refer to the earlier industrial buildings at King's Yard. Officers considered that the building in itself was of high quality, though there was only limited information about the general design principles for Utility buildings which would ensure its integration with later applications. Details of the hard landscaping had been submitted only the previous day and the Committee's views were sought. Members noted that hard landscaping was appropriate for the site but that officers preferred to consider the landscaping details when proposals for the surrounding area were clearer so that the overall design was integrated.
- 5.6. Further details of the lighting of the towers were to be submitted.
- 5.7. A recent study had shown that the background noise level was higher than expected and the applicants had requested that the maximum permitted level be raised from 35dBA to 45dBA. Tower Hamlets Environmental Health Officer had objected to a maximum limit of more than 40dBA because of the potential impact. It was recommended that this technical issue should be resolved by delegating authority to officers to amend the proposed condition 2 to impose a noise level which was acceptable to Tower Hamlets after appropriate discussions with the applicant. Members noted that the honeycomb detailing on the towers was not a significant factor in relation to the noise level.
- 5.8. The building would be unstaffed and would not be a high energy user. Members were disappointed that it had not been designed to make a substantial contribution to ODA's overall sustainability targets but noted that the S106 agreement specifically excluded the sub-station from the general requirement for buildings of more than 1,000 sq m to meet BREEAM Excellent rating.

5.9. Members discussed the proposals. There were differing views about the design of the building, but Members noted officers' views that the design and other issues discussed were satisfactory subject to the recommended conditions.

5.10. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED in accordance with the recommendations and subject to the imposition of revised condition 2 and additional condition 4:

The Committee

- a) AGREED the reasons for APPROVAL as given in the report and the Update report;
- b) GRANTED planning permission subject to (c) and the conditions and informatives below
- c) DELEGATED authority to the Head of Development Control to amend and agree the wording of condition 2 to include a maximum noise level acceptable to the London Borough of Tower Hamlets

Conditions:

- 1 Before the commencement of above ground construction works a sample of the materials to be used on all external surfaces of the building (including the material to be used on the brown roof) and external hard landscaped areas within the application site shall either be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority or erected as a sample panel on site for the inspection and approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority, whichever shall be so agreed by the Local Planning Authority with the applicant.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory standard of external appearance in accordance with policies 4B.1 and 4B.6 of the London Plan and policies DEV1 and DEV12 of the Tower Hamlets Unitary Development Plan.

- 2 Noise levels from the building shall not exceed (**figure to be agreed and inserted**) from a distance of 10m measured from any point of the façade of the substation building hereby approved.

Reason: To protect the amenities of existing and future adjoining occupiers in accordance with the provisions of policy DEV 50 of the Tower Hamlets Unitary Development Plan.

- 3 Prior to occupation of the building full details of all signs to be located on site and on the building shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented fully in accordance with such approval unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory standard of external appearance in accordance with the provisions of policy DEV1 of the Tower Hamlets Unitary Development Plan

- 4 Notwithstanding the drawings hereby approved, the details of the hard landscape around the building are not approved and prior to the commencement of above ground construction works full details of the external hard surface areas (including samples) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory standard of external appearance in accordance with policies 4B.1 and 4 B.6 of the London Plan and policies DEV1 and DEV12 of the Tower Hamlets Unitary Development Plan

Informatives:

- 1 The applicant is reminded that the requirement of condition OD.0.18 (x) regarding external lighting is not discharged by this permission. The applicant is advised to contact the Local planning Authority in order to agree a timetable for the submission of the lighting details for this building.
- 2 The applicant is reminded that the provisions of conditions SP.0.36 and OD.0.38 on Unexpected Contamination apply to all site preparation and construction works.
- 3 The applicant is advised that the indicative details of piling for the development are insufficient to discharge the requirements of OD.0.26 on Foundation Details. All of the details stated in OD.0.26 are required to be submitted before the Local Planning Authority can consider these for approval.

6. PLANNING APPLICATION

07/90185/REMODA

Reserved matters applications for the construction of landbridges LO3A and LO3B within the Olympic Park, Tower Hamlets and Hackney

- 6.1. A planning officer gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report. Permission had been granted for the 2 landbridges on 28 September 2007 as part of the Olympic and Legacy Facilities and Site Preparation consents. Both the proposed bridges would be permanent structures forming part of the main concourse during the Games and retained in legacy as the principal link between the northern and southern parts of the Park. Bridge LO3A would cross the North London line. Bridge LO3B, which lay to the south, would cross Carpenter's Road. It would be widened during the Games with a temporary addition, but this did not form part of the current application. It was recommended that the proposed structures be approved but that their appearance should be subject to the submission of further details of facing materials and other details of the design.
- 6.2. Members were concerned at the lack of detailed information about the design of these bridges and about the need to consider the application before the Urban Design and Landscape Framework (UDLF) had been approved. They emphasised the need for a common language of design to give coherence to the Park and an overarching rationale as indicated in the original Masterplan

Framework. In the absence of such a framework the submission of one-off applications was undesirable. Officers informed the Committee that a document had recently been submitted and the Committee would be briefed about the UDLF, which was programmed to be considered at the Committee meeting on 11 March 2008 but might be brought forward earlier. Copies of the submitted document would be circulated to Members.

Action:
Head of Development Control

6.3. In response to questions the applicant's architect explained that bridge LO3B would be widened for the Games by a design and build contract which could not be commenced until the crowd capacity need had been calculated. The applicant also stated that he thought the design life of the steel mesh to be used in the parapets would be around 20 years, after which the mesh would have to be replaced. Members were surprised that this was much shorter than the life of the structure.

6.4. Members noted that the proposed structures were within the agreed parameters and that further details were to be submitted pursuant to conditions of features such as the stone faced baskets to be used on the embankments. They remained concerned that important aspects of the scheme had not yet been resolved and agreed that the further information should be brought back to the Committee for approval when approving submissions to discharge the conditions.

6.5. Members asked that in future a limited number of the most useful drawings of proposals should be included in the report since these would generally assist Members more than photographs of the site.

Action:
Head of Development Control

6.6. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED in accordance with the recommendation and subject to the imposition of revised condition 1

The Committee:

- a) AGREED the reasons for APPROVAL as given in the report
- b) APPROVED the Reserved Matters application and GRANTED Planning Permission subject to the following condition and to the elements listed in that condition being referred back to the Committee:
 1. Before the following elements of the proposals are implemented, full details of those elements shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
 - Details, including sample panels, of the proposed concrete finishes to all exposed areas of concrete and the colour of painted steelwork;
 - Details of the north and south facing abutment walls facing the highway under bridge LO3B including sample panels of any proposed brickwork to any external surface;

- Details, including sample panels, of the proposed stone faced basket finish;
- Detailed elevations at 1:50 scale showing typical proposed parapet details including the concrete parapet on bridge LO3A and to include proposed colour, material and detail showing the parapet in relation to the top of the stone filled basket slope and the surface of the bridge deck.

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the detailed design of these elements is satisfactory

Michael Appleton and Janice Morphet left the meeting

7. PLANNING APPLICATION

07/90199/REMODA

Reserved matters applications for the construction of a pedestrian bridge to provide a town centre link between the Stratford City site and the existing town centre at Stratford

- 7.1. A planning officer gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report and took into account the updates which had been circulated correcting the report and referring to comments received after the report had been published. Outline permission had originally been granted by the London Borough of Newham for the Stratford City Development, and subsequent S73 applications had been granted permission on 13 November 2007. This current application had been delegated to Newham and the Committee's views were sought for presentation to Newham's Planning Committee. The proposal was an application for approval of reserved matters for the construction of the town centre link bridge across the main railway line at Stratford Regional Station to connect the new development to the existing Stratford town centre. However, the application did not include the access steps, lifts and escalators at either end of the bridge nor the lighting.
- 7.2. The bridge was critical for access to the Olympic Park during the Games, and at 12m wide the proposed bridge would have sufficient capacity for the majority of Olympic flows. Members welcomed Newham's aspiration for a wide 'living' bridge which would create an attractive environment and encourage the integration of the new development.
- 7.3. The update covered the applicant's response to comments by ODA's Transport team including their concerns about the lack of any information about the connections at either end. Members were also concerned about this issue and the desirability of having the surrounding contextual detail. John Shimmen, the applicant's representative, explained that in order to avoid a delay of a year, they must be in a position to order materials and progress the works to meet the timetable for railway possessions which had been booked. The remaining reserved matters were due to be submitted in June 2008. These would form part of a wider application for the public realm, the design of which would affect the whole of the new shopping centre as well as Meridian Square. At the Stratford end the complex connection to the station and the relationship to the retained taxi rank were still to be designed in detail.

- 7.4. John Shimmen representing the applicant, presented a copy of a letter to the planning officer which had been received that day from Network Rail withdrawing their objection to the proposal (report, para 6.2.3).
- 7.5. The update also corrected paragraph 7.1.3 of the report making clear that the indicative height of the bridge was 6.5 metres. The structure of the bridge was therefore within the agreed parameters and in accordance with the zonal Masterplan.
- 7.6. Members acknowledged the importance of the bridge and the timing of the application. They agreed that the design of the bridge was to be welcomed in so far as it could be appreciated, but reserved their position about the design of the interfaces which were to form part of the later application.
- 7.7. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED unanimously in accordance with the recommendation:

That the London Borough of Newham be advised that the ODA Planning Committee has no objections to the grant of permission, but ask that the London Borough of Newham consider the comments made and the suggested conditions and informatives as included in the report and in the update report in considering and deciding this application:

Conditions:

1. A formal Reserved Matter Application for means of access to the Town Centre Link (TCL) bridge, including hard and soft landscaping and the treatment of public realm in, at minimum, Zone 1 of Stratford City (excluding the Angel Lane site) should be submitted to the ODA PDT by 30th June 2008. This application should include detailed proposal for lighting along the TCL Bridge in addition to resting places for persons with limited mobility. The type, design and spacing of resting places must be informed through pre-application discussions with the Stratford City Consultative Access Group.

Reason: To ensure that the a comprehensive scheme for the Town Centre Link is delivered taking account of the design, access and integration requirements of the London Planning Authority, in accordance with Policy EQ19 and S7 of the London Borough of Newham Unitary Development Plan (adopted June 2001) saved from the 27th of September 2007 in accordance with the direction from the Secretary of State.

ODA Transport:

2. Notwithstanding the details shown on the plans and other documents hereby approved, the details of the Town Centre Link Bridge and the southern pier of the approved bridge and its relationship to the new Westbound Centre Line platform (known as Platform 3A) are not approved. A revised plan showing any alterations required to the position of the southern pier must be submitted and approved to the Local Planning Authority, in

consultation with Network Rail, prior to the implementation of this planning permission.

Reason: To ensure that the approved development does not adversely affect the extension and modification of the Stratford Regional Station.

Informatives:

1. The Applicant is expected to continue to liaise with the Metropolitan Police in bringing forward detailed designs relating to the means of access to and from the TCL bridge.
2. It is expected that any future Reserved Matters application for the TCL stairs and Meridian Square include the re-development of the existing taxi rank and drop-off area, as this is integral to the re-development of Merdian Square and the surrounding area.
3. The Reserved Matters application for Zone 1 Public Realm in Stratford City including the treatment of the TCL Bridge, TCL stairs and (accessible) lifts is expected to be formally submitted to the Local Planning Authority within 6 months of the date of this planning permission.
4. The Local Planning Authority expects that the lifts to be provided at each end of the TCL Bridge be accessible 24 hours a day, 365 days a year and to be provided independent of the buildings proposed to be constructed on either side of the bridge.

8. PLANNING APPLICATION

07/90206/FULODA

Installation of a deep drain, ground re-grading, remediation, and associated works

- 8.1. The Committee considered the report and took into account the updates which had been circulated and which were explained by a planning officer. The application was for works of remediation and regrading which would constitute commencement of development and for which outline planning permission had been granted. A full application had therefore been submitted.
- 8.2. The update clarified paragraph 7.6.3 of the report and referred to the attached archaeological report which had been submitted by the applicant on 6 December. The proposed condition about the submission of such a report was therefore redundant and an amended condition was proposed requiring that the archaeological plan be implemented.
- 8.3. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee **RESOLVED** unanimously in accordance with the revised recommendation:

The Committee

APPROVED the application for the reasons given in the report and GRANTED planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives as set out in the report, but with the amended condition 3 as follows:

3. Prior to the commencement of development in areas known as Frigoscandia (South), Frigoscandia North and Temple Mill lane, archaeological investigations must be undertaken in accordance with the details as shown in the following drawing prepared by Arup with the reference 122982-01: SK-ACH-000(Issue A) and the Written Scheme of Investigations (WSI) submitted to the Local Planning Authority on 6 December 2007 which comprises:

- a) WSI for Non Land Raise Area Temple Mill Lane Access/Securit (Revised November 2007)
- b) WSI for Non Land Raise Area Frigoscandia South (Revised November 2007) and
- c) WSI for Non Land Raise Area Frigoscandia North (Revised November 2007)

This information is provided in accordance with the recommendations of the Archaeological Issue Report (dated 11 October 2007) accompanying the application submission.

Reason: To ensure that any archaeological remains on the site are recorded and, if required, preserved in accordance with Policy 4B.10 of the London Plan and Policy EQ43 of Newham's Unitary Development Plan 2001 (as saved)

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

(Agenda Item 9)

9.1. There was no other business.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 8.05 pm

Signed:

L. Baldry

Chairman

Date: *29th January 2008*

