

**OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY**

**ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

29 January 2008

**SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 16<sup>th</sup> COMMITTEE MEETING**  
Held on 8 January 2008 at 18.00

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

---

**Present:** 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:**

Celia Carrington  
William Hodgson  
Janice Morphet  
Dru Vesty

**Officers in attendance:**

Vivienne Ramsey ODA, Head of Development Control  
Angela Hughes ODA, Planning Decisions Team  
Richard Griffiths ODA, Legal adviser, Planning Decisions Team,  
(Pinsent Masons)  
Vanessa Brand ODA, Committee Secretary

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

1.1. Apologies were received from Lorraine Baldry and Michael Appleton who were unable to attend the meeting.

**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 Item 5. A further update would be circulated during the meeting in respect of

Item 6. The Chairman stated that he would adjourn the meeting for 10 minutes to allow Members to read this update.

Item 5: Update

- Amended condition 3
- Letter from London Borough of Newham dated 13 December 2007

Item 6: Update

- Representations on behalf of Stratford City Developments Ltd and response on behalf of the applicant and the ODA
- Amendments to recommendation

2.2. The order of business was unchanged.

2.3. There were no requests to speak.

**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 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 personal interests read out were correct. William Hodgson also declared a personal interest in that a fellow lecturer from University College, London, Jonathan Kendall, who worked for Fletcher Priest, architects, masterplanners for the Stratford City development, was attending the meeting. None of these personal interests were considered prejudicial.

#### 4. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING (AGENDA ITEM 4)

4.1. The Secretary apologised for an error in the Minutes. The heading should read:

Draft Minutes of 15<sup>th</sup> Committee Meeting. Held on 11 December 2007.

4.2. Members agreed that para 6.3 should be amended to read:

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.

4.3. The Committee

AGREED the Minutes of the 15<sup>TH</sup> Planning Committee Meeting subject to the amendments at paras 4.1 and 4.2 above.

4.4. In relation to the Actions Arising from the Minutes, Members noted that the Urban Design and Landscape Framework (as currently submitted) had been circulated to them. They also noted that although some useful drawings had been included with the papers for the meeting, important drawings had not been attached to the report on Item 6. The Head of Development Control undertook to keep the inclusion of illustrative material under review.

**Action:**  
**Head of Development Control**

#### PLANNING APPLICATIONS

#### 5. PLANNING APPLICATION 07/90198/REMODA

**Reserved matters application for Stratford International Station Eastern Egress Bridge and the Construction Arrangements relating to the development of the bridge, pursuant to a direction for deemed planning permission granted by the Secretary of State pursuant to the Channel Tunnel Rail Link (Stratford Station and Subsidiary Works) Order 2001**

5.1. A planning officer gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report and took into account the updates which had been circulated. The application was for approval of reserved matters pursuant to the Secretary of State's Direction as to deemed planning permission in relation to the Channel Tunnel Rail Link (Stratford Station and Subsidiary Works) Order 2001. The proposals related to the location, design, and construction (including working hours) of the Eastern Egress bridge, which would serve the domestic platforms of the new Stratford International Station. There had been no objections to the

works as such, but London Borough of Newham had submitted the letter dated 13 December 2007 which was attached to the update, because they considered that their earlier representations were not adequately reflected in the report.

- 5.2. Officers considered the proposals to be acceptable. The bridge had to be available by December 2009 when domestic trains would begin to serve the station and in view of the tight timetable, officers recommended a revised condition 3 about the timing of the submission of sample materials.
- 5.3. The Head of Development Control explained that the feasibility study of the practicality and cost of the Eastern Egress bridge, as promised in the applicant's earlier unilateral undertaking, had been carried out. Officers had seen a presentation demonstrating that the proposals were practicable within budget, but no document had yet been submitted. Members noted that South Eastern Railway, as train operator of domestic services, and the ODA Transport team were both satisfied that the capacity of the new bridge was adequate for Games and Legacy passenger flows. Newham officers had also seen the presentation about feasibility but were seeking clarification of some points. Formal submission of the feasibility study as promised, would make the information available in writing and provide the clarification sought.
- 5.4. Members expressed some concern about the potential for international passengers to cross the rails to the domestic platforms in order to exit the station unsupervised via the new Eastern Egress bridge, and noted that the Border and Immigration Agency had not been consulted. A representative of Union Railways North Ltd responded that she was not aware of consultations about this particular proposal but that the principle of this application was established under the deemed planning permission granted in 2001. The Head of Development Control did not consider that this issue was a direct planning matter but in view of the Committee's concerns she would ask the applicant to seek assurance from the Border and Immigration Agency.

**Action:**  
**Head of Development Control**

- 5.5. Newham's representations related primarily to the interchange between the two Stratford stations and how passengers would reach or leave the new bridge. This was an issue which needed to be resolved but was not relevant to this application, being a reserved matters application for siting design and external appearance of the Eastern Egress Bridge. Discussions were continuing with Newham officers, with a view to attaching a condition to the approval notice for the masterplan for Zone 1 of Stratford City to address their concerns. Accordingly, Newham's representations were not a reason for refusing the current proposals for approval of reserved matters.
- 5.6. Members' views were also sought about the letter dated 30 November 2007 submitted by the applicant, Union Railways North Ltd. This sought agreement that the Eastern Egress bridge together with the extension of the Docklands Light Railway, would satisfy condition 3 of the deemed planning permission dated 2001 which required the creation of a travelator or similar mechanical means between the two Stratford stations to facilitate passenger interchange.

- 5.7. Members noted that, although this letter stated under the heading 'travelator issues' that 'Cost benefit analysis suggests that this is not a sound investment of public money', no quantitative cost benefit analysis was available.
- 5.8. Members agreed with officers' views that the design and other issues relating to the Eastern Egress bridge were satisfactory subject to the recommended conditions. However, they considered that the issue of interconnection between the two stations and, specifically, the connections from the new Eastern Egress bridge, were of great importance. The shortest possible appropriate route must be identified and from that point of view, they did not consider that the DLR extension provided a mechanical means of facilitating pedestrian interchange. Condition 3 of the deemed planning permission should therefore not be treated as discharged at this time. They wished to consider proposals for the interchange and other connections at the proper time. This should be made clear by the Head of Development Control in her reply to the applicant's letter.
- 5.9. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee **RESOLVED** unanimously in accordance with the recommendations as revised that:

The Committee

- a) **APPROVED** the application for the reasons given in the report
- b) **GRANTED** subject to the conditions and informatives at paragraphs 10.4 and 10.5 respectively of this report but with condition 3 revised as set out below
- c) **COMMENTED** on the letter dated 30 November 2007 from the Applicant regarding the provision of a mechanised link and covered walkway between the Stratford International Station and the Stratford Regional Station, that the condition imposed should not be treated as discharged at this time. The Committee wished to discuss the connections from the Eastern Egress bridge when full proposals were available.

Revised condition 3

A sample of all materials and colours to be used on the external surfaces must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the installation / cladding of materials on development hereby approved

*Reason: To ensure that development will be of high quality and will provide consistency between the external appearance of the main Stratford International Station building and the development hereby approved in accordance with Policy 4B.10 of the London Plan.*

***The Chairman adjourned the meeting for 10 minutes to permit Members to read the Update report for Item 6, which had just been circulated.***



## **6. PLANNING APPLICATION**

### **07/90208/AODODA**

**Approval of details in accordance with Condition A1 (requiring the submission of a zonal masterplan for the Stratford City site); and proposed changes in writing to the requirements of Conditions D2, E2 and U1 (relating to the distribution of housing, open space, and road alignment) and proposed changes in writing to the approved parameter plans in accordance with Conditions D9 and D9a of outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA, issued by the ODA Planning Decision Team on 13 November 2007.**

- 6.1. A planning officer gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report and the updates. The zonal masterplan for zones 3-6 of the Stratford City development covered the residential development together with education and community uses and open space as well as commercial development in zone 3. The current masterplan had been the subject of pre-application discussions with officers and others and was considered generally acceptable. Approval was, however, dependent on written changes to a number of conditions attached to the outline permission originally granted by the London Borough of Newham on 17 February 2005 as varied by subsequent permission granted on 13 November 2007.
- 6.2. Conditions D2, E2, and U1 dealing with distribution of floorspace and openspace, and with residential density, and conditions D9 and D9a dealing with the approved parameter plans would all require to be amended to match changes introduced by the zonal masterplan. The environmental effects of these changes were not considered to be new or different in comparison to the development approved under the planning permission and conditions were recommended to ensure submission of further details where appropriate, including a condition to meet TfL's concerns about bus lanes.
- 6.3. Representations had been received on behalf of Stratford City Developments Ltd dated 19 December 2007 and 8 January 2008 objecting to the proposals unless any decision notice issued approving this proposal contained a condition safeguarding the route for a temporary access road between the A12 and Stratford City Zone 1 (the principle of which had been approved under the Olympic Site Preparation Planning Permission). Officers advised that a condition to this effect was not appropriate since permission for the zonal masterplan for zones 3-6 related to the legacy layout and approval could not prevent the details of the temporary road coming forward under the Olympic Site Preparation Planning Permission and could not prevent the construction of the temporary access road before the Games.
- 6.4. Members noted that the redistribution of open space within the masterplan resulted in the reduction of the size of North Park in favour of more smaller neighbourhood areas. North Park, however, remained a significant space.
- 6.5. Members were concerned about the extent to which the development would be linked to the surrounding areas and wished to see the overall context into which the development fitted. They noted, however, that the links including pedestrian and cycle routes to the Olympic Park, could at present only be indicated because the detailed alignments were subject to proposed change by the ODA. They also noted that the 3 bridges linking the development to the

East would cross the Chobham Farm development site, a narrow strip of land which would be developed after the Games. Members recognised the risk that these links would create an unfriendly environment at least in the short term. They were concerned that all links should be as attractive as possible to pedestrians and other users to avoid the development being isolated.

- 6.6. The Head of Development Control emphasised that the zonal masterplan represented a set of principles developed from the outline permission and would be supplemented by the submission of reserved matters filling in the detailed information which Members sought. In the meantime she would aim to produce a composite overall plan showing the relationships between the Olympic Park, Stratford City, and the surrounding areas.

**Action:**  
**Head of Development Control**

- 6.7. In response to Members' concerns about the design and distribution of the residential accommodation the Head of Development Control also explained that officers considered the residential units in the submitted masterplan had been improved from a previous version with a reduced number of North-facing units. However, although the plans were largely BRE compliant the full studies of wind tunnelling, and daylight and sunlight had not yet been completed (and hence the recommendation for Members to delegate the application to the Head of Development Control subject to the results of the wind tunnelling and microclimate assessment being acceptable). All family units had dedicated private space and lower units in the perimeter blocks had private rear space and a central communal space with restricted access. Overall the percentage of affordable housing met the 30% requirement in the original planning permission and in accordance with the S106 agreement was distributed across zones 4 and 5 (zone 3 comprised a constrained smaller area adjacent to the CTRL Box and is less suitable for residential accommodation). She also confirmed that proposals for maintenance and long-term management of the estate had to be approved separately and is governed by the S106 agreement.

- 6.8. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee **RESOLVED** unanimously in accordance with the recommendation as revised that:

#### The Committee

- a) **APPROVED** the application **IN PRINCIPLE** for the reasons given in the report
- b) **DELEGATED** the granting of permission to the Head of Development Control, subject to:
  - (a) the submission of updated Parameter Plans which show the changes that are proposed to be made in writing in accordance with Conditions D9 and D9a of the revised planning permission, as outlined in the Design Statement Addendum (dated 18<sup>th</sup> December 2007); and
  - (b) the submission of further assessment regarding wind tunnelling and microclimate to complement the proposed changes to the Parameter Plans as detailed at paragraph 10.1(a) of the report.

(c) the further assessment submitted as part of paragraph 10.1(b) of the report being acceptable;

(d) the above points (a) – (c) being found by officers to be acceptable, permission will be issued subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report with the addition of the following reason for condition 1:

*The works are acceptable on the basis of the particulars contained within the application and this condition seeks to ensure that the development is undertaken in strict accordance with those details as approved, in accordance with Policies 4B.1 of the London Plan and S2 of Newham's Unitary Development Plan 2001 (as saved)*

c) **DELEGATED** to the Head of Development Control the making of any necessary consequential changes to the associated S106 agreement.

**7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**  
(Agenda Item 7)

7.1. The next meeting would take place on 29 January 2008, and there was likely to be a meeting on 12 February 2008.

7.2. In the meantime the Committee would meet for an informal discussion over dinner on the evening of 15 January 2008.

*There being no other business the meeting closed at 7.40 pm*

Signed:



Date: 26/2/2008

Chairman