OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY
Planning Decisions Team

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

25 March 2008

SUBJECT: **MINUTES OF 20th COMMITTEE MEETING**
Held on 18 March 2008 at 18.00

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

Present:

Lorraine Baldry	Chairman
David Taylor	

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:

Mike Appleton
Celia Carrington
William Hodgson
Janice Morphet
Dru Vesty

Officers in attendance:

Vivienne Ramsey	ODA, Head of Development Control
Anthony Hollingsworth	ODA, Chief Planner Development Control
Mick Gavin	ODA, Planning Decisions Team
Allan Ledden	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 the updates in respect of Items 5 and 6

Item 5

- Revised recommendation
- Letter from Savills
- Letter from ODA
- Ecology update – Stadium Bridge

Item 6 (Updates circulated before the meeting)

- Reasons for approval and summary of relevant Development Plan Policies
- Consultation responses

2.2. The order of business was unchanged.

2.3. It was agreed that the following should address the Committee:

Item 5
Jonathan Murch, Savills and Simon Fraser, Allies and Morrison

Item 6
Richard Anderson, Broadway Malyan

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 and David Taylor declared an interest as a Board Member of ODA, which had been accidentally omitted from the paper. None of these personal interests were considered prejudicial.

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

4.1. The Committee

AGREED the Minutes of the 19th Planning Committee Meeting

4.2. There were no matters arising.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

5. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS 07/90230/REMODA & 07/90231/REMODA (AGENDA ITEM 5)**
Submission of first stage Reserved Matters for the Olympic Stadium and the construction of 3 footbridges (F07, F11, F17), one road bridge (H04) and the stadium side piles and pile caps of five temporary (Games phase only) bridges (adjacent to those listed above and for F08)

5.1. A planning officer gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report and took into account the Update which had been circulated. The two applications for reserved matters pursuant to conditions OD.0.16 (first stage Stadium details of substructures), OD.0.19 (construction only of bridges and abutments), and OD.0.59 (foundation design including piling) for the Olympic Stadium and the associated bridges were considered together.

5.2. The proposals for the Stadium related only to the first stage comprising the engineering works required to create the substructure and the associated lower level platform and podium level. This would allow construction to begin. The lower level platform allowed separation of pedestrians and vehicles but the details of layout and design did not form part of the submission. However, a number of illustrative drawings of the Stadium in Games time had also been submitted to show how the first stage works were expected to relate to the temporary Stadium. The design and superstructure would be the subject of a separate later submission.

5.3. The proposals for the bridges related to the creation of 4 permanent bridges crossing to the Stadium island and abutments on the Stadium island for 5 temporary bridges for the Games. Illustrative material about the design of the bridges was also submitted. The lack of detail had been criticised by a number of consultees and particularly by the London Borough of Newham. However, this submission was only for the siting and dimensions of bridge decks and adjacent abutments. All elements of the design and appearance of the bridges and associated landscaping would be submitted separately and in accordance with the details to be included in the appendix to the Urban Design Landscape Framework, due for submission by 31 March 2008.

5.4. There had also been objections because of the likely impact of the bridges on the ecology of the waterways but these objections had been withdrawn after a meeting with the applicant and British Waterways, the Environmental Agency, and London Wildlife Trust after which they welcomed reassurances about the impact of the future development.

5.5. The applicant's representatives, Jonathan Murch, Savills and Simon Fraser, Allies and Morrison spoke in support of the application setting out the timetable for construction work on site and the submission of reserved matters applications for the Stadium and Bridges and associated submissions including the Legacy Masterplan Framework which would cover the Legacy proposals. In response to a question about the effects of overshadowing the waterways they stated that the Carpenters Road Bridge and Bridge 31 were examples of the bridges cited as similar in width and height to the proposed permanent Stadium bridges. The impact on ecology was therefore acceptable.

5.6. The Committee noted that the proposals they were considering did not include any details of design all of which, and particularly those for the bridges, they would need to consider very carefully when the second stage reserved matters applications were submitted. The Committee were also reassured that, although the plan shown to them of the Stadium at podium level included illustrative information about the location of pods and other details eg drawings of vehicles, these were not being considered for approval. They requested that the Head of Development Control should inspect and list the drawings to be approved with this in mind.

5.7. The Committee also noted that the concrete batching plant for the Stadium would be located close by on the site of the temporary warm-up track.

5.8. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED unanimously in accordance with the revised recommendation as amended below and the points made during discussion that:

The Committee

APPROVED the first stage Reserved Matters application for the Stadium, PARTIALLY APPROVED the Reserved Matters application for the Stadium Bridges, and PARTIALLY DISCHARGED Condition OD.0.59, for the reasons given in the report, and GRANTED planning permission subject to the points made during the discussion and the following informatives:

<u>First Stage Stadium Reserved Matters</u>

(i) The Reserved Matters are approved subject to full details of the materials and finishes to be used on the lower ground level, supporting columns and podium surface and edges being included in the second stage application

Reason: to ensure the development is of a high quality appearance

<u>Stadium Bridges</u>

(ii) The Reserved Matters are partially approved in respect of the siting, length, width and depth of the permanent bridge decks, box girders and abutments, and the siting, length, width and depth of the Stadium side piles and pile caps for the temporary

bridges. A further Reserved Matters submission is required pursuant to OD.0.19 to discharge the remaining matters as detailed below:

Design, appearance and external materials of the bridges, abutments, gabions, balustrades, parapets and lighting, including the following:

- Landscape treatment and integration of the abutments and gabions, including the junction where the box girder engages with the gabion abutment.
- The detailed resolution of the construction and finishing of the box girders for each of the bridges.
- The surface treatment of the bridges, including specification of the detail of the metal grille
- Detail on the relative extent of each layer of the bridges, including where the edges become rim and where the balustrade section ends.
- Details of the lighting strategy both on and below the bridges should be clearly set out.

6. PLANNING APPLICATION 06/90011/FUMODA (AGENDA ITEM 6)
Mixed use redevelopment of the site at 80-92 Stratford High Street to provide a 27 storey tower with a 6-storey street building comprising 202 residential units, 792sq.m. of offices at ground floor and first floor, 218sq.m. of a café/bar (Class A3/A4) or office or leisure use at ground and first floor with 65 car parking spaces, 150 cycle spaces, 32 motorcycle spaces in a basement car park with access via the High Street and associated landscaping. Development known as Stratford Edge

6.1. A planning officer gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report and the Updates which had been circulated. He explained that the application for a mixed use development at 80-92 Stratford High Street had originally been determined by the London Borough of Newham but had had to be referred to ODA when its planning powers came into force, and had been considered previously by the Committee at a meeting in November 2006. Following that decision the application had been brought back to the Committee to consider two specific points in relation to the S106 Agreement.

6.2. The applicant had proposed to supplement the open space provision for residents by improving and maintaining a small triangle of land adjacent to the site which was already laid out as public open space with seating. It had eventually been determined that the land was in the ownership of the London Borough of Newham (Highways Department) but the applicant had been unable to reach agreement with them. It was now proposed that the applicant should make a contribution of £50,000 towards upgrading The Greenway.

Since this was adjacent to the site there would be direct benefit to the residents. The proposal was not in accordance with the Borough's UDP policy OS8, but that policy requiring open space to be provided on the development site, preceded the proposals for the Olympic Park. In that context it was now considered that the proposal was reasonable.

6.3. The applicant had also agreed to cooperate in ensuring that a bridge could be constructed across Stratford High Street to carry the Greenway. Since no loads could be imposed on the Greenway itself, any foundations on the north side would have to be accommodated adjacent to the proposed new building. The developer had agreed that this future structure could be safeguarded by the legal agreement.

6.4. The applicant's representative, Richard Anderson from Broadway Malyan, spoke in support of the application. In response to a question he explained that the applicant had costed the proposal for improving and maintaining the existing open space at £50,000 and had benchmarked this against similar proposals in the area. Members noted that the open space, which they had passed during a site visit to the Olympic Park earlier in the day, was not in good condition. They regretted that the developer would not be improving it and recorded their view that the London Borough of Newham, as freeholder, should consider improving the space as a public amenity.

6.5. The applicant's representative also explained that as a mixed use development, it would be necessary to comply with both BREEAM rating 'very good' for the commercial element and, for the residential accommodation, with the current equivalent of eco-homes which had been the relevant standard at the time the application was originally approved in 2006. Members requested that the Head of Development Control should ensure that this standard was included in the agreement.

6.6. Members noted that the £2,000 listed in the Heads of Terms as an administration fee was a contribution towards the cost of administering the parking permits scheme for which future residents of this development were not eligible. They also noted that the density approved reflected the location of the site.

6.7. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED unanimously in accordance with the recommendation

The Committee

DELEGATED authority to the Head of Development Control to grant planning permission subject to the satisfactory amendment of the draft legal agreement under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 taking into account the Committee's views as recorded at para 6.5 above, and subject to the conditions set out in the report and the reasons as set out in the Update.

7. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**
(AGENDA ITEM 7)

7.1. The Committee would meet again on Tuesday 25 March 2008.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 7.00 pm

Signed: Z Baldry Date: 8/4/2008

Chairman