

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 November 2008

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 33rd COMMITTEE MEETING
Held on 28 October 2008 at 18.00

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

Present:

Lorraine Baldry Chairman

Local Authority Members:

Cllr Rofique Ahmed LB Tower Hamlets
Cllr Conor McAuley LB Newham
Cllr Geoff Taylor LB Hackney

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, Planning Decisions Team
Richard Smith	ODA, Planning Decisions Team
Joanne Pacey	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. There were apologies from David Taylor and Councillor Terry Wheeler who were unable to attend the meeting.

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

2.1. There were Updates for Items 6 and 7

Item 6

- Additional consultation responses from the London Boroughs of Hackney and Newham
- Updated consideration and assessment of management and maintenance and consultee responses

Item 7

- Consideration of cycle parking, motorcycle parking, Eastern egress, and hours of access through retail centre

2.2. The order of business was unchanged.

2.3. There were requests to speak by representatives of the applicants in relation to Items 5 & 6.

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 to 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?'

Members confirmed that the personal interests read out were correct. 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 32nd Planning Committee Meeting.

4.2. There were no Matters Arising

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

5. OPTEMS (OLYMPIC PARK TRANSPORT & ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SCHEMES) STRATEGY FOR APPROVAL (AGENDA ITEM 5)

- 5.1. A Planning Officer gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report. The OPTEMS Strategy had been submitted for approval pursuant to Schedule 4 of the S106 Agreement dated September 2007. It had been prepared by the OPTEMS group set up to help mitigate the transport impacts outside the Olympic Park resulting from approval of the Olympic, Paralympic and Legacy Transformation Planning Application (07/90010/OUMODA) and the Site Preparation and Facilities and their Legacy Transformation Planning Application (07/90011/FUMODA). The OPTEMS Strategy would be submitted annually and in future years it would include a programme for mitigations.
- 5.2. Ted Allett, the Chairman of OPTEMS since April 2008, spoke in support of the strategy. In the coming year he expected that the OPTEMS group would be considering some urgent schemes relating to car parking pressures in the adjacent host Boroughs.
- 5.3. Members noted that the OPTEMS group included ODA but that ODA was not itself funded through OPTEMS. The £20m funding had been calculated in relation to the worst case assessment made during the original Transport Assessment: this included the impact if all construction materials were delivered by road. However, Appendix B to the report listed a large number of proposals and, if adopted, these would exceed the funding provided. The funding would therefore have to be used to ensure the most effective mitigations.
- 5.4. Members also noted the clarification given in relation to two of the points raised by the London Borough of Newham (p9 para 6.3, fourth and sixth bullet points). The assumptions in the original Transport Assessment would be reviewed and refined as necessary as part of the OPTEMS annual report process to ensure that traffic pressures were as anticipated, and any undue impacts would be eligible to be considered for mitigation.
- 5.5. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED unanimously that:

the Committee

APPROVED the submitted OPTEMS Strategy report 2008.

**6. APPLICATION NUMBER: 08/90196/AODODA
(AGENDA ITEM 6)**

UDLF Appendices. Submission of Urban Design & Landscape Framework Appendices pursuant to condition OD.0.9 of planning permission 07/90010/OUMODA dated 28/09/07.

Land within the London Olympic Site Boundary to the North of Stratford Town Centre, East of the Lea Valley Navigation, South of Eastway and the A12 and West of the Lea Valley Railway

- 6.1. Simon Fraser (Allies and Morrison) gave a presentation on behalf of the applicant referring to and illustrating the 3 separate documents submitted. These showed the design intent for Bridges, Retaining Structures, and Streetscape. He had earlier shown Members some samples of materials on site that afternoon. He confirmed that the documents were not design manuals but that designers would be expected to abide by the principles and illustrative drawings unless there was good reason not to do so.
- 6.2. Following the applicant's presentation the Chief Planner, Development Control gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report and took into account the Update which had been circulated. The application was for approval of appendices to the Urban Design and Landscape Framework (UDLF) submitted pursuant to Condition OD.0.9 of the Olympic and Legacy Facilities planning permission. The required appendix for the Park and Public Realm had not yet been submitted, and whilst the documents relating to the Bridges and Retaining Structures were reasonably comprehensive, the Streetscape components were not as detailed. Nevertheless the proposals were considered satisfactory to be recommended as a partial discharge of the condition.
- 6.3. Members were concerned that the Bridges document did not include any examples of the treatment of the transition from one type of balustrade to another. Such transitions could prove difficult to design, for example, where there was a change of height. Members noted that details were under consideration and that the designs would be coordinated with the Park and Public Realm proposals. However, they considered it essential to review a range of generic examples before they could determine relevant forthcoming applications and they agreed that a condition to this effect should be imposed.
- 6.4. Members commented that the sample gabions to be used on bridge abutments and wingwalls shown to them on site, had included chickenwire inserted behind the metal framework of the baskets. This element, which had been introduced by the contractor, raised potential issues about safety and maintenance. They noted that this feature was not part of the proposals submitted for approval.
- 6.5. Members endorsed the comment made by the London Borough of Newham in relation to the Streetscape document about the importance of acknowledging the history of the site in future years. Members would wish to see such opportunities taken: for example, the use of Olympic references of some sort (eg through art installations or wayfinding).
- 6.6. Members noted the references in the Streetscape document to the treatment of Kensington High Street. They considered that this example should be followed

in relation to the colours employed for tactile paving and noted that, whilst a contrast was required to assist those with limited sight, the red material illustrated was not appropriate.

6.7. Members questioned the use of standard lighting columns 10m high. Columns of this height were used to light 4 lanes of traffic at Kensington High Street: while at Tooley Street, another example cited in the document, a 2 lane street was lit by columns only 8m high. They noted that the higher columns were proposed as standard recyclable columns for Games only, giving efficient lighting with the minimum number of columns; lower columns might be substituted where the Loop Road was retained in transformation and on the local distributor network. However, Members were concerned that the 10m columns would be retained in Legacy on streets where they might be unnecessary with a detrimental impact on the proposed 'dark' areas of the Park. They requested further information comparing their use with lower columns in relation to the arguments about: the number of columns needed versus their height; the costs involved initially and over the lifetime of the columns; and the degree of light 'spillage'.

6.8. Members agreed that, although the underpass lighting illustrated met statutory requirements, the design was not of an acceptable quality and an alternative should be identified.

6.9. In the light of their concerns Members were not prepared to approve the Streetscape document and agreed that it should be deferred for amendment within 1 month to address the Committee's concerns.

6.10. There being no further questions, the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED unanimously that

the Committee

- a) ACCEPTED the UDLF Appendices relating to Retaining Structures and Bridges subject to the additional condition below
- b) DEFERRED approval of the UDLF Appendix relating to Streetscape for one month to allow amendments to be submitted addressing the concerns expressed during the discussion as minuted above
- c) Subject to (a) and (b) above, APPROVED a partial discharge of matters reserved under condition OD.0.9 of planning permission 07/90010/OUMODA subject to the conditions and informative set out below:

Additional Condition

Within 6 weeks of the date of this approval a supplementary document to the Bridges and Retaining Structures documents shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for its approval, which shall include design details of typical junctions and transitions between the following types of parapets:

- a) pedestrian footbridge to concourse/landscape parapet;
- b) highway bridge to over-rail bridge parapet;
- c) pedestrian bridge to over-rail parapet;
- d) pedestrian bridge to venue parapet.

Reason: To ensure that the design of the parapets are of a high quality.

Informative: The applicant is advised that the LPA will wish to have received submission of, and approved, this Supplementary Document prior to formally discharging the details of any further applications, approvals of details or reserved matters applications for any bridge or retaining structure parapets.

Condition as recommended in the report

Within one month of the approval of the last of the following documents or submissions: Waterspace Masterplan, Biodiversity Action Plan, Inclusive Access Strategy, Lighting Strategy and the Reserved matters for Park and Public Realm; the UDLF and its Appendix shall be reviewed to ensure that its Design Principles are consistent with the content of these associated documents and a revised UDLF document submitted to the Local Planning Authority for consideration of proposed amendments and approval, in consultation with relevant statutory bodies.

Reason: To ensure that clear and consistent design and landscape guidance is available to inform the Olympic development.

Informative as recommended in the report:

The applicant is reminded that the following details are still to be approved by the Local Planning Authority pursuant to condition OD.0.9:

Typical design details and a palette of materials proposed to be used in the extent of the Parklands and Public Realm work package.

**7. APPLICATION NUMBER: 08/90162/REMODA
(AGENDA ITEM 7)**

M2 - M6 Retail UPDATE

Reserved Matters application pursuant to Conditions B1, B8, B10, A4, D3, D9, D9a, T3 and T4 of outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA for the construction of Buildings M2-M6 (Retail, Leisure and Car Parking) with floorspace of 140,905m², comprising 77,434m² (gross) retail, 20,668m² (gross) leisure and parking for 3203 cars over 42,783m² including Buildings M7 and M8 car parking at basement level.

Blocks M2, M3, M4, M5 M6 & Basement M7 and M8. Zone 1, Stratford City Development, Marshgate Lane, Stratford.

- 7.1. A Planning Officer gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report and took into account the Update which had been circulated. The application, which was for approval of reserved matters pursuant to planning permission 07/90023/VARODA for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Stratford Rail Lands, had been delegated to the London Borough of Newham. The Committee had previously considered the proposals at their meeting on 22 July 2008 and in accordance with their decision the amended proposals had been brought back for further comment.
- 7.2. Members noted the changes made following comments by the Design Review Panel and other changes including those relating to motor cycle parking and access through the retail centre to and from the Eastern Egress of Stratford

International railway station. They noted that there was currently sufficient space to provide on-street motor cycle parking serving the retail space as recommended. They also noted that the timetable for hours of access related to the domestic train timetable. In order to ensure that those arriving or leaving by train could walk through the retail centre, they agreed that there should be a specific reference to access being available 30 minutes before the first train and 30 minutes after last trains.

7.3. There being no further questions, the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED unanimously that

the London Borough of Newham should be informed that the Committee considered the application and amendments acceptable subject to the conditions and informatives as previously recommended and as set out below.

Additional and Amended Conditions

- 1) Hours of opening for the Eastern Egress corridor and section of Northern Arcade to the Northern Ticket Hall should start 30 minutes before the first train and close 30 minutes after the last train of each day, reflecting the hours specified by South Eastern Trains which for the time-being is, Monday to Friday 0545 – 0030 hrs, Saturday 0559 – 2345 hrs and Sunday 0630 – 2345 hrs.
- 2) Details of security arrangements for the Eastern Egress route to be provided for approval by LPA.
- 3) Details of the layout and management of the cycle parking areas within the basement of the Retail Centre to be provided for approval by LPA.
- 4) Details of layout and access arrangements (including hours of access) for motorcycle parking within the basement parking levels to be provided for approval by LPA.
- 5) Details of layout and management of motorcycle parking beneath car park ramp to be provided for approval by LPA.
- 6) Screening of the dry recyclables bays either side of the eastern egress crossing to be submitted for approval by the LPA.
- 7) Servicing arrangements for the two non-loading bays either side of the eastern egress crossing to be provided for approval by the LPA.
- 8) Steps and step-lift arrangements along the corridor into the retail centre from the Eastern Egress to be reviewed and revised arrangements to be submitted for approval by the LPA.

Informative

The on-street motorcycle parking provision is still expected to be fulfilled as per 2.7 of the S106 obligation.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There being no other business the meeting closed at 7.55 pm

Signed: Z Baldry

Date: 13/1/2009

Chair