

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 42nd COMMITTEE MEETING

Held on 24 March 2009 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	(Items 1-4)
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
Liz Fisher	ODA, Planning Decisions Team
Chris Lelliott	ODA, Planning Decisions Team
Nathan Tepairi	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 Councillor Terry Wheeler who was not able to attend the meeting.

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

There were Updates for Items 5, 6, 7, & 8

Item 5 – Stratford City - playing fields associated with Education Campus

- amended plans
- representations from the applicants
- amended conditions and informative

Item 6 – Stratford City – Education Campus

- amended plans
- reconsultation responses
- further information

Item 7 – Under Bridge U06

- additional consultation comments
- PDT response

Item 8 – Bridge parapets for Henrietta Street and Alma Street

- clarification of description of works
- consultation
- Network Rail
- amended recommendation

2.1. The order of business was changed to take Item 6 before Item 5.

2.2. Representatives of the applicants had requested to speak in favour of Items 5, 6, 7, & 8

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 – 8.

'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 recorded were correct and none of the personal interests were considered prejudicial.

4. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING (AGENDA ITEM 4)

4.1. The Committee

AGREED the Minutes of the 42nd Planning Committee Meeting

- 4.2. The Action Arising recorded in the Minutes under Para 9.1 was reviewed. The Chief Planner Development Control reported that changes to hours of working approved by the Environmental Health Officers pursuant to s.61 of the Control of Pollution Act were monitored by the ODA Delivery Partner and would be reported to the next meeting of the Public Protection Forum in April. The information would also be reported to the Committee at a future Committee meeting.

Action:
Head of Development Control

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Philip Turner and Kelda Free gave presentations to the Committee on behalf of the applicants in respect of Items 6 and 5 respectively.

5. APPLICATION NO: 08/90360/REMODA (AGENDA ITEM 6)

Stratford City - Education Campus

Application for the approval of reserved matters of an all age education campus comprising;

Single storey children's day centre; Two storey nursery and primary school building; Five storey primary and secondary school building; three storey specialism building housing an auditorium, materials workshops and cafe together with sports hall and changing accommodation, all available for shared educational/community uses (including lifelong learning); With associated vehicular and pedestrian access from Temple Mill Lane (north elevation), pedestrian access from Chobham Place (west and south elevations); Car park, cycle parking; External play areas including three Multi Use Games Areas, hard surfaces and planted areas, play equipment, seating, lighting (both pole mounted and attached to the buildings) and fencing; and Erection of stone filled gabion retaining wall along Temple Mill Lane; Pursuant to conditions B1 and B8 of outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA, being details of layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping, together with approval in writing to permit development that exceeds the development height indicated in the Masterplan for Zones 3-6 and shown on Parameter Plan (7) and to permit the relocation of the Day Care Facility, pursuant to conditions A4 and D9 of the outline planning permission.

- 5.1. Following the presentations by the applicants' representatives, a Planning Officer then gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report and took into account the Update which had been circulated. The application was a reserved matters submission for the erection of an all age education campus pursuant to original outline planning permission granted by the London Borough of Newham for the Stratford City Development as amended and approved by the ODA Planning Committee in November 2007 (07/90023/VARODA).
- 5.2. Members generally welcomed the design, which they considered would form a landmark building, but noted that the use of external colour would be critical to the success of the building. The proposed condition would require approval of a strategy governing choice of colours. The Design Review Panel would be consulted but Members agreed that the colours chosen should clearly identify the development and its different elements.
- 5.3. Members recognised that, as an Academy, the school would be independent but they required reassurance of the evidence demonstrating whether the development would be fit for purpose. They were concerned that a Head Teacher would not be appointed until 2011 and that, in the absence of an operational client, there was therefore no direct input into how the school would be managed. They noted the responses by representatives of the applicant that, for that reason, great emphasis had been put on designing the buildings to be flexible so that they could be adapted internally at the time of fitting out and later as educational practice developed. They also stated that there had been consultation with the London Borough of Newham and with teachers in both the London Boroughs of Newham and Waltham Forest as well as with Government and others with Academy experience including successful practicing Head Teachers: an independent review had been commissioned from a Head Teacher. Members asked to see the relevant information subsequently.

Action:
Head of Development Control

- 5.4. Officers confirmed that they had specifically consulted the education departments of the LB Newham and Waltham Forest and that no comments had been received from these particular sections of the Councils on the application. Having taken legal advice about the relevance of this issue to their determination of this reserved matters application, Members noted that work had been undertaken to establish that the scheme met the generic standards of the Department for Children, Schools and Families. Members requested that they should be briefed subsequently with information about the quality assurance process which would be put in place for the academy and how this would contribute to the educational vision governing the design. An informative to this effect was requested by Members.
- 5.5. Members noted that although targets had been set for recycling and composting, this topic was linked to the waste management strategy and would be discussed with school management. They agreed that an informative should be applied to any permission emphasising the importance of setting high standards for recycling.
- 5.6. Members specifically noted the Update and the reconsultation responses from Network Rail. The applicant was willing to cooperate with Network Rail about

the alignment of the fence or fences along the boundary with the play spaces in order to avoid where possible, a double fence line. It was recommended that an informative should be added to any permission to this effect. There was a concern that the fences along the boundary would not be sufficient to deter children from climbing them, particularly to retrieve balls. However, Members recognised that the play areas to the East were designed so that ball games would not be played at the Southern end, behind the Day Care Centre where the site was closest to the railway lines and that this area was designed for use only by the youngest children.

5.7. Members were concerned that the space provided for bicycle parking would only reflect existing practice rather than encouraging cycling. They welcomed the confirmation from Officers that the School Travel Plan would include a mechanism for regular review of the achievement of sustainable transport targets. Additional cycle parking could be provided following these review periods if it was considered to be a necessary step in the achievement of the sustainable transport targets for the school. They welcomed the suggestion that, if the required regular review indicated the need for more space, this could be provided in the public square outside the school where it would also benefit visitors.

5.8. Members also noted that:

5.8.1. bays were allocated outside the Day Care Centre for parents to drop off children at the school

5.8.2. although the Stratford City Consultative Access Group considered that the application was 'acceptable' in relation to accessibility, officers reported that the proposals were fully in line with national standards. Members stated their preference for an 'exemplar' standard rather than an 'acceptable' one.

5.8.3. the pedestrian bridge across Temple Mill Lane would be the subject of a separate application. Members asked Officers to ensure that a high quality design for this bridge is achieved.

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

the Committee

- a) **APPROVED** the development, including the siting of the Day Care Facility, that deviated from the approved Zonal Masterplan and the development height set out on Parameter Plan 7, pursuant to conditions A4 and D9 of the outline planning permission; and
- b) **GRANTED APPROVAL** to the reserved matters pursuant to outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA for the reasons given in the report and subject to the conditions and informatives as set out in the report with additional informatives to be drafted covering the following:

1. **Assurance that before the academy is opened that the final fit out meets required client and educational standards;**

2. That a higher target figure for recycling and composting be sought in the waste management strategy for the academy;
3. That the applicant works with Network Rail to ensure as far as possible that boundary fence lines are aligned..

**6. APPLICATON NO: 08/90358/FULODA
(AGENDA ITEM 5)**

Stratford City - Laying out of playing fields

- a. 2 tennis courts, a synthetic turf pitch and 4 Multi-Use Games areas;
 - b. with vehicular access from Temple Mill Lane (north) to a service and maintenance area and access to the railway line and vehicular access/egress from/to Temple Mill Lane (south) to a car park for 30 cars, coach turning and drop off area and covered store for 19 cycles;
 - c. earthworks to form an embankment to facilitate a footbridge landing point, access to pitches and inclined viewing area;
 - d. formation of gabion walls to Temple Mill Lane and erection of a parapet wall above a reinforced earth slope adjacent to the railway line;
 - e. erection of fencing and installation of lighting;
 - f. installation of a rainwater harvesting tank and treatment plant for harvested water under car park;
 - g. landscaping with tree planting, areas of grassland (incorporating a trim trail) and a willow wall along the eastern boundary of the site;
- Together with an application for outline planning permission for the erection of a storage shed and equipment store amounting to not more than 222sqm of Gross External Floor Area with scale, layout and appearance reserved for future determination

- 6.1. A Planning Officer gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report and took into account the Update which had been circulated. The proposals were for full planning permission for the laying out of playing fields for the school and for community use on land to the North of Temple Mills Lane, and for outline planning permission for the erection of an equipment store and maintenance building to serve the playing fields. Permission had previously been granted for the playing fields at the same time as the outline permission for the Stratford City Development. However, the site had changed since its inclusion in the Games-time facilities and a new permission was required.
- 6.2. The applicants had requested that the time limit for implementation of any permission should be extended by 1 month to 30 April 2013 to allow for the timing of the land transfer after the Games. An amended condition as set out in the Update report was therefore recommended.
- 6.3. The amended plans described in the Update report were generally acceptable but further detail was required about rainwater harvesting and water treatment and an additional condition and informative were recommended.
- 6.4. Members welcomed the community use of the playing fields outside school hours which was guaranteed by the S106 Agreement: this would be for 38 hours per week during term time and for 98 hours per week in school holidays. The joint usage would, however, raise some issues which needed to be resolved.

- 6.5. In the revised scheme the car-parking spaces for staff which were provided on the school site would be supplemented by spaces on the playing fields site. All the spaces were needed to meet the condition previously imposed for staff parking. Whilst spaces should be available after school hours, Members recognised that some school staff would need to stay later. They agreed that a condition should be imposed requiring parking spaces to be managed to ensure that some spaces were vacated for use by the public after school hours. (Following subsequent review by officers, it is considered that this issue is wholly covered by the wording of condition no.15 and no additional condition is necessary.) Members also noted that there would be some on-street parking which could be used by the public and would be available for the 1 Multi-Use Games Area which was for general public use at all times.
- 6.6. Members noted that it was no longer proposed to provide on-site changing rooms as included in the S106 Agreement. Access would be controlled and the playing fields would be managed from the school with use of facilities in the Specialism building, which would be better supervised. Nevertheless they considered that the lack of more convenient on-site changing rooms and other facilities was a disadvantage. It was likely to inhibit commercial management and they suggested that some consideration should be given to providing basic services for possible future development. They agreed that an informative to this effect should be added.
- 6.7. Members were also concerned about the height of fences around the Multi Use Games Areas (MUGA) of the site in relation to this development and agreed to impose an additional condition requiring details of the design, finish, and height of the MUGA fences and the final finishes of all other fences to be approved.
- 6.8. Members also noted that
- 6.8.1. the use of synthetic turf field of play was designed to accommodate both football and hockey. The applicant confirmed that this surface was suitable for use for club hockey use according to the International Hockey Federation standards and should shortly be agreed by England Hockey.
- 6.8.2. the lengthy ramp down from the pedestrian bridge would be supplemented by an improved crossing at grade level for those unable to use the steps down to the playing fields.
- 6.8.3. the lowest branches of the trees planted on the terraced ramp would be sufficiently high to allow the stepped ramp to function as an informal viewing platform for events
- 6.8.4. The storage building should be of a high quality design.
- 6.9. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED unanimously that:

The Committee

APPROVED both applications subject to the conditions and informatives as included in the report and in the Update and subject to:

Additional conditions

Notwithstanding the details shown on the submitted plans, details of the height and appearance of the fencing around and between the Multi Use Games Areas shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior its erection.

Reason: To ensure that the fence is of sufficient height to contain errant balls and in the interests of the visual amenity of the area, in accordance with policy BHE3 of the Waltham Forest Unitary Development Plan (First Review) 2006.

Notwithstanding the details shown on the submitted plans, full details of the appearance, including colour, of all sports pitches and boundary fencing shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to its erection.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area, in accordance with policy BHE3 of the Waltham Forest Unitary Development Plan (First Review) 2006

Additional informative

Consideration should be given to providing services for potential future development of facilities on site to encourage commercial management of the facilities.

7. APPLICATION NO: 09/90022/FULODA

(AGENDA ITEM 7)

U06 and U06 Pedestrian Arch

Full planning application for the construction of Under Bridge U06 and U06 Pedestrian Arch comprising construction of a concrete trough structure (including other engineering works), pedestrian restraint parapets and vehicle collision load restraints

- 7.1. Simon Fraser (Allies & Morrison) gave a presentation on behalf of the applicant. In general the proposals were similar to those for underpass U02 previously approved by the Committee. In Legacy there would be a route for pedestrians and cyclists both alongside the U06 and in the re-opened adjoining rail arch which would form a pedestrian/cycle only route. Details of legacy form and finish of these routes would come forward as part of Legacy Transformation details. Since the earlier decision on underpass U02, the applicant had been refining the proposals for the pedestrian parapets in order to make them less like guardrails in appearance. The same parapet design, would be used for both Underpasses.
- 7.2. A Planning Officer then gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report and took into account the Update which had been circulated. The proposal was an application for full planning permission for works to Under Bridge U06 and to the adjacent pedestrian arch: proposals which had not previously been submitted but were needed to improve connectivity.
- 7.3. There being no questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED unanimously that

The Committee

- a) AGREED the reasons for APPROVAL; and
- b) GRANTED planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

**8. APPLICATION NO: 09/90004/AODODA
(AGENDA ITEM 8)
Henrietta and Alma Street Bridge Parapets
Submission of details in relation to condition 2 (Bridge Parapets) for Bridge 2
(Henrietta Street) and Bridge 3 (Alma Street) of planning consent
08/90043/FULODA**

- 8.1. Martin Knight gave a presentation on behalf of the applicant illustrating how they had sought to develop a common design language for bridge and associated parapets with transition sections which would minimise the impact of the stringent requirements for protecting railways and highways.
- 8.2. A Planning Officer then gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report and the Update which had been circulated. The proposals were for full discharge of condition 2 of the permission previously granted for the bridge structures at Alma Street and Henrietta Street. A revised recommendation was proposed.
- 8.3. There being no questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED that

The Committee

DELEGATED authority to the head of Development Control **to APPROVE** the application and discharge the details submitted subject to securing the necessary amendments to the scheme which minimise the extent of the 3m high element on Henrietta Street bridge and minor changes resulting from technical requirements as required by HS1 or Network Rail.

**9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS
(AGENDA ITEM 9)**

There being no other business the meeting closed at 8.35 pm

Signature



Date 25/8/2009

Chair

