

**OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY**

**ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 45th COMMITTEE MEETING**  
Held on 26 May 2009 at 18.00

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

---

**Present:**

Lorraine Baldry                      Chairman

**Local Authority Members:**

Cllr Conor McAuley      LB Newham  
Cllr Geoffrey Taylor      LB Hackney

**Independent Members:**

Mike Appleton (items 1-9)  
Celia Carrington  
William Hodgson  
Janice Morphet  
Dru Vesty

**Officers in attendance:**

Vivienne Ramsey	ODA, Head of Development Control
Victoria Crosby	ODA Planning Decisions Team
Anne Ogundiya	ODA Planning Decisions Team
David Horkan	ODA Planning Decisions Team
Liz Fisher	ODA Planning Decisions Team
Tamara Orrlov	ODA Planning Decisions Team
Richard Griffiths	ODA, Legal adviser, Planning Decisions Team, (Pinsent Masons)
Matthew Foy	ODA, Legal adviser, Planning Decisions Team, (Pinsent Masons)
Vanessa Brand	ODA, Committee Secretary

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

1.1. Apologies were received from David Taylor, Councillor Rofique Ahmed, and Councillor Terry Wheeler who were not able to attend the meeting

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

2.1. There were Updates for:

Item 6 - Plot N01

- Further revised plans
- Further information on Overheating Avoidance
- Conditions

Item 7 – Plot N02

- Revised Plans
- Conditions

2.2. The order of business was unchanged.

2.3. Representatives of the applicants had requested to speak in favour of Items 5 to 9

**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 10.

'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. 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 44<sup>th</sup> Planning Committee Meeting  
*PLANNING APPLICATIONS*

**5. APPLICATION NO: 09/90050/AODODA  
(AGENDA ITEM 5)**

**Construction Workforce Travel Plan**

**Submission of Construction Travel Plan pursuant to condition 1 of planning permission reference 07/90182/AODODA (Construction Transport Management Plan).**

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

- 5.1. Neil Lees, ODA, gave a presentation on behalf of the applicant illustrating the Construction Travel Plan.
- 5.2. A Planning Officer then gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report. The Construction Travel Plan as submitted was pursuant to condition 1 of the Construction Transport Management Plan approval granted in January 2008, ( reference 07/90182/AODODA).
- 5.3. Members welcomed the report. They also welcomed the proposal to publish the lessons learned from not only the transport plan but also from other aspects of the Olympic development where such lessons could benefit others dealing with planning projects. Members noted that they would be briefed in due course about the progress being made to promote such publication.
- 5.4. Members also noted that work to the North London Line in 2010 would affect both the Park Site workforce and other travellers to Stratford, but noted that it was proposed to publicise the alternative options and to encourage workers to use different forms of public transport during this period. The applicant informed members that proposals would be finalised in Autumn 2009.
- 5.5. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee **RESOLVED** unanimously that:

the Committee

**APPROVED** the application for the reasons given in the report to allow the discharge of condition 1 of the Construction Transport Management Plan approval (reference 07/90182/AODODA) subject to the proposed informative set out in the report.

**6. APPLICATION NO: 08/90234/REMODA  
(AGENDA ITEM 6)**

**Plot N01**

**Application for the approval of reserved matters for 288 residential units and 452m2 of complementary retail space (A1-A5) with associated car-parking and on-plot landscaping pursuant to Conditions B1 and B8 of outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA being details of layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping.**

***Plot N01, Zone 5, Stratford City, London, E15***

- 6.1. Stephen Quinlan, Denton Corker Marshall Architects, gave a presentation on behalf of the applicant illustrating the proposed block N01 in the Olympic Village.
- 6.2. 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 proposals were for approval of reserved matters for residential and complementary retail development at plot N01 within the Stratford City Athletes' Village pursuant to conditions B1 and B8 of the outline planning permission granted on 13 November 2007 (07/90023/VARODA).
- 6.3. Revised plans with minor changes had been submitted including a reduction in the number of wheelchair units in plot N01 but not affecting the site wide requirement. The Planning Officer stated that following discussions with the applicant minor amendments to certain conditions had been considered acceptable. Accordingly, it was recommended that authority be delegated to the Head of Development Control to make such appropriate amendments to the conditions..
- 6.4. Members noted that the concerns expressed by the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority about the design had not been expressed in detail, but that the proposals had been considered appropriate by the Design Review Panel and the PDT recommended that the design should be approved. Members were generally content with the design.
- 6.5. Members expressed concern about the possibility of overheating of some residential units and a possibility of unattractive changes having to be made to the design in order for the building to meet building regulation requirements. Members noted that the Stratford City Environment Review Panel (ERP) was not yet convinced that the detailed treatment could be satisfactorily resolved, and the applicant was still waiting for the results from the overheating avoidance assessment. After discussion Members agreed that a condition should be imposed on the approval to ensure that any potential overheating in the development is controlled in an appropriate manner. Members agreed that they should delegate to the Head of Development Control the ability to impose a suitable condition following consultation with PDT's independent environmental consultants about the proposals.
- 6.6. Members noted that the ERP were also concerned about the appropriate provision of waste for this block but noted that a condition had been recommended which would require a waste management strategy to be submitted. This waste management strategy would fit into the wider site-wide waste strategy.

- 6.7. Members accepted that the balconies on the affordable housing were half the size of those on other units but that they met the standards required.
- 6.8. Members also noted that the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority was now satisfied with the proposals.
- 6.9. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED unanimously that:

the Committee

- a) **APPROVED** the submission of reserved matters pursuant to outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA for the reasons set out in the report and subject to condition and informatives as set out in the report and modified in accordance with 'b' and 'c' below
- b) **APPROVED** an additional condition ensuring any overheating in the building is controlled in an appropriate manner to be agreed by the local planning authority
- c) **DELEGATED** authority to the Head of Development Control to make such amendments to the conditions as she considers appropriate and to impose an additional condition for the purpose set out in (b) above

**7. APPLICATION NO: 08/90211/REMODA  
(AGENDA ITEM 7)**

**Plot N02**

**Application for the approval of reserved matters for 298 residential units and 203m<sup>2</sup> of retail floorspace with associated car-parking and on-plot landscaping pursuant to Conditions B1 and B8 of outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA being details of layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping.**

***Plot N02, Zone 5, Stratford City, London E15***

- 7.1. Alex Lifshutz, Lifshutz Davidson Sandilands Architects, gave a presentation on behalf of the applicant illustrating the proposed block N02 in the Olympic Village.
- 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 proposals were for approval of reserved matters for residential and complementary retail development at plot N02 within the Stratford City Athletes Village pursuant to conditions of the outline planning permission granted on 13 November 2007 (07/90023/VARODA)
- 7.3. Revised plans with minor changes had been submitted including a reduction in the number of wheelchair units in plot N01 but not affecting the site-wide requirement, and an increase in the height of the roof parapets. It was recommended that the following conditions set out in the report should be amended to cover minor changes including:

- 7.3.1. Condition 1: the list of approved drawing numbers to be updated

7.3.2. Condition 9: 'roof parapets' to be added to the items listed

7.3.3. Condition 10: to be amended requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

7.3.4. Condition 16: to be deleted (because this duplicated condition 7)

7.4. Members welcomed the design but noted that the proposal raised some of the same issues discussed under Item 6 (Plot N01). In particular they noted that the concerns about the potential overheating of the units applied. They also recognised that some balconies were smaller than those for other units, but noted that there was no agreed minimum size for balconies

7.5. Members noted that the proposal was to create a single large space to provide bicycle parking and considered that it would be more appropriate to create a number of smaller spaces with separate doors if feasible. It was agreed that this amendment should be considered by PDT in relation to condition 14.

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

the Committee

- a) **APPROVED** the submission of reserved matters pursuant to outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA for the reasons set out in the report and subject to conditions and informatives as set out in the report and modified in accordance with 'b' and 'c' below
- b) **APPROVED** an additional condition ensuring any overheating in the building is controlled in an appropriate manner to be agreed by the local planning authority
- c) **DELEGATED** authority to the Head of Development Control to make such amendments to the conditions as she considers appropriate and to impose an additional condition for the purpose set out in (b) above

## **8. APPLICATION NO: 08/90372/FULODA (AGENDA ITEM 7)**

### **Temple Mill Lane Pedestrian Footbridge**

**Erection of a pedestrian footbridge across Temple Mill Lane to link the education campus at Chobham Academy (Plot N12 Stratford City) with playing fields on the land to the north.**

***Temple Mill Lane, Stratford, London E15***

8.1. Andrew O'Donnell, Allford Hall Monaghan Morris Architects, gave a presentation on behalf of the applicant illustrating the proposed pedestrian footbridge.

8.2. A Planning Officer then gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report. The application was for planning permission for the pedestrian footbridge to span Temple Mill Lane. The bridge would connect Chobham

Academy and the playing fields on the Metropolitan Land to the north, both of which had been recently approved by the Committee. The linking footbridge related to part 7 of the S106 Agreement relating to the Stratford City Development.

- 8.3. Members were concerned about a number of issues relating to the design of the parapet. They noted that the width of the area in transition to the parapet across Temple Mill Lane might encourage children to act unsafely. They were also concerned about the detailed design and maintenance of the parapet top and the port-holes which would allow smaller children to see through to the street below. Members noted the existing drawings illustrating the footbridge but considered that additional detail should be submitted to ensure that the parapet was safely designed and managed. They agreed that the proposed condition 4 should be amended to take into account these concerns.
- 8.4. Members noted that access to the footbridge would be controlled and that management and monitoring of the footbridge had been assigned to the responsibility of the school under the November 2007 Stratford City S106 agreement. (The 24 hour public access to the one multi-use area of games would be direct from the street.) The management regime would also be responsible for maintenance of the footbridge. They noted that the Pedestrian Footbridge Management Plan would be required under the S106 Agreement six months before the opening of the bridge.
- 8.5. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED unanimously that:

the Committee

**APPROVED** the application subject to the conditions and informatives as set out in the report, but with condition 4 amended as below:

Amended condition 4

Prior to the commencement of the development, written details and samples, (including the erection of sample panels) to be used in the construction of;

1. The external surfaces of the bridge and its supports and braces (including details of the finished colour);
2. The gate to be provided at the northern end of the bridge deck;
3. The internal surfaces of the parapets and deck, including application of anti graffiti surface treatment;
4. the transition from the parapet to the glazed screen;
5. Parapet tops;
6. Portholes.

Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority the development shall be constructed and retained in accordance with the approved details.

*Reason: To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development. In accordance with policy EQ45 of the London Borough of Newham Unitary Development Plan (June 2001) and policy BHE3 of the London Borough of Waltham Forest Unitary Development Plan (First Review) 2006*

**9. APPLICANT NO: 08/90253/FULODA**

**(AGENDA ITEM 9)**

**Additional Retail Space, Stratford City**

**Full planning application to add 14826sqm of retail floorspace at Stratford City, Zone 1, within Blocks M1, M2, M4, M5, M6 & M8 in the form of mezzanine floors (in addition to the retail floorspace approved under outline permission ref: 07/90023/VARODA).**

***Buildings M1, M2, M4, M5, M6 & M8, Zone 1, Stratford City Site, Stratford Rail Lands***

- 9.1. Byron Davies and John Shimmen, Westfield, gave a presentation on behalf of the applicant illustrating the proposed mezzanine retail floorspace.
- 9.2. A Planning Officer then gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report. The application was for full planning permission for 14,826 square metres of additional retail floorspace for Zone 1 of Stratford City. The additional space would be located as mezzanines within the agreed retail floorspace in blocks M1, M2, M4, M5, M6, and M8. The application had been delegated to the London Borough of Newham and the Committee's views were sought.
- 9.3. Members noted that the additional retail space was intended also to increase the number of jobs for local people. They recognised that the retailers would be responsible for engaging with the local employment/training initiatives and assisting local authorities to provide longer term employment for residents living locally.
- 9.4. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee **RESOLVED** unanimously that the ODA Committee:
- a) **AGREED** to the s106 heads of terms, included in the report
  - b) **AGREED** to grant the Head of Development Control authority to negotiate the detailed terms and obligations for the agreement, in accordance with the attached Heads of Terms;
  - c) **ADVISED** the London Borough of Newham that the ODA Planning Committee has no objections to the grant of permission for the additional retail application, on the basis that:
    - i. all buildings to comprise the additional retail floorspace have been approved by the LPA;
    - ii. the GLA is advised about the Council's draft decision prior to the issue of any decision notice;
    - iii. any consent is subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report;

**a section 106 agreement is completed prior to the grant of permission in accordance with the heads of terms set out in the report.**



## 10. STRATFORD CITY SPLIT S106 REPORT (AGENDA ITEM 10)

- 10.1. Richard Griffiths, Legal Adviser to the PDT, then gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report. The proposal was to allow S106 Agreements for both Zone 1 and Zones 2-7 to permit the relevant developers to provide Intermediate residential units in place of any Market Housing units to be constructed under planning permission 07/90023/VARODA. The changes would apply only to those units constructed prior to the Olympic Games and within a capped maximum number and to the same mix of unit sizes. The scale of the maximum cap was being discussed to allow not more than 21% of the total Market Housing units in both Zone 1 and Zones 2-7 to be replaced by Intermediate housing.
- 10.2. It was noted that the resolution in the report referred to the units being constructed, completed, and provided prior to the Games. However, given that the units will be used for the Athletes' Village the resolution should only refer to the fact that the units need to be constructed before the Games.
- 10.3. Members were concerned that Market Housing and other types of housing should be mixed on site. The Head of Development Control noted that the initial drawings she had seen suggested that this approach was likely to be adopted. However, it was noted that the current drafting gives the developers absolute discretion on the market units to be replaced subject only to consulting with the London Borough of Newham and having reasonable regard to those comments. It was noted that this would be reviewed at the detailed drafting stage.
- 10.4. Members were concerned that access to the 'place of worship' had been described as to be made available during retail opening hours. They considered that it should be maintained on days when uses other than retail use were open (eg on Easter Sunday when entertainment sites would be accessible). It was agreed that access should therefore be related to 'centre opening hours' within the main retail centre (not to 'retail opening hours').
- 10.5. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED unanimously that:

the Committee

**APPROVED** the proposals and granted the Head of Development Control authority to, in accordance with the terms specified in the report, agree to a provision in the Zone 1 Section 106 Agreement and in the Zones 2-7 Section 106 Agreement allowing both the Zone 1 developer and the Zones 2-7 developer to provide Intermediate Units in place of Market Housing Units subject to:

- (a) the Intermediate Units must be constructed, before the Olympic Games;
- (b) an overall cap on the number of Market Housing Units that can be converted so as to protect Stratford City as a sustainable community;

- (c) the mix of unit sizes of the Intermediate Units must be the same as the mix of unit sizes that would have applied to the Market Housing Units; and
- (d) the London Borough of Newham must be notified in writing of the number of Intermediate Units that the developer intends to provide in place of any Market Housing Units, together with the proposed location and tenure, and the developer must have reasonable regard to any comments received from the London Borough of Newham

and on such other terms as considered acceptable by the Head of Development Control in order to secure a mixed use sustainable community at the Stratford City Development.

**11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS  
(AGENDA ITEM 11)**

*There being no other business the meeting closed at 8.10 pm*

Signature 

Date 25/8/2009

Chair