

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 84th COMMITTEE MEETING

Held on 26 July 2011 at 18.00

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

Present:

Lorraine Baldry	Chairman
David Taylor	Deputy Chairman

Local Authority Members:

Cllr Terry Wheeler,	LB Waltham Forest
Cllr Geoffrey Taylor,	LB Hackney
Cllr Conor McAuley,	LB Newham
Cllr Judith Gardiner	LB Tower Hamlets

Independent Members:

Celia Carrington
William Hodgson
Mike Appleton
Dru Vesty

Officers in attendance:

Vivienne Ramsey	ODA, Director of Planning Decisions
Anthony Hollingsworth	ODA, Chief Planner Development
Richard Griffiths	ODA Legal Adviser, Planning Decisions Team (Pinsent Masons)
Saba Master	ODA Board Secretary

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

1.1. There were apologies from Janice Morphet.

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

- 2.1 There were Updates for Items 6 and 7.
- 2.2 The order of business was unchanged.
- 2.3 There were requests to speak from Catherine Odell, Savills, and Michael West, Allies and Morrison, for Item 6 and Simon Wright, ODA, for Item 6 and Item 7.

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 Item 5, 6 and 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?'

The Members of the Planning Committee confirmed that the declarations of personal interests recorded on the paper for Item 3 were correct and that none were considered prejudicial.

Conor McAuley asked for his declarations of interest to be applied to Item 5 of the agenda.

4. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING (AGENDA ITEM 4)

- 4.1. The Committee

AGREED the Minutes of the 83rd Planning Committee Meeting.

5. F14 Temporary Bridge 11/90348/REMODA

Reserved Matters application for the construction of F14 temporary pedestrian and buggy bridge pursuant to condition 5 of permission 10/90331/OUTODA for use during the Games, located over the Greenway and Loop Road connecting the warm-up track to the Stadium.

- 5.1 A PDT Officer gave a presentation and explained that the 2007 Olympic and Legacy Facilities (OLF) outline planning permission established the principle of the development of a temporary Games phase bridge crossing the Greenway to link the warm-up track and Stadium. Following design development, a "slot-in" planning application for outline planning permission was submitted in 2010 for bridge F14. Outline planning permission 10/90331/OUTODA was granted on 20 October 2010.
- 5.2 The PDT Officer showed illustrative diagrams of the 2007 approved temporary Games phase bridge F14 and 2010 approved bridge F14. .
- 5.3 The Committee were shown illustrative views of bridge F14 from the south of bridge H17 and from the Stadium concourse. The Officer explained the main issues:
- The revised proposal has a more compact alignment, lower structure, with the ramp having an at-grade crossing flush with the Greenway surface.
 - There will be a covered pedestrian route with a canopy enclosure 3.3m high and 5.1m wide which comprises a support frame with tensioned fabric on its internal and external faces. In addition an open buggy route runs alongside the pedestrian route. This will provide a 4m wide route enclosed either side by one metre high galvanised steel parapets. Diagrams of sections of the pedestrian and buggy routes were shown to the Committee.
- 5.3.1 The PDT Officer explained that issues regarding accessibility are compliant with the ODA Inclusive Design Standards. In terms of sustainability, a lightweight design solution with potential for reuse and recycling of the structure has been employed..
- 5.3 The Officer explained that PDT are content that the submitted reserved matters details are acceptable and should be approved. Although the structure will be prominent in views from the Stadium western drop off entrance area, the simplicity and consistency of the material and colour to be used for the cladding and the pedestrian enclosure will ensure that bridge F14 does not have an over-dominant presence. The design solution is fit for purpose and functional. It represents an improvement on the original 2007 scheme in terms of reduced scale and improved appearance, and in achieving a smaller, more sustainable link appropriate for a temporary structure which will be removed post Games.
- 5.4 A member expressed concern about security issues and questioned whether the MPA had been consulted regarding the proposal. A PDT Officer reported that the MPA had been sent the report but provided no comment, which is why they are not listed in the report.
- 5.5 A member asked for further information regarding the condition imposed to require the submission of fire safety issues. A PDT Officer explained that this was normally a Building Regulations matter but as these do not extend to bridges, further information on fire safety had been requested in light of the comments by LFEPa. The officer

confirmed that the applicant had submitted a fire safety risk assessment and that subject to consultation on this, the proposed fire safety condition could be removed prior to issue of the decision notice.

- 5.6 A member expressed concern that public access to the Greenway post-Games should be secured as quickly as possible. A PDT Officer stated that the applicant is required to submit a phasing plan for reinstatement of access and PDT therefore has some control to ensure early reinstatement of public access. A PDT Officer also explained that the backstop date for removal of all temporary elements was secured by planning condition on the grant of the 'slot-in' permission for the bridge; the backstop date being 31 December 2013.
- 5.7 A member expressed concern that the section of the bridge over the Greenway be removed as quickly as possible after the Games. Officers confirmed that this would be taken into account when considering the phasing plan for re-instatement and that an Informative would be added seeking removal as soon as possible after the Games. It was also suggested that PDT would formally write to the applicant regarding the Committee's concerns and the expectation that the removal of the section of the bridge across the Greenway post-Games would be undertaken as quickly as possible in order to facilitate public access.
- 5.8 The applicant explained that the impact of the bridge construction works on the Greenway would be mitigated, being phased so that one side of the Greenway is kept open at all times. .
- 5.8 There being no further questions the Committee (unanimously):

APPROVED the Reserved Matters submitted pursuant to condition 5 of permission 10/90331/OUTODA subject to the addition of an informative which states that PDT expects the removal of the section of the bridge across the Greenway post Games to be undertaken as quickly as possible in order to facilitate public access. Members also requested that PDT write to the applicant separately to confirm this point.

6. Multi Storey Car Park (MSCP) PV Roof 11/90330/FULODA

Construction of an open canopy comprising photovoltaic panels on a steel frame on the roof of the eastern half of the MSCP in post-Games phase.

- 6.1 Simon Wright (Director of Infrastructure and Utilities, ODA) Catherine Odell (Savills) and Michael West (Allies and Morrison) introduced this application on behalf of the applicant. The applicant gave a brief history regarding the ODA's decision, in 2010, not to proceed with the use of a wind turbine in Eton Manor for various technical and operational reasons, and how alternative options to ensure the ODA renewable energy targets were investigated.
- 6.2 The applicant reported that after much investigation it was decided that photovoltaic cells would be put on the MPC and the Multi Storey Car Park (MSCP). Photovoltaic panels would be installed on a canopy structure to the roof of the eastern part of the MSCP in post-Games phase. This would meet at least 1.5% of the 9% on-site renewable energy generation capacity target. In addition, an off-site retrofit option (RE:NEW and RE:FIT programme by the GLA and LDA) would ensure that the ODA meets its overall target 50% carbon reduction target by 2013 as required in the 2007 Olympic planning permissions s.106 legal agreement ..

- 6.3 The applicant showed photographs of the existing north west corner and the proposed north west view. The applicant reported that the design is energy efficient and will create a prominent design to serve and promote renewable energy production.
- 6.4 A PDT Officer gave a presentation and explained that the 2007 Olympic and Legacy Facilities (OLF) outline planning permission included the outline consent for the construction of a building for use as a MSCP (with a conversion strategy condition for the western half) in PDZ5. Also included in the 2007 permission, was condition OD.0.21, (Building emissions and renewable energy). This condition required sufficient on-site renewable energy generation capacity to be installed to meet at least 20% of the annual carbon emissions of the venues and other buildings to be retained on site in legacy phase.
- 6.5 The PDT Officer explained that the consultation process had received no objections. Responses were received from Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, MPA and Transport for London.
- 6.6 The PDT Officer reported that the following issues raised by the proposal were considered:
- 6.6.1 **Sustainability** – the proposal would provide an estimated offset of 1.5% of the annual carbon emissions of the built aspects of the Olympic Park development.
- 6.6.2 **Design and appearance** –The proposed canopy and panels are considered to work well with the post-Games form of the eastern part of the MSCP, when the cladding is added. The detailed design of the secondary canopy and panels would be secured by a suggested condition.
- 6.6.3 **Integration with other permissions and applications** – There would be no loss of car parking spaces and no impact on vehicle circulation on the top deck as a result of the proposal. The current application does not prevent the implementation of the already consented post-Games cladding scheme for the eastern half of the MSCP. It is seen as an important part of the ODA's revised strategy towards renewable energy generation and overall carbon emissions reduction on the Olympic Park. The carbon offset would be secured in a modification deed to the 2007 section 106 agreement to ensure the predicted saving is continued through the detailed design phase.
- 6.6.4 **Metropolitan Open Land, SIL and other policy issues** - The addition of the canopy is considered not to adversely affect the current Metropolitan Open Land or Strategic Industrial Location designation of the site. There are not considered to be any residential amenity issues given the distance of 190m to the nearest residential property and the existing bulk of the consented MSCP. The installation of the PV panels and associated structure is not considered to adversely affect biodiversity.
- 6.7 An Update Report was circulated to the Committee. The Update Report outlined additional conditions to ensure the construction of the canopy and PV panels is in accordance with site wide controls; Building Height Limits (LTD.1.2), Hours of work (LTD.1.7), Approval of on-site construction facilities (LTD.1.10), Permitted development (LTD.1.16, LTD.1.17, LTD.1.18), Construction noise and vibration (LTD.1.20, LTD.1.21, LTD.1.22, LTD.1.23, LTD.1.24), Construction dust (LTD.1.25), Removal of buildings and equipment on completion (LTD.1.28), Revised Code of Construction Practice and Delivery Arrangements (LTD.14) and Construction workers parking (LTD.15). An update on the London Plan was also included in the Report.

- 6.8 In conclusion, the PDT Officer reported that Officers recommend approval of the application as it is considered to comply with sustainability, design, open space, amenity and remediation policies in the London Plan and the London Borough of Hackney UDP and Core Strategy.
- 6.9 A member pointed out that as a contractor has not yet been appointed, the Committee actually have no detailed designs for the appearance of the Photovoltaic panels on the MSCP. Officers confirmed that there were sufficient details of the proposal as a whole on which to take a decision. Further detailed submissions on materials and final finishes were secured by conditions. The member asked for information on what procedures were in place if the equipment needed to be changed. A PDT Officer reported that this would depend on how far the appearance changes from the current proposal before Members, and if those changes were of a material nature then a new planning application would be required.
- 6.10 A member asked why the condition for at least 1.5% towards the proposed carbon offset contribution, to the site-wide target of 9%, was not included in the Update Report or in any of the conditions stated in the Report. The legal adviser explained that this was in Appendix 2D of Item 7.
- 6.11 A member expressed concern that the detailed design of the PV canopy on the MSCP roof should be more sensitive to the design of the MSCP, especially as it is an entry point to the Olympic Park. A PDT Officer responded that an informative can be added to make it clear that PDT expects the design to reflect the curving corners when the detailed design is submitted pursuant to condition 3.
- 6.12 A member asked who would be responsible for the maintenance of the PV panels, including the annual jet wash and testing, and how would PDT ensure that this is done. A PDT Officer reported that a suitable condition on the management and maintenance details of the PV panels would be imposed, if this was not already covered within the conditions of the main MSCP structure.
- 6.13 A member asked whether a condition could be added to require the canopy to be extended onto the western part of the MSCP (if retained). The Legal adviser explained that planning permission would be required for the western part of the MSCP to remain and as such, a requirement to have the canopy extended onto the western part of the MSCP was outside of the current planning application.
- 6.14 A member commented that the 11% gap in renewables provision with the loss of the turbine would never be made up in time for Games phase, but that there is scope in the legacy phase to retrofit the venues further, or provide additional renewable energy generation elsewhere.
- 6.15 A member expressed concern and asked PDT to ensure that the applicant is aware that a high quality of design treatment would be expected of the details required in condition 3.
- 6.16 There being no further questions, the Committee, (unanimously);
- i) **APPROVED** the submitted application for the PV panels and **GRANTED** planning permissions for the reasons given in the report subject to completion of the Deed of Modification to the 2007 section 106 agreement, and the conditions and informatives as set out in the report and the additional informative and condition as and if required following the Committee's discussion;

- ii) **GRANTED DELEGATED AUTHORITY** to the Director fo Planning Decisions to negotiate and complete the Deed of Modification to the 2007 section 106 agreement;
- iii) **AGREED** to a suitable condition on the management and maintenance details of the PV panels if this wasn't reasonably covered within conditions on the main MSCP structure.

7. Renewable Target Section 73's 11/90313/VARODA, 11/90314/VARODA, 11/90315/VARODA, 11/90316/VARODA, 11/90317/VARODA, 11/90318/VARODA, 11/90319/VARODA, 11/90320/VARODA, 11/90321/VARODA, 11/90322/VARODA, 11/90323/VARODA, 11/90324/VARODA, 11/90325/FULODA and 11/90326/VARODA

Proposals:

11/90313/VARODA

Location – Olympic Park

Proposal – Variation of conditions OD.0.21 (Building emissions and renewable energy) and LTD.1.3 (Building emissions and renewable energy) of the Olympic and Legacy Facilities permission ref. 07/90010/OUMODA to remove the requirement for the wind turbine, and reduce the on-site renewable energy generation requirement from 20% of annual carbon emissions of the venues and other buildings to be retained in the legacy phase to at least 9% of annual carbon emissions. Non compliance with condition OD.7.1 (Wind turbine) and condition OD.0.3 (Work in accordance with approvals) to reflect the non-implementation of the wind turbine.

11/90314/VARODA

Location – Terminal Pumping Station, Planning Delivery Zone 3

Proposal - Variation of condition 43 (Building emissions and renewable energy) of the Terminal Pumping Station permission ref. 08/90059/OUTODA to reduce the on-site Olympic Park renewable energy generation requirement from 20% of annual carbon emissions of the venues and other buildings to be retained in the legacy phase to at least 9% of annual carbon emissions.

11/90315/VARODA

Location – Velopark, Planning Delivery Zone 6

Proposal - Variation of conditions VOD.15 (Velodrome Building emissions and renewable energy) and VLT.04 (Building emissions and renewable energy) of the Velopark permission ref. 08/90276/FUMODA to reduce the on-site Olympic Park renewable energy generation requirement from 20% of annual carbon emissions of the venues and other buildings to be retained in the legacy phase to at least 9% of annual carbon emissions.

11/90316/VARODA

Location – North Central Parklands, Planning Delivery Zones 5 and 6

Proposal - Variation of condition PPR.21 (Emissions and renewable energy) of the North Central Parklands permission ref. 08/90310/FULODA to reduce the on-site Olympic Park renewable energy generation requirement from 20% of annual carbon emissions of the venues and other buildings to be retained in the legacy phase to at least 9% of annual carbon emissions.

11/90317/VARODA

Location – South Central Parklands, Planning Delivery Zones 2 and 4

Proposal - Variation of condition PPR.21 (Emissions and renewable energy) of the South Central Parklands permission ref. 08/90311/FULODA to reduce the on-site

Olympic Park renewable energy generation requirement from 20% of annual carbon emissions of the venues and other buildings to be retained in the legacy phase to at least 9% of annual carbon emissions.

11/90318/VARODA

Location – Basketball landscaping, Planning Delivery Zone 6

Proposal - Variation of condition PPR.18 (Emissions and renewable energy) of the Basketball landscaping permission ref. 08/90312/FULODA to reduce the on-site Olympic Park renewable energy generation requirement from 20% of annual carbon emissions of the venues and other buildings to be retained in the legacy phase to at least 9% of annual carbon emissions.

11/90319/VARODA

Location – Handball landscaping, Planning Delivery Zone 5

Proposal - Variation of condition PPR.18 (Emissions and renewable energy) of the Handball landscaping permission ref. 08/90313/FULODA to reduce the on-site Olympic Park renewable energy generation requirement from 20% of annual carbon emissions of the venues and other buildings to be retained in the legacy phase to at least 9% of annual carbon emissions.

11/90320/VARODA

Location – Handball arena, Planning Delivery Zone 5

Proposal - Variation of conditions HOD.12 (Handball building emissions and renewable energy) and HLT.4 (Building emissions and renewable energy) of the Handball arena permission ref. 08/90328/FUMODA to reduce the on-site Olympic Park renewable energy generation requirement from 20% of annual carbon emissions of the venues and other buildings to be retained in the legacy phase to at least 9% of annual carbon emissions.

11/90321/VARODA

Location – Eton Manor, Planning Delivery Zone 7

Proposal - Variation of conditions EMOD.13 (Building emissions and renewable energy) and EMLTD.7 (Building emissions and renewable energy) of the Eton Manor venues permission ref. 09/90198/FUMODA to reduce the on-site Olympic Park renewable energy generation requirement from 20% of annual carbon emissions of the venues and other buildings to be retained in the legacy phase to at least 9% of annual carbon emissions.

11/90322/VARODA

Location – Post-Games Transformation Parklands, Planning Delivery Zones 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 15.

Proposal - Variation of condition PGT.14 (Emissions and renewable energy) of the post-Games Transformation parklands and public realm permission ref. 09/90410/FUMODA to reduce the on-site Olympic Park renewable energy generation requirement from 20% of annual carbon emissions of the venues and other buildings to be retained in the legacy phase to at least 9% of annual carbon emissions.

11/90323/VARODA

Location – Aquatics Centre, Planning Delivery Zone 1

Proposal - Variation of condition 4 of the Post-Games phase reserved matters approval for the Aquatics Centre ref. 08/90026/REMODA to reduce the on-site Olympic Park renewable energy generation requirement from 20% of annual carbon emissions of the venues and other buildings to be retained in the legacy phase to at least 9% of annual carbon emissions.

11/90324/VARODA

Location – Planning Delivery Zone 4

Proposal - Variation of condition PPR.18 (Emissions and renewable energy) of the PDZ4 landscaping permission ref. 08/90314/FULODA to reduce the on-site Olympic Park renewable energy generation requirement from 20% of annual carbon emissions of the venues and other buildings to be retained in the legacy phase to at least 9% of annual carbon emissions.

11/90325/FULODA

Location – Eton Manor

Proposal - Provision of hard standing in Games phase in the space left by the absence of the Olympic Park wind turbine as its associated structures.

11/90326/VARODA

Location – Aquatics Centre, Planning Delivery Zone 1

Proposal - Variation of condition 4 of the Games phase reserved matters approval for the Aquatics Centre ref. 08/90025/REMODA to reduce the on-site Olympic Park renewable energy generation requirement from 20% of annual carbon emissions of the venues and other buildings to be retained in the legacy phase to at least 9% of annual carbon emissions.

7.1 Simon Wright, ODA, introduced the applications on behalf of the applicant.

7.2 A PDT Officer gave a presentation and explained that the application comprised of 14 applications in total; 1 slot in application and 13 variations of conditions applications. The 14 applications are all related to the ODA's decision not to progress the wind turbine approved on Eton Manor. The ODA is seeking to formally remove the Eton Manor wind turbine from the approved scheme, and to vary the renewable energy conditions on the 2007 permission and subsequent 'slot-in' permission for the venues and parklands so that the renewable energy generation target would be reduced from 20% to 9% of annual carbon emissions. The ODA is also seeking to make a modification to the 2007 Section 106 Agreement at Schedule 11 to allow its 50% carbon emissions reduction target to be achieved by allowing off-site measures to be included, namely the RE:NEW and RE:FIT retrofit programmes by GLA and LDA. A new slot in application has been made which proposes hard standing for Games phase in the location of the approved wind turbine; a statement of superseded development to remove the wind turbine and its associated sub-station from the consented scheme has been submitted to accompany the application.

7.3 The PDT Officer reported that the Environment Agency and British Waterways raised no objection. 7.4 The Update Report contained responses from Lee Valley Regional Park Authority who raised no objection, and the London Borough of Tower Hamlets and the London Borough of Hackney which both raised objections. The Update Report also provides an update on the Heads of Terms for the Section 106 agreement and an update on the newly adopted London Plan.

7.5 The PDT Officer outlined the considerations for the suite of applications. These were Sustainability, in terms of the wind turbine; renewable energy provision; off-site carbon measures and; the slot-in application for hard standing at Eton Manor. Officers are satisfied that the ODA has used reasonable endeavours to try to secure the provision of the wind turbine but for various external reasons it has not been possible for Games or post-Games implementation. Officers accept that further provision for renewable energy on-site to make up for the loss of the turbine is not feasible at this stage (beyond the addition of PVs to the MPC and MSCP) and that the 9% proposed is the maximum practicable. The proposal is in line with the newly adopted London Plan which allows for

off-site carbon reductions measures to be included where delivery is certain. The off-site measures would allow the 50% target to be reached. The Update Report was referred to regarding the additional heads of terms and newly adopted London Plan.

- 7.5 The slot-in application for temporary hard standing is considered to be acceptable and accord with section 5(5) of the Olympic Act regarding making proper provision for the Games. The overall packages of 14 applications is considered to comply with planning policies which seek to reduce carbon emissions and maximise renewable energy generation where feasible.
- 7.6 A member asked PDT to make it clear that, although there is disappointment that the 20% target could not be reached it was reasonable back in 2007 for the applicant and PDT to have set this target but for various reasons since then it is no longer practicable. Officers are satisfied that the ODA has used its reasonable endeavours to fulfil the 20% target.
- 7.7 A member asked about the lessons learned for wider sustainability. A PDT Officer reported that the ODA are building resilience for change which will be transferable to other projects, and considered in the Legacy Communities Scheme.
- 7.8 A member asked if the ODA's aspiration of holding the "most sustainable Games ever" was still true. A PDT Officer reported that the aspirations of the ODA were still captured by the 50% carbon emissions target and that the "most sustainable Games ever" claim was not one PDT had made in its consideration of the 2007 Olympic planning applications. .
- 7.9 A member asked for reassurance of the wider 50% carbon reduction target being realistic, as set by Schedule 11 of the 2007 Section 106 Agreement. A PDT Officer explained that on-site measures were investigated and discussed with the applicant and that the off-site measures had also been discussed extensively with the applicant and that the target is as resilient as it can be. The ODA had investigated carbon credits but the host boroughs are not satisfied with this approach, whereas the proposed off-site schemes would be of benefit to the host boroughs.
- 7.10 A member expressed the view that the decision not to use the wind turbine was a unique incident, and there were not many lessons that would be learned. The member also reminded the Committee that compared to previous host cities London 2012 would be the most sustainable Games. The member felt confident that the 9% target, and possibly the 20% original target, would be exceeded in legacy mode.
- 7.11 A member questioned why the Committee had not seen a clear commitment to funding another renewable energy project off-site to address the 11% deficit. A PDT Officer replied that the deliverability of the off-site measures pre Games and additionality of benefit were key considerations, together with the amount of control the ODA would have with funding other off-site measures. The proposed scheme would have local benefits in the four boroughs.
- 7.12 There being no further questions the Committee voted (10 Yes and 2 Abstentions) and;
- i) **APPROVED** the variation of conditions submission ref. 07/90313/VARODA to vary conditions OD.0.21 and LTD.1.3 of the September 2007 permission ref. 07/90010/OUMODA to vary the renewable energy generation capacity conditions from 20% to at least 9%, to remove condition OD.7.1 (wind turbine), to remove the approved plans and drawings relating to the wind turbine and to grant planning permission for the reasons given in the Report

SUBJECT to conditions and the completion of the Deed of Modification to the 2007 Section 106 Agreement all as detailed in **appendix 1A** to the Report.

- ii) **APPROVED** the variation of conditions applications listed below to vary the renewable energy generation capacity conditions from 20% to at least 9% and to grant planning permission for the reasons given in this Report **SUBJECT TO** conditions and the completion of the Deed of Modification to the 2007 Section 106 Agreement all as detailed in the following appendices to the Report;

11/90314/VARODA – see recommendation section of **appendix 1B**
11/90315/VARODA – see recommendation section of **appendix 1C**
11/90316/VARODA – see recommendation section of **appendix 1D**
11/90317/VARODA – see recommendation section of **appendix 1E**
11/90318/VARODA – see recommendation section of **appendix 1F**
11/90319/VARODA – see recommendation section of **appendix 1G**
11/90320/VARODA – see recommendation section of **appendix 1H**
11/90321/VARODA – see recommendation section of **appendix 1I**
11/90322/VARODA – see recommendation section of **appendix 1J**
11/90323/VARODA – see recommendation section of **appendix 1K**
11/90324/VARODA – see recommendation section of **appendix 1L**
11/90326/VARODA – see recommendation section of **appendix 1M**

- iii) **APPROVED** the submitted full planning application ref. 11/90325/FULODA for the hard standing at Eton Manor and to grant planning permission for the reasons given in the Report **SUBJECT TO**;
- a) the conditions and informatives as set out in **appendix 2B** of the Report and Statement of Superseded Development as set out in **appendix 2C** of the Report; and
- b) the completion of the Deed of Modification to the 2007 Section 106 Agreement.
- iv) **GRANTED DELEGATED AUTHORITY** to the Director of Planning Decisions to negotiate and complete the Deed of Modification to the 2007 Section 106 Agreement in order to:
- a) bring the planning permissions detailed in **appendices 1A to 1M** of the Report into the remit of the 2007 Section 106 Agreement;
- b) to secure the off-site carbon measures as detailed in the draft heads of terms contained in **appendix 2D** of the Report; and
- c) secure such other obligations that the Director of Planning Decisions considers necessary and arising from the negotiation of the Deed of Modification.

8. Any Other Business

There being no other business the meeting ended at 19.30.

Date of next meeting: 13 September 2011

Signed: J. Beldry

Chairman

Date: 25/10/2011