

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 87th COMMITTEE MEETING

Held on 25 October 2011 at 18.00

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

Present:

Lorraine Baldry 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
Matthew Foy	ODA Legal Adviser, Planning Decisions Team (Pinsent Masons)
Saba Master	ODA Board Secretary

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

1.1. There were apologies from David Taylor and Janice Morphet.

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

- 2.1 There were no Updates.
- 2.2 The order of business was unchanged.

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.

'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.

4. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING (AGENDA ITEM 4)

- 4.1. The Committee:

AGREED the Minutes of the 86th Planning Committee Meeting.

5. LOCOG OBS Tower & Prestige Ticketing 11/90454/OUTODA

Application for Outline Planning Permission for:

- *The siting and scale of a temporary prestige ticketing structure with a footprint of 6,100sqm and maximum height of 15 metres consisting of two x three (3) storey*

*elements linked by a central glazed atrium with an external seating area to the south-east;
and*

- *The siting and scale of a temporary OBS Tower with a footprint of no more than 1,050sqm and a maximum height of 22.5 metres.*

- 5.1 A PDT Officer gave a presentation and explained that the 2007 Olympic and Legacy Facilities (OLF) established planning permission for various overlay including Spectator Support Areas (SSA); Front of House (FOH); and Back of House (BOH) facilities during Games phase within PDZ 4.
- 5.2 The PDT Officer showed an illustrative diagram setting out the areas for spectators, the areas for operations and the Front of House areas permitted under the 2007 OLF permission.
- 5.3 The PDT Officer explained there were two parts to the current application:
- 5.3.1 The first part was an application for Outline Planning Permission for the siting and scale of a temporary prestige ticketing structure with a footprint of 6,100sqm. The maximum height of the structure would be 15 metres comprising of two x three storey elements linked by a central glazed atrium with an external seating area to the south east. The temporary structure is intended to be used by Prestige Ticketing Ltd to host its corporate hospitality during the Games. This structure would accommodate a maximum of 3000 guests and 800 staff. Although the height of the structure varies the maximum height is at the atrium (15 metres). The total floor space area is 10,697m² broken down into Restaurants (6,285m²), Guest Toilets and cloakrooms (912m²), Kitchens (1920m²), Offices and ancillary areas (963m²) and the Atrium (617m²).
- 5.3.2 The second part of the application is for outline planning permission for the siting and scale of a temporary OBS Tower with a maximum height of 22.5 metres with four storeys. The footprint would be no more than 2013m² comprised of Studios, Equipment room, WC's and corridors (1368m²), Catering concessions (300m²), Stairs and ancillary accommodation (300m²), Reception (22m²) and TOC (23m²). The OBS Tower would be located within the Back of House area within PDZ 4 but is of sufficient height to be visible from the Front of House Common Domain area. It would be operational 24 hours per day.
- 5.4 The details for the access, layout, external appearance and landscaping have been reserved for later consideration for both structures.
- 5.5 The PDT officer showed diagrams to explain the general considerations of the application which included the:
- 5.5.1 **Principle and siting and quantum** – The proposed locations for the 2011 OBS Tower and Prestige Ticketing are consistent with the locations permitted in 2007 for Spectator Support and Back of House areas. Furthermore the total quantum of floorspace being proposed in these applications together with that permitted at the last committee meeting as part of the common domain does not exceed that permitted in 2007.
- 5.5.2 **The Scale of Development and Visual Impact Assessment** – DC CABE have provided formal comments in relation to the outline planning application and have commented that the “The disposition and heights of the temporary buildings and structure appear sound”. PDT consider the application acceptable within the context of the Olympic Park venues and recent residential development of up to nine storeys to

west of PDZ 4 in Fish Island and having regard to their temporary nature of the structures. Furthermore, officers considered that that the Prestige Ticketing and OBS Tower would not result in any significant difference in the visual impact assessed under the 2007 OLF Environmental Assessment.

- 5.5.3 The proposal is not considered to raise issues in terms of flooding and drainage, accessibility, remediation or neighbour amenity subject to the various conditions proposed in the report. Details on sustainability issues would also be addressed by the proposed conditions.
- 5.5.4 **Consultation** - The application has been advertised by the display of four site notices with letters sent to the occupiers of the 297 properties to the west of the application site. There were no objections raised by statutory and non-statutory consultees. Consultee comments have informed the suggested conditions and informatives as set out in the report. DC Cabe have asked for further details on the central Atrium and restaurant wings, the pavillion roof, lighting, the Atrium form, scale, colour, branding and entrances, the plant compound appearance and the site context. DC CABA have not proposed any change to the recommendation.
- 5.6 In conclusion, the PDT Officer reported that the proposed scheme takes into account the surrounding developments that are now under construction and is consistent with the consented PPR Games phase approval for the site, so no incompatibility issues are raised. Subject to the suggested conditions and informatives, the proposal for this temporary venue is considered to comply with policies in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets UDP and Core Strategy, the London Plan and the draft replacement London Plan policies, which would allow for the proper preparation for the 2012 Games in accordance with section 5(5) of the Olympic Act.
- 5.7 A member asked for further information about the foundations of the structures and whether a condition would be required relating to any unexpected contamination which might arise upon removal of the proposed piling. The applicant reported that piles would be placed underneath the structure with steel poles at a size of 140 and 178 in diameter and at a depth of 15 metres. The applicant pointed out that PDT had imposed a numerous number of conditions dealing with remediation and that there is site wide remediation strategy. The applicant agreed to have further discussions with PDT, as required, to ensure remediation is in accordance with what is expected by the Committee. PDT officers explained that although this was an Outline Planning Application that the suggested remediation conditions sought to duplicate the OLF remediation conditions in order to secure a consistent approach to remediation matters and that the conditions would require that the applicant accord with relevant approved remediation documents. PDT Officers pointed out conditions 7, 22-31, 33 and 60 reiterate the OLF conditions regarding the site wide remediation strategy and that the conditions are consistent with what the Committee has previously agreed. There are consolidating validation reports and the approved documents would stress the need for monitoring. However, if unexpected contamination is encountered then this is covered under condition 58, (post-Games transformation). PDT officers are therefore satisfied that the conditions recommended are consistent with the approved approach and conditions of the parent OLF permission in respect of remediation matters.
- 5.8 A member asked for clarification as to whether the outstanding details would be submitted by way of a reserved matters application and whether such applications would be presented to the Committee or dealt with under delegated authority. A PDT officer confirmed that reserved matters submissions would be required and that the details were specified in condition 6 and that it could be returned to committee for determination.

5.9 Finally, a member asked the applicant why an outline application had been submitted. The applicant reported that the proposal had been seperated so that the Committee could get an early understanding of the general layout of the common domain before detailed design work was completed.

5.10 There being no further questions, the Committee took a vote and voted unanimously to:

AGREE the reasons for approval and grant Outline Planning Approval subject to the conditions and informatives set out at Section 10 of the report.

6. Any Other Business

There being no other business the meeting ended at 18.30.

Date of next meeting: 22 November 2011

Signed:



Chairman

Date: 13/12/2011