OLYMPIC
DELIVERY
AUTHORITY
Planning Decisions Team

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: **MINUTES OF 89th COMMITTEE MEETING**
Held on 13 December 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 (Items 1-8 and Item 10)
Cllr Conor McAuley	LB Newham (Items 1-8 and item 10)

Independent Members:

Celia Carrington
William Hodgson
Janice Morphet
Dru Vesty (Items 1-8 and Item 10)

Officers in attendance:

Vivienne Ramsey	ODA, Director of Planning Decisions
Anthony Hollingsworth	ODA, Chief Planner Development Control, Planning Decisions Team
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 Mike Appleton and Judith Gardiner.

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

2.1 There were updates for items 7, 8, 9 and 10.

2.2 The order of business was changed, with Item 10 being taken prior to Item 9.

2.3 There were requests to speak from Jamie Hindhaugh, BBC, and Oli Heywood, LOCOG for Item 6; Martin Jameson, Serie Architects, and Paul Andrews, BMW for Item 7; Jon Watson, Westfield for Item 9 and 10; Jagdeep Bhogal, UNITE Group Plc and Tony McGuirk, BDP Architects for Item 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 Item 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 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?'

Geoffrey Taylor declared a prejudicial interest, in connection with item 9, on the basis of his position as a Board Member of Cass and Claredale Halls of Residence Association Limited and as such agreed to leave the meeting during the consideration of this item.

Conor McAuley also declared a prejudicial interest, in connection with item 9, on the basis of his position as a Councillor for LB Newham and as Chair of LB Newham Strategic Development Committee, which discussed this item and led to LB Newham subsequently objecting to the application, and as such agreed to leave the meeting during the consideration of this Item.

The remaining 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 88th Planning Committee Meeting.

5. 11/90691/AODODA– Main Media Complex (MMC) (Planning Delivery Zone 5)

Submission of details of temporary buildings and structures associated with the Games time operation of the Main Media Complex (MMC) pursuant to conditions OG.03 (temporary structures) and OD.0.20 (engineering works) of permission 07/90010/OUMODA and comprising: temporary High Street structures providing retail and other services; two International Broadcast Centre (IBC) Logistic Compounds to the west of the IBC; hard surfacing and use of an area to the north of the IBC for Olympic Broadcast Service Motor Pool car park.

5.1 A PDT Officer reported that the application submission provides details of the proposed temporary buildings in the area between the International Broadcast Centre (IBC) and Main Press Centre (MPC) (an area known as the High Street) together with further details regarding the provision of two fenced compounds along the western side of the IBC and the provision of a car park for 70 vehicles to the north of the IBC. The officer explained that the additional car parking to the north of the IBC is required because the Olympic Broadcast Service (OBS) needs vehicle access to all areas within specified travel times and this is not possible using the Multi Storey Car Park which is outside the secure boundary of the Olympic Park.

5.2 The PDT officer explained the elements of the proposals, which included

- Erection of temporary structures within the High Street providing retail units, other services and facilities.
- Two IBC Logistics Compounds alongside the west of the IBC.
- OBS Motor Pool car park.
- Extensive planting used to screen temporary structures and compound fence.
- Hard surfacing of the application site.

5.3 Diagrams were shown of the site plan, the ground floor plan (north and south), the Olympic Broadcast Service Car Park (70 car parking spaces to the north of the MPC), the compound fence detail including planting on the outside and the, high street detailed elevation including the screening areas and the climbers on the timber structures. The planting on the "High Street" would be brought in and installed just before Games time.

5.4 The PDT Officer reported that an extensive consultation had taken place. Furthermore, additional consultation responses had since been received from CABE who did not wish to comment on the application but were pleased to note the efforts made to incorporate landscaping. Transport for London had also since confirmed that they had no objection provided servicing and construction would be in accordance with the appropriate management plans.

5.5 The PDT Officer explained that the main considerations for this application were:

- The Principle of development (although this had been established through a previous permission for a 'High Street' development at this location for the Games phase);

- The layout and access arrangements (including crowd modelling to show that the temporary buildings leave sufficient space as well as acceptable vehicle access to the compounds and the car park.

- The design and appearance – the temporary structures and compounds are of a suitable design quality and will be screened with planting.

- Noise from plant at the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on local residents. A further cumulative noise assessment would be undertaken for the IBC/MPC development pursuant to condition OG.4.

5.6 In conclusion, the PDT Officer reported that the application took into account the logistical requirements for the Games and as such provided a more compact area of temporary structures towards the north of the site and the introduction of the two logistic compounds alongside the IBC. Officers therefore consider the proposals to have achieved an acceptable balance between the need for large scale logistical facilities and the creation of a suitable working environment for the Media Complex workforce during the period of Games operations.

5.7 A member asked if the applicant was confident with the planting system being proposed for the green walls in the High Street. The applicant reported that the planting system is a proprietary one which had been used successfully on a previous project and that the irrigation system would use non-potable water.

5.8 A member asked why the car park could not be removed prior to 31 December 2013. A PDT Officer reported that as this application was an approval of details, the date for removal of the car park had already been fixed by the parent 2007 Olympic planning permission. However, it was agreed that an amended informative which requires removal of the IBC car park at the earliest opportunity (and by no later than 2013) would be imposed.

5.9 There being no further questions the Committee unanimously;

APPROVED the application for the reasons given in the report and approved the details as a partial discharge of conditions OG.3 and OD.0.20 of Planning Permission ref. 07/90010/OUMODA subject to the conditions and informatives listed in the report with an amended informative requiring the removal of the IBC temporary car parking at the earliest opportunity and in any event prior to 31 December 2013.

6. 11/90676/FULODA – BBC Studio

Erection of temporary freestanding television studios in connection with the 2012 Olympic Games comprising; shipping containers located on the deck of Bridge L03 to hold technical accommodation and act as a platform to support a purpose built television studio, construction of a temporary external access staircase providing access from the studios to the Games phase Loop Road, associated plant and equipment including a back-up generator at Loop Road level, production lighting, external terrace area for outdoor production and laying down of hard standing and creation of bell-mouth providing vehicular access from the Loop Road to a temporary parking area.

6.1 The applicant reported that the application was for the erection of a temporary television studio on the concourse area which forms the deck over the land bridge L03B, forming part of the LOCOG Temporary Common Domain Overlay area. The proposed development also includes a supporting plant compound and parking area located at Loop Road level. The compound and studio would be linked by a temporary external staircase.

6.2 The applicant reported that the position of the temporary studio, the resulting views and proximity to the park were all key factors in the choice of location and would directly influence the editorial content of the BBC's output and therefore what it offers to its audiences.

6.3 The applicant reported that the original proposals had been revised so that:

- The rear staircase was removed.
- Allies and Morrison were commissioned to work with the BBC and Urban Space Management.
- The separate structures were re-configured to give the appearance of a single structure.
- The BBC has now agreed to partnering with the ODA "Winning Words" initiative with regards to external treatment.
- A working group had been created with the LOCOG Common Domain team to ensure the look and feel is consistent with other structures within the park. Further details of how the LOCOG 'look' will be applied to this building would be submitted once this work has concluded.

6.4 The applicant showed the Committee diagrams of the location and the proposed build.

6.5 The applicant also reported that:

- The access and egress would be by way of a rear service lane.

- The structure had full disability access to and from the concourse.

- The crowd flow impact of the structure had been modelled by LOCOG in conjunction with the crowd flow modelling for the concessions.

- There would be no impact on utilities and no ground works would be needed as the structure is temporary. The power would be provided by LOCOG.

6.6 A PDT Officer gave a presentation and reported that this was a full application for a temporary television studio within the northern extent of PDZ 4. This development was not approved as part of the proposals in the 2007 Olympic and Legacy Facilities planning permissions although this planning permission did include approval for Back of House broadcast areas and press areas in addition to those accommodated within the International Broadcast Centre (IBC).

6.7 The PDT Officer reported that the application site and proposed development consisted of the following:

- TV Studios and technical accommodation located at the Upper (Bridge Deck) level.

- A platform composed of shipping containers on which the TV Studio structure will sit above.

- The shipping containers require no ground works to sit on top of the bridge deck.

- The supporting platform structure will incorporate a single WC, a lighting gallery, a broadcast stand up position (East facing) and a green room space.

- The proposed Television Studio structure is a bespoke structure which was commissioned by the BBC to facilitate multi camera, multi presenter studio presentation for use in all major events coverage.

- Ancillary structures and plant areas at the Loop Road Level to service the deck level structure.

- Vehicular access from the Loop Road to a temporary parking area.

- The temporary hardstanding/parking area is approximately 10m, at its shallowest (up to 15m maximum) by 12m.

6.8 The PDT Officer reported that the main considerations were the principle of development and its design and appearance. In particular:

- The location of the structure would be compatible with the Games phase approved Park and Public realm concourse layout for Bridge LO3.

- The temporary television structure would also be compatible with the line of Common Domain concessions approved over Bridge L03, contingent on a very minor amendment to the approved LOCOG Common Domain arrangements.

- Spectator Support Building SSB 12, which formed part of the 2007 OLF approved scheme, adjoins the application compound site to the west of Bridge L03B, but the implementation of the current application would not prejudice that development coming forward if required.

- The principle of proposed development is considered acceptable and is also considered to accord with policies in the London Plan on regeneration, the Olympics, and accord with section 5(5) of the Olympic Act in making proper preparation for the Games.

6.9 The Officer explained that PDT was satisfied with the visual impact and appearance of the proposed development in respect of its scale, bulk and height. However, it is considered that the appearance of the shipping containers, TV Studio and the timber "exoskeleton" detail should be carefully controlled in order to ensure that the appearance is consistent with the overall design quality of the Park. Officers therefore recommended conditions requiring the submission of further details, specifically in respect of the proposed "exoskeleton" and potential overlay of any LOCOG "look", such as the application of colour to vertical fins and the incorporation of the "winning words" project in order to ensure that a high quality of appearance is achieved.

6.10 In addition, officers had concluded that the proposal would not result in any adverse impacts in terms of flooding and drainage, accessibility, remediation or noise, subject to the various conditions as set out in Section 10 of the report. No objections have been raised by statutory and non-statutory consultees with consultee comments having informed the suggested conditions and informatives. The proposed scheme has taken account of the surrounding developments that are under construction and is consistent with the consented PPR Games phase approval for the site. As a result no incompatibility issues have resulted. The development is a sustainable solution to the provision of a temporary studio structure. The conditions recommended address the issues of materials, waste and water use.

6.11 A member expressed concern regarding the materials to be used for the "exoskeleton" and that it was important that the design details, particularly the fixings and treatment, be suitably controlled by condition. A PDT Officer suggested that condition 5 could be amended to include the details of the fixing and jointing of the "exoskeleton" to the containers.

6.12 A member also asked whether the facility would be retained for the Paralympic Games. The applicant replied that the BBC was not the rights holder and consequently the facility would not be retained after the Olympic Games.

6.13 There being no further questions the Committee, unanimously:

APPROVE and GRANTED planning permission for the reasons given in the report and subject to the conditions and informatives set out at section 10 of the Report with an amendment to condition 5 to include details of fixing and joining of the 'exoskeleton' to the containers.

7. 11/90669/FULODA – Sponsor Showcase

Erection of a temporary Waterworks River pavilion in connection with the 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympics with gross external footprint of 761m² and water features comprising: engineering works to construct a steel piled (impact piling) substructure supporting a rectangular two storey glazed pavilion accommodating VIP and bar areas, exhibition and circulation space, queuing area and ancillary retail, office and service space at Ground Level (+5.45 AOD) and display space at Upper Level (+10.150 AOD) and construction of vessel impact protection piles to the north and south of the pavilion.

7.1 The applicant gave a presentation and explained that the application was for the erection of a temporary Waterworks River pavilion in connection with the 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympics. The proposed Waterworks Pavilion is to remain open to visitors throughout the Olympic Games, from 27 July to 12 August 2012, and the Paralympic Games, from 29 August to 9 September 2012. The applicant showed images of the site and location as well as indicative illustrations showing the Waterworks Pavilion in context.

7.2 The applicant reported that the structure would be a simple two storey showcase. Flood modelling had been undertaken by Buro Happold. The structure would be based on two lines of piling structures with a water cooling system being used to cool the structure and to conserve energy.

7.3 A PDT Officer gave a presentation and explained that the application proposed a temporary sponsors showcase pavilion building in the Waterworks River. It would have a gross external footprint of 761m2 and the construction would include engineering works to construct a steel (Impact piling) substructure supporting a rectangular two storey glazed pavilion accommodating VIP and bar areas, exhibition and circulation space, queuing area and ancillary retail, office and service space at Ground Level. The upper level would comprise display space, including water features and a series of roof canopies. The applicant also sought approval for the construction of vessel impact protection piles to the north and south of the pavilion.

7.4 The PDT Officer reported that the main considerations included:

7.4.1 Principle:

- Temporary Games phase overlay elements, such as sponsor showcasing structures, not only provide commercial and functional services for spectators but also create additional focal points and activities for spectators, either before or after sport sessions, which would beneficially alleviate crowd pressures within the Olympic Park. The location of the Waterworks Pavilion Sponsor Showcase at the terminus of one of the popular ramps/graded routes is therefore seen as an important element in encouraging crowds away from the PDZ2 spectator support village which is expected to be very busy at peak times.

- The proposed development suitably responds to the approved and now established Games phase PPR context which provides a setting for the gathering of visitors in the garden areas directly to the west of the application site.

- PDT considers that the principle of the proposed development is acceptable as it would accord with policies in the London Plan on regeneration, blue ribbon network and the Olympics, is consistent with the principle approved in the OLF Waterspace Masterplan and would accord with section 5(5) of the Olympic Act in making proper preparation for the Games.

7.4.2 Design and Appearance:

- PDT welcomes the proposal, which is a sophisticated response to the location and the overall form, scale and massing of the structure and the scheme's architectural treatment and material section are well handled.

- The proposal would provide a high quality architectural insertion into the PDZ2 Common Domain Masterplan which would enhance the setting of the immediate area of the Waterworks River.

7.4.3 Ecology:

- Natural England is satisfied with the conclusions reached in the Ecology Assessment and have made no further comment.

- The Environment Agency has not made comment on the Ecological aspects of the scheme other that those related to lighting impact.

- PDT Officers and PDT's consultants have noted a number of construction matters which require further details in order to ensure that the impacts identified within the Ecology Assessment are mitigated. Conditions are recommended which secure such mitigation.

7.4.4 **Sustainability** – PDT Officers are satisfied that the proposal represents a suitably sustainable design solution. Compliance with LOCOG's broader operational sustainability objectives will be secured in the consideration of details (secured by condition) of a final Sustainability and ME Plant Statement and pursuant to condition OG.5.

7.4.5 Flood Risk:

- The Environment Agency has withdrawn an earlier objection and recommended three conditions seeking details of debris management, lighting and ensuring that the structure is removed.

7.4.6 Other Issues:

- The proposal would not result in any adverse impacts in terms of drainage, accessibility, remediation or noise subject to the various conditions set out at Section 10 of the report. LBN Environmental Health requested that the hours of any impact piling be restricted by condition which is set out at Condition 10 of the main report. The applicant has provided sufficient justification to support the preferred piling method. The proposed removal method is set out within the submitted Piling Risk Assessment and the EA has no raised no objection to the proposals.

7.5 The PDT Officer reported that the Update Report had minor changes to the wording of conditions No's 1 (temporary planning permission), 5 (materials, finishes and further details – Pavilion), 8 (Debris Management Plan), and 9 (Construction Environmental Management Plan; Ecology, Biodiversity and Water Mitigation Measures).

7.6 A member raised concern about the details of the roof design, the proposed method of fixing the roof to the columns and the proposed drainage arrangements. It was agreed that condition 5 would be amended to include additional details on the roof design, (including thickness of the canopy), and the method of fixing the roof to the columns.

7.7 The Committee, unanimously:

> **APPROVED and GRANTED** planning permission for the reasons set out in the Report subject to the conditions and informatives set out at Section 10 of the Report subject to the amendments to the conditions set out the Update Report and a further amendment to condition 5 to include additional details on the roof design (including thickness of the canopy) and the method of fixing the roof to the columns.

8. 11/90664/AODODA – McDonalds PDZ 2

Proposal: Application for Approval of Details (partial discharge) pursuant to Conditions PPRG.3 (Temporary buildings), PPRG.4 (Noise control during the Games), PPR.25 (Foundation Details), PPR.40 (Protection and Validation of Remediation), PPR.41 (Remediation monitoring) and PPR.52 (Signage and advertising) attached to permission 08/90311/FULODA (South Central PPR) comprising: Erection of a temporary two storey McDonald's Restaurant with a gross external footprint of 799m² and covered areas comprising: external dining areas, kitchen facilities, storage space, waste storage areas, staff facilities, offices, foundation works, ancillary structures and landscaping.

8.1 A PDT Officer gave a presentation and explained that the proposal is for an approval of details application in respect of a temporary two storey McDonald's Restaurant, with a gross external footprint of 799m² and maximum height of 11.5m above concourse level. The site was the subject of LOCOG Common Domain submission 11/90449/AODODA which sought approval for details of temporary buildings and structures within PDZ2 in connection with the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games including the erection of temporary front of house structures.

8.2 The PDT Officer reported that the proposed height and location of a McDonald's restaurant, of no more than 750sqm, was included for approval as part of that submission, but no further details were submitted at that time. The maximum height and location of the restaurant has therefore been approved and the current submission seeks approval of the details of the structure.

8.3 The PDT Officer reported that the proposed structure comprised a portable, sectional aluminium frame which is assembled on site. The frame and building envelope including all floors, walls and roof materials are provided by the temporary building manufacturer from their standard kit of parts and will be fully reusable. The inner shell is proposed to then be wrapped with a number of additional elements, including a graphic wrap, which is used to shroud the standard temporary building and reflect McDonald's brand image and provide modulation and visual interest to the form. The graphic is proposed to be applied to all elevations of the building following a late amendment to the scheme at PDT's request. The applicant has stated that they are currently investigating a reuse for the graphic wrap.

8.4 Given that the principle of the development had been previously approved at this location the PDT Officer reported that the main consideration related to the design and appearance of the development:

8.4.1 The overall appearance, form, modulation and design of the proposed development was considered to be of high quality and would enhance and appropriately define the western edge of the previously approved LOCOG Common Domain PDZ2 "Spectator Support Village". The landscape proposals would provide a quality outdoor seating area that would be capable of integrating with the overall Masterplan for the Common Domain.

8.4.2 The proposal would not result in any adverse impacts in terms of flooding and drainage, accessibility, sustainability, remediation or noise, subject to the various conditions as set out in section 10 of the report and within the Update Report.

8.5 The PDT Officer reported that no objections had been raised by statutory and non-statutory consultees as set out in section 6 of the Report and consultee comments have informed suggested conditions and informatives.

8.6 A member requested that further details be secured regarding the fixing of the timber cladding to the main structure to ensure a high quality of external appearance. It was agreed that informative 10 would be amended to make it clear that these details still needed to be provided as part of the submission of further design details for PDT's approval.

8.7 There being no further questions, the Committee unanimously:

> **APPROVED** the application for the reasons given in the main and Update Report as either a partial or full discharge of the conditions listed therein subject to the conditions and informatives set out within the main Report (as amended by the Update Report) and an amendment to informative 10 to include details of the fixing of the timber cladding.

The order of the agenda was re-arranged and Item 10 was considered prior to Item 9.

10. 11/90648/FULODA AND 11/90682/FULODA

Proposals:

1) Erection of a 5 metre high permanent podium structure on the roof of Building M7.

2)Erection of a two-storey temporary structure on the podium to create an entertainment/hospitality venue (sui generis), including temporary deck, lift, stair core, back of house area and vinyl mesh screen.

10.1 The applicant confirmed that they were seeking approval for two separate but related applications: (i) a permanent podium structure on the roof of Building M7 and (ii) a temporary (Games only) two-storey structure on the podium. Images of the scheme were presented.

10.2 A PDT Officer confirmed that the application consisted of two planning applications:

i) **11/90648/FULODA** is an application seeking permanent permission for a podium structure on the roof of Building M7 and 11/90648/FULODA – Permanent podium

ii) **11/90682/FULODA** is an application for temporary permission to erect a two-storey structure to be used as a hospitality suite during the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

10.3 **11/90648/FULODA –Permanent Podium Structure**

10.3.1 The podium would provide a development platform for three temporary structures for use by Olympic sponsors and broadcasters during the lead into and the period of the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games 2012. Following the end of the Paralympic Games, it is proposed that the temporary structures be removed to make way for the construction of a multi-storey office building on top of the podium. The office building would be the subject of a further application.

10.3.2 The PDT Officer explained that the podium would be located on top of the plant already on the roof of the M7 building. Columns would support the podium on the northeast, southeast and northwest elevations, typically 9 metres apart. The columns on the north east elevation would be aligned to be consistent with columns on the existing building. Before and during the Olympic and Paralympic Games, the podium would have a balustrade for construction safety as well as an exposed grey structural steel frame. Following the Paralympic Games, a permanent screen would be erected around the steel frame. There would be one roof access hatch from the M7 retail building provided for maintenance of the plant and machinery.

10.4 11/90682/FULODA – Temporary two-storey structure on podium

10.4.1 A PDT officer explained that the temporary two-storey structure would sit on the central part of the podium and would accommodate a hospitality venue for Cisco. The two-storey temporary structure would extend to a total floor space of 1800sqm with approximately 900sqm on each of the ground and first floors. The total height of the temporary structure would be 10.5metres. When positioned on top of the podium it would be 42.2metres from ground level (15.8metres from the existing roof of M7).

10.5 The PDT Officer highlighted that the main considerations for the two applications were:

10.6 **Principle of development**

10.6.1 The principle of developing a retail plus office building on plot M7 was established in the Zone 1 Masterplan. There is currently no approved detailed design of the office development. However, the Applicant anticipates that this application will come forward following the Games.

10.6.2 Given that some 10,612sqm of commercial floor space has previously been permitted for plot M7, the principal of providing a permanent development platform which will support this future office building is considered acceptable subject to a suitable external appearance and screening in case the office development is delayed for a number of years.

10.6.3 The principle of locating a temporary hospitality venue on a vacant roof space at the Westfield shopping centre for the period of the Games is acceptable, given the nature of the surrounding uses and the town centre location. The location would enable the users of the facility to take advantage of views over to the Olympic Park and to feel near to the Games activity whilst not adversely impacting on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

10.7 **Design and Appearance**

10.7.1 The podium structure has been designed as a simple functional concrete structure to provide a platform for the future office development that has been agreed in principle. This feature is considered acceptable in design terms and would not detract from the appearance of the M7 retail building. For the period during the Olympic and Paralympic Games, it is proposed to screen the structure of the podium, the details of which have not been finalised. A condition is recommended which requires the details to be submitted.

10.7.2 Following the end of the Paralympic Games, the external treatment to the podium would be an adequate finish to enclose the structure. It would also enclose the roof top plant on the retail building. The anticipated office development on top of the podium would eventually permanently cover the structure of the podium. A condition is proposed to ensure the installation of this screening immediately following the removal of the hospitality venue.

10.7.3 For the hospitality venue, the proposed timber-structure, teal-coloured canopy would envelope most of the front elevation and part of the rear elevation of the sample venue box. The teal-coloured canopy with rounded edges ensures that the appearance is unique to Cisco whilst providing a colourful temporary addition to the roof of M7.

10.7.4 The decking and stair and lift cores would be clad in a vinyl/PVC screen which would hide any steel structures from view. A condition is proposed requiring details of the material to be submitted at a later date.

10.7.5 The back of house areas would be covered with a vinyl mesh wrap on the northeast and southeast elevations. The plans indicate that this would be 3000mm high and it would come forward as a future application. The wrap would suitably screen the back of house areas from view from Southern Boulevard and Chestnut Plaza. There is no screening on the southwest side of the back of house areas as it is expected that a temporary venue would be located in front of this. While the back of house structures are effectively standard portacabins, which can be hired in, the vinyl mesh wrap would ensure that they would not be visible from the public realm. It is recommended that a condition is added for details of the fabric wrap to be submitted for approval.

10.8 **Access and accessibility**

10.8.1 In terms of accessibility, step free level access would be provided at the entrance to the hospitality venue, as well as inside the building. In order to ensure that the venue is fully accessible, a condition is recommended to require details of both the accessible toilets and the accessible lift be submitted for approval.

10.9 **Sustainability -** The application submission includes a sustainability statement which indicates the approach taken to the design, the materials used, waste management and decommissioning. The Applicant intends to re-use or recycle all materials where possible, following the Paralympic Games. Officers consider that the proposal would represent a suitably sustainable form of temporary development.

10.10 The PDT Officer reported that the Update Report proposes amendments to Condition 5 (post-Games screening) and Conditions 2 and 3 (the removal of temporary structures).

10.11 A member asked if the screen of the podium was complimentary and suitable for a temporary period. In addition they also asked how long the temporary period would be for as it seemed this could be up to 10 years. A PDT officer explained that this was a concern and that members do have the option of only granting a temporary permission for the podium.

10.12 Another member asked how long the temporary period should be and noted that this may depend on the quality of the screening. It was suggested and agreed that the podium should only be granted temporary consent for 10 years.

10.13 There being no further questions, the Committee, unanimously:

i) In respect of submission **11/90648/FULODA** (permanent podium), **APPROVED** the application for the reasons set out in the main Report Update Report and subject to the conditions and informatives listed therein subject to the deletion of condition 1 and its replacement with a condition requiring removal of the structure within 10 years; and

ii) In respect of submission **11/90682/FULODA** (temporary hospitality venue) **APPROVED** the application for a temporary period, for the reasons set out in the main Report and Update Report subject to the conditions and informatives set out therein.

Geoffrey Taylor, Conor McAuley and Dru Vesty left the meeting for the consideration of Item 9.

9. 11/90618/FUMODA – UNITE Scheme

Proposal: Erection of a building varying in height from 12 to 25 storeys (maximum height +90m AOD) to provide 891 single study bedrooms, arranged in clusters with communal kitchen areas, and 60 studios for student accommodation with provision of ancillary communal and office areas at ground and first floor and landscaped amenity area, together with the provision of 11 coach parking bays and coach operators facilities utilising existing access and egress to/from the site.

9.1 The applicant reported that Plot S25 has an area of 0.42ha and is located to the west of Westfield Shopping Centre, south of the CRTL Box. In the Stratford City outline planning permission the site was included in Zone 2, a predominantly commercial area with limited residential and complementary retail floor space. Permission has been sought and approval in principle been given to amend the boundary between Zones 1 and 2, resulting in the site moving to within Zone 1. This decision is subject to the completion of a legal agreement that would prevent the developers from seeking approval for any of the Zone 1 office floor space on this plot prior to the approval by the ODA, as local planning authority, of a revised Zone 1 masterplan.

9.2 The applicant reported that the proposal includes a coach park comprising of 15 bays. The coach park would be managed by Westfield and also include welfare amenities for drivers and blue badge parking for the student accommodation.

9.3 The applicant reported that UNITE would operate and manage the student development. A model and visual diagrams were shown of the proposed development which included the wrapping of the building which comprised of red brick for the external surface and white brick for the internal surface. Details of the colour, texture and finish of the brick would be subject to conditions.

9.4 A PDT officer gave a presentation and explained that the proposal was for a full planning application for the erection of a building varying in height from 12-25 storeys (maximum height +90m AOD) to provide 891 single study bedrooms and 60 studios with communal and office areas at ground and first floor, landscaped amenity areas together with provision of 11 coach parking bays and coach operator facilities.

9.5 The PDT Officer drew attention to the Update Report and the results of the additional daylight and sunlight testing and reasons why officers consider the scheme to be acceptable on this regard.

9.6 The PDT officer also reported that the applicants had responded to the GLA Stage 1 comments regarding design and access and that additional consultation responses had been received from ODA Property, with respect to their interest in Zones 3-6. The amended recommendations arising from continuing discussions with the GLA, following the Stage 1 response and as a result of the further daylight and sunlight studies, include some amendments to the s106 Heads of Terms (particularly blue badge parking); an amendment to condition 27 regarding the Accessibility Management Plan and an informative regarding future use in terms of the building not being considered suitable for permanent residential use due to the results of the daylight and sunlight testing.

9.7 The PDT Officer reported that the main issues and considerations included:

9.7.1 The Principle of Development:

The development of the site will contribute towards regeneration of Stratford and its growth to Metropolitan Centre status, which may include Higher Education facilities; the requirement for student housing as identified in the London Plan, the Newham Draft Core Strategy and the Stratford Metropolitan Masterplan and; the parking area for coaches will bring visitors to the Westfield Shopping and Leisure Development and is an appropriate use.

9.7.2 Location:

The development would extend the range of development offered by Stratford City and the contribution that the area as a whole made towards achieving the Borough Council's spatial vision. It was well related to public transport, retail and leisure facilities. A s106 agreement would ensure accommodation is let to students using a 'cascade mechanism' to require that rooms are first offered to universities within the borough of Newham; then to universities in the adjoining boroughs and lastly to universities elsewhere in London. Rooms would be let to full-time students of HEFEC institutions only for a period of 51 weeks.

9.7.3 Design:

- The layout of the development on the site has been informed by sunlight and daylight studies undertaken during the design process. This has resulted in a C-shaped form of development above the ground and first floors that fill the entire site, with the exception of a strip along the northern boundary. The creation of the C-shape sets back south facing rooms from Monfichet Road, maximising the distance between these rooms and future development on the opposite side of the road in Zone 2.

- The approved maximum height parameters for areas to the north, south and east of the site are all greater than the maximum height of the proposed development and in the long term it is expected that development up to these maxima will be undertaken. Until development within Zone 2 is undertaken the proposed building will be taller than adjoining development in Zone 1 and therefore an analysis of the building against the criteria for evaluating proposals for tall buildings set out by CABE/ English Heritage has been undertaken.

- The architectural quality of the building has been considered through the design process by the Stratford City Design Review Panel and amended plans have been submitted to address points of concern identified by the local planning authority, and LB Newham and the GLA as consultees.

- The GLA has commented that consideration should be given to securing greater activation of the east and west facades to make the development more attractive at street level. Officers do not agree that public uses should be provided on the west elevation.

9.7.4 **Sustainability** - The PDT Officer reported that with regard to sustainability the development would achieve a BREEAM rating of 'Excellent' with a 26% reduction in carbon emissions. It is considered that the scheme would also achieve ecological and biodiversity benefits with the provision of over 900sqm of landscaped communal amenity space at a variety of levels.

9.7.5 **Accessibility** – Wheelchair accessible and adaptable rooms will be provided and an Accessibility Management Plan will ensure that these details are satisfactory together with those for blue badge parking and drop-off spaces.

9.8 A member asked if a Landscape Management Plan existed and if an additional condition would be required for this. It was agreed that this would be secured as part of condition 12.

9.9 The member also asked if the design of the staggered upper staircase would affect the comfort levels of the garden areas. The applicant reported that there would be a balustrade around the roof terrace, the materials chosen were non slip and the staircase would be covered with a PV canopy.

9.10 The member further expressed concern regarding security and requested reassurance that the Landscape Management Plan would address the comfort levels of the garden areas and ensure the safety of residents. A PDT Officer referred the member to condition 13 which would be expanded to ensure it incorporated the upper levels of the building. It was pointed out that condition 14 requires a further wind study to be undertaken once the building was completed and any further mitigation measures identified to be provided.

9.11 A member commented that the design of the scheme was critical for its success and to that end was concerned that in the event that the application architects were not retained, that a contribution towards an additional design review would be insufficient. The member expressed a desire for the wording of the s106 to be strengthened to require more than "reasonable endeavours" to retain the application architects. It was therefore agreed that the obligation to retain the application architects should be an "all reasonable endeavours" obligation.

9.12 A member expressed concern that the car park noise at 80 decibels, in terms of the coach bays, was excessive. The applicant reported that it was in the permitted guidelines and PDT officers considered that the noise impact would not be detrimental.

9.13 A member queried whether students would be tempted to park in Westfield's car park. The applicant confirmed that the two hour free parking currently available at Stratford City was a temporary measure and that long term the cost would be prohibitive.

9.14 A member also queried the heating arrangements and the applicant clarified that a district boiler system would be used and not gas boilers, as stated in 7.2.3 of the report.

9.15 A member expressed concern about the daylight and sunlight results and why students were being treated less favourably than residential users. The member felt there was insufficient justification for the current design and why it was acceptable given the sunlight and daylight results. A PDT Officer explained it had been originally intended that the site would be used for an office building. However, given the high level of need for student accommodation in Newham and the nature of the use of the building by students, officers explained that they considered the proposal satisfactory. The member stated that the there was insufficient detail in the report on the stated need for student accommodation which might outweigh concerns about the daylight and sunlight testing results. Officers confirmed that the Principle of Development section of the report set out the need case and that this had been supplemented by the applicant presentation. The member also stated that more clarity could have been provided about alternative massing options which may have improved the sunlight and daylight results. Officers confirmed that the form and mass of the building had been subject to a number of design reviews with the Stratford City Design Review Panel and that the Panel was supportive of the scheme now proposed.

9.16 A member stated that with respect to the need for student accommodation, a large number of students were currently living in HMOs in the Leyton area and that this in turn was putting pressure on the local housing stock. The member considered that this scheme could potentially ease some of that pressure.

9.17 Another member asked a question about the objection from the LB of Newham. A PDT officer explained that the LB of Newham preference was for student accommodation in the town centre. However, the core strategy simply identified the need and the application site was considered by officers to be acceptable.

9.18 Finally a member commented about the BREEAM level being achieved and queried why, given the sustainability credentials of the building, a higher level was not being achieved. Officers confirmed that pre-construction estimates indicate that an 'Excellent' rating should be achieved which is considered to be policy compliant.

9.19 There being no further questions, the Committee voted, (5 in favour and 1 against) to:

i) **GRANT PERMISSION** for the reasons given and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the main and Update Reports, subject to:

- an amendment to condition 12 to ensure that a landscape management plan is secured;

- an amendment to condition 13 to ensure the upper levels of the building are included;

- the completion of a modification to the existing Stratford City section 106 agreements and the grant of the non-material amendment in respect of the transfer of plot S25 from Zone 2 to Zone 1;

- the completion of a new section 106 agreement to secure the measures set out in main and update reports such agreement to include a provision requiring the applicant to use all reasonable endeavours to retain the application architects during the detailed design and construction work; and

- Referral to the Mayor of London

ii) GRANT DELEGATED AUTHORITY to the Director of Planning Decisions to amend any conditions as necessary following receipt of the Mayor of London Stage 2 letter.

iii) GRANT DELEGATED AUTHORITY to the Director of Planning Decisions to negotiate the section 106 agreement referred to at (i) above on the terms outlined in the main and update report together with any such amendments deemed necessary following receipt of the Mayor's Stage 2 letter and to issue the decision notice.

The order of the agenda was re-arranged to its original schedule and Item 11 was considered.

11. Any Other Business

There being no other business the meeting ended at 20.10

Date of next meeting – 24 January 2011

Signed: Chair

Date: 24/1/2012