

**OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY**

**ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

23 January 2007

AGENDA ITEM: 4

SUBJECT: **MINUTES OF 5<sup>th</sup> COMMITTEE MEETING**

Held on 9 January 2007 at 18.00

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

---

**Present:** Lorraine Baldry Chairman

**Local Authority Members:**

Cllr Rofique Ahmed – LB Tower Hamlets  
Cllr Conor McAuley – LB Newham  
Cllr Geoff Taylor – LB Hackney  
Cllr Terry Wheeler - LB Waltham Forest

**Independent Members:**

Michael Appleton  
Celia Carrington  
William Hodgson  
Janice Morphet  
Dru Vesty

**Officers in attendance:**

Vivienne Ramsey ODA, Head of Development Control  
Anthony Hollingsworth ODA, Chief Planner, Development Control  
Dawn Blackwell 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

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

In respect of Item 7 the Chairman drew attention to updates to the report circulated

- New recommendation
- 6 letters
- TravelWatch had also submitted a statement which had been circulated to Members and Brian Cooke, Chairman of TravelWatch had asked to speak

## **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM 3)**

3.1. In respect of item 7 the following personal interests were declared. These were not prejudicial interests. The Chairman declared a personal interest as Chairman of the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation. Janice Morphet declared a personal interest relating to her daughter who is employed by Ashursts, the firm of solicitors acting for Stratford City Developments Ltd on work not connected with that contract or any other planning issues.

3.2. In addition, David Taylor had sent a statement declaring a personal interest in relation to his instructing Anthony Curnow of Ashursts, Solicitors. Mr Curnow is instructed by Stratford City Developments Limited, one of the joint applicants on the planning application to be considered under Item 7 of the agenda. David Taylor instructs Mr Curnow on a matter entirely unrelated to the Stratford City application and he had been advised that this connection may be perceived as giving rise to a prejudicial interest. Consequently, he had decided to withdraw from the consideration and determination of the planning application.

## **4. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING (AGENDA ITEM 4)**

4.1. The Committee:

AGREED the Minutes of the 4<sup>th</sup> Committee meeting held on 12 December 2006

4.2. The Committee noted that drawings were displayed to illustrate Item 7 and displays would be provided for future meetings as necessary

## **5. ENFORCEMENT CHARTER (AGENDA ITEM 5)**

5.1. Anthony Hollingsworth introduced the paper. The draft Charter set out the standards of service and priorities for future enforcement action and summarised the range of possible actions.

- 5.2. The Committee welcomed the Charter but requested that the text should be extended to clarify the use of the term 'expedient' in relation to ODA deciding whether or not to take formal action in any specific case.
- 5.3. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED unanimously in accordance with the recommendation that the Committee agreed that they:
- a) RECEIVED and NOTED the Enforcement Charter
  - b) DELEGATED authority to the Head of Development Control to finalise and publish the Enforcement Charter subject to clarifying in the text how ODA would decide whether or not to take formal action in any specific case

## **6. DRAFT REVISED SCHEME OF DELEGATION (AGENDA ITEM 6)**

- 6.1. Anthony Hollingsworth introduced the paper. The original delegation from the ODA Board had given very wide-ranging powers to the Head of Development Control and the Board had asked that the working of the delegation should be reviewed by the Planning Committee within a brief period. The report recommended a series of development thresholds as exceptions to the delegation to the Head of Development Control to define the major applications which should automatically be considered by the Planning Committee. These had been set below the thresholds for applications to be referred to the GLA.
- 6.2. The Committee noted that the Head of Development Control proposed to prepare a forward programme of applications and a Committee programme as the volume of applications increased, and to report on decisions made by her. The electronic planning software in preparation would automatically generate a list of validated planning applications which could be emailed to Committee Members. This system would be operational by 1 March 2007 and would allow Members to call for applications to be considered by the Committee within 21 days of registration in accordance with exception 1.2c of the proposed revised scheme of delegation.
- 6.3. It was agreed that the exception at 1.2d(iii) relating to car parks containing 250 or more parking spaces should be reviewed. A car park of even 100 cars might be significant and a car park deemed to be significant in the context of the Olympic Planning area should be referred to the Committee for consideration.
- 6.4. The Committee also noted that the exception at 1.2d(ii) related to an application where the subsequent total size of an extended building would comprise 2.500 sq m or more gross floor space
- 6.5. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED unanimously in accordance with the recommendation that the Committee agreed that they:

- a) NOTED the Draft Revised Scheme of Delegation
- b) Subject to modification of the wording of exception 1.2d(ii) and the Committee's comments made about the operation of the delegation, AUTHORISED the Head of Development Control to finalise the Scheme of Delegation for agreement by the ODA Board

## *PLANNING APPLICATIONS*

### **7. ENCLOSURE OF 320M LENGTH OF RAILWAY LINE; DEMOLITION OF POWERHOUSE BRIDGE; CONSTRUCTION OF TWO NEW BRIDGES AND INFILLING OF CHANNELSEA RIVER PLANNING APPLICATION 06/90005/FUMODA (AGENDA ITEM 7)**

- 7.1. The Committee considered the report and took into account the Update which had been circulated and the attached six letters including a letter dated 9 January 2007 from London and Continental Railways (LCR). This item had twice been deferred from previous Committee Meetings to allow all parties to discuss the possibility of agreeing a solution in relation to an original Grampian condition imposed on a consent under the Transport Works Act for Stratford International Station. The Head of Development Control introduced the item and reported that those Committee Members present had visited the site that afternoon and had viewed the Stratford International station and the position of the proposed eastern egress from the domestic platforms, the site of the new DLR station and the proposed enclosure of the Woolwich Line north of Stratford Regional station. LCR had now given a commitment to 'undertake a technical feasibility study to confirm that the proposed Eastern Egress can be delivered prior to the opening of Southeastern's domestic train services' over the next 8 weeks with ODA and in consultation with the stakeholder group including Westfield, Southeastern, London TravelWatch, London Borough of Newham and DLR.
- 7.2. Brian Cooke of TravelWatch addressed the Committee. He referred to his statement (which had been circulated to Members) withdrawing TravelWatch's objection subject to certain specified assurances. He welcomed LCR's letter and the proposed undertaking but remained concerned that the estimated cost of a maximum of £15 million referred to by LCR might not be sufficient and that the original Grampian condition might not be satisfied.
- 7.3. In response to questions David Joy, Planning Director of LCR modified the wording of his letter of 9 January 2007 to read 'Once the feasibility study has concluded that the proposal can be built within the required timescale and at a reasonable cost (current estimate £15 million) LCR will undertake to provide this facility, subject to obtaining the necessary consents. This is on the basis of a funding package to include the currently committed ODA Javelin expenditure on additional station capacity for domestic passengers.'
- 7.4. The Committee commented on the value of the site visit and the additional illustrative material which had enabled them to understand the proposals fully. They noted that outstanding matters to be considered by the Planning

Committee in due course would include the details to satisfy the Grampian condition under the Transport Works Act

7.5. The Committee also noted that the applicant proposed to prepare an Environmental Management Plan to address in detail the wide range of environmental issues associated with the works including health and safety issues, hazardous waste disposal, noise and dust etc. This should be subject to an explicit condition.

7.6. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee **RESOLVED** unanimously in accordance with the recommendation that the Committee agreed that they:

- a) **AGREED** the Reasons for **APPROVAL**; and
- b) **APPROVED** the application with the conditions given in the report and with an additional condition requiring the submission of an Environmental Management Plan and subject to receipt of a satisfactory revised unilateral undertaking to cover the matters outlined in the modified letter from LCR dated 9 January 2007
- c) **DELEGATED** authority to the Head of Development control to conclude the unilateral undertaking and issue the decision

**8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS  
(AGENDA ITEM 8)**

8.1. There was no other business

*There being no other business the meeting closed at 7.10 pm*

Signed  
Chairman



Date 23rd January 2007

