OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY
Planning Decisions Team

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

12 August 2008

SUBJECT: **MINUTES OF 29th COMMITTEE MEETING**
Held on 22 July 2008 at 18.00

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

Present:

Lorraine Baldry	Chairman
David Taylor	Deputy 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 (Items 1 - 5)

Independent Members:

Mike Appleton
Dru Vesty

Officers in attendance:

Anthony Hollingsworth	ODA, Chief Planner Development Control
Liz Fisher	ODA, Planning Decisions Team
John Gardener	ODA, Planning Decisions Team
Joanne Pacey	ODA, Planning Decisions Team
Richard Griffiths	ODA, Legal adviser, Planning Decisions Team, (Pinsent Masons)
Vanessa Brand	ODA, Committee Secretary

1. APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 1)

1.1. There were apologies from, Celia Carrington, William Hodgson, and Janice Morphet who were unable to attend the meeting.

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

2.1. There were Updates for Items 5 – 7

Item 5

- Representations from the Design Review Panel
- Amended condition

Item 6

- Additional representations from
  - British Waterways
  - Environment Agency
  - Metropolitan Police (Olympic Security Directorate)
- Amended recommendation

Item 7

- Corrections
- Review of Retail Centre Design
- Additional representations
  - LB Newham transportation
  - Metropolitan Police (Olympic Security Directorate)
  - South Eastern (Rail)
  - Environment Agency
  - Transport for London
  - LB Tower Hamlets
  - Metropolitan Police Authority
- Additional officer comments
- Amended recommendation with additional conditions

2.2. The order of business was unchanged.

2.3. There were requests to speak by representatives of the applicant in relation to Items 5-7.

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 Items 5-7.

'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?'

Members confirmed that the personal interests read out were correct. None of these personal interests were considered prejudicial.

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

4.1. The Committee

AGREED the Minutes of the 28th Planning Committee Meeting.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

5. **PLANNING APPLICATION 08/90106/REMODA (AGENDA ITEM 5)**
Application for the approval of reserved matters for 296 residential units and 357sq.m. of retail floorspace with associated car-parking and on-plot landscaping pursuant to conditions B1 and B8 of outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA being details of layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping

5.1. Glen Howells, architect, presented the proposals on behalf of the applicant for the first block (plot N15) of Stratford City residential accommodation. It was confirmed that plot N15 was designed for Legacy but would be used as the Olympic Village for athletes during the Games (although it was noted that a separate planning application would have to be submitted for this temporary Games use). Glen Howells showed indicative illustrations of the varied elevations designed by 3 different architectural practices. In response to a question he also explained that the large trees shown in the central courtyard could be grown in that location by increasing the soil depth at certain points without including specific treepits. This would be part of the Landscaping Strategy.

5.2. A Planning Officer then gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report and took into account the Update which had been circulated. The application was for approval of Reserved Matters in accordance with the planning permission granted on 13 November 2007 (07/90023/VARODA) and with the zonal Masterplan for zones 3-6 approved in May 2008. The proposals were governed by a series of strategies including parameter plans and the site wide housing strategy. Some further details would be required including details of the landscaping of the courtyard. There were also relevant obligations under the S106 agreement and Members noted the London Borough of Newham's comments that in their view not all the S106 obligations had been fully satisfied.

5.3. Members noted that the affordable housing was concentrated in a single part of the development block rather than 'pepper potted', but that the design was considered to meet the criterion for 'tenure blind' mix of housing accommodation as required by the S106 agreement.

5.4. Members also noted that the Metropolitan Police were satisfied that the design would achieve "Secured by Design' accreditation. However, they were concerned about the proposals for controlling access by those residents paying for car parking beneath the internal courtyard and about access to the upper storey units. The car park entrances would be electronically controlled and access to the upper units would also be restricted by the use of controlled doors, each of which would permit access to groups of 35-50 units. The Committee were concerned that it would be difficult to control access effectively amongst such a large group of residents and asked that the applicant should consider this issue in relation to future applications.

5.5. Members generally welcomed the proposals and were minded to grant approval. However, the proposed distribution of housing types did not meet the approved site wide housing strategy and accordingly Members noted that officers were currently in discussions with the applicant over a revised strategy. Members were therefore recommended to delegate approval to the Head of Development Control pending satisfactory resolution of the revised site wide housing strategy.

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

the Committee

a) APPROVED the submission of reserved matters pursuant to outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA in principle

b) DELEGATED authority to the Head of Development Control to issue the approval following the approval of the revised Site Wide Housing Strategy and being satisfied that the development is in accordance with the approved strategy, for the reasons given in the report and subject to the conditions and informatives as set out in the report with amended condition 1 as follows:

Prior to the commencement of the construction of the superstructure an assessment of the ratings ascribed by the BRE Green Guide for Specification at the time of submission of the relevant details for all materials to be used in the construction of the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority..

Reason: To ensure that the materials to be used in the construction of the building will contribute to the achievement of Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes.

6. PLANNING APPLICATION 08/90102/AODODA (AGENDA ITEM 6)

Submission of a Waterspace Masterplan pursuant to Condition SP.0.10 of the Olympic Park Site Preparation planning permission reference 07/90011/FUMODA and Condition OD.0.10 of the Olympic and Paralympic Facilities planning permission reference 07/90010/OUMODA

6.1. Richard Jackson, ODA, gave a presentation to the Committee on behalf of the applicant explaining that the Waterspace Masterplan covered 6 key themes

and recognised some legacy opportunities. The plan sought to balance the conflicting interests of stakeholders, and in particular British Waterways Board and the Environment Agency. ODA was committed to establishing a working group to include LDA, LOCOG, and British Waterways Board which would look at issues such as the potential for wharves. The plan should be considered a snapshot which would be developed and supplemented as discussions continued.

6.2. A Planning Officer then gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report and took into account the Update which had been circulated. The application was for approval of the Waterspace Masterplan as required by conditions SP.0.10 of the Olympic Park Site Preparation planning permission and OD.0.10 of the Olympic and Paralympic Facilities planning permission. The brief, which had been approved in February 2008, required the plan to consider proposals for the construction, Games, and transformation phases of the project. It was not to include Legacy proposals but to take account of and not prejudice the Legacy Masterplan Framework (LMF). The plan had been submitted to meet the timetable required by the conditions but would be updated to take account of the proposals for the Park and Public Realm which are scheduled for submission in November.

6.3. Members noted that ODA had held regular meetings with British Waterways Board and with the Environment Agency including fortnightly technical meetings with the two together, and separate monthly meetings. The applicant confirmed to Members that there was a good relationship with these stakeholders. Members also noted that the S106 agreement required the role of waterspace to be included in the LMF. However, they were concerned that opportunities for good legacy development would be lost if not addressed in the Waterspace Masterplan. A number of Members expressed disappointment at the limited amount of information included in the plan and questioned why the recommended condition which required details of the role and use of the waterways during Games-time was only required by 31 December 2011. They were keen that all parties should be fully engaged in developing proposals and wanted to see more specific proposals in the updates to the Waterspace Masterplan, for example, for moorings. Officers confirmed that the 31 December 2011 date was consistent with other temporary overlay submission deadlines as set out in conditions on the Olympic and Legacy Facilities planning permission. However, officers acknowledged that this date should reasonably be brought forward to enable the installation of relevant infrastructure in good time before the Games. Noting the representations made by British Waterways the Committee requested that a session be arranged at which British Waterways could brief them about their ideas.

6.4. The Environment Agency had requested that figure 3.3.3 should be amended to show what had previously been agreed.

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

the Committee

APPROVED the Waterspace Masterplan in respect of condition SP.0.10 of the Olympic Park Site Preparation planning permission and condition OD.0.10 of the Olympic and Paralympic Facilities planning permission

subject to the conditions set out in the report, an earlier date than that recommended in condition 1 (the date to be agreed by Officers) and with figure 3.3.3 substituted as requested by the Environment Agency.

7. PLANNING APPLICATION 08/90162/REMODA (AGENDA ITEM 7)

Reserved Matters application pursuant to Conditions B1, B8, B10, A4, D3, D9, D9a, T3 and T4 of outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA for the construction of Buildings M2-M6 (Retail, Leisure and Car Parking) with floorspace of 140,905m², comprising 77,434m² (gross) retail, 20,668m² (gross) leisure and parking for 3203 cars over 42,783m² including Buildings M7 and M8 car parking at basement level.

7.1. Simon Cochran, RPS Planning, gave a presentation on behalf of the applicant illustrating the design of the shopping centre at Stratford City (blocks M2-M6).

7.2. A Planning Officer then gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report and took into account the Update which had been circulated. The application, which was for approval of reserved matters pursuant to planning permission 07/90023/VARODA for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Stratford Rail Lands, had been delegated to the London Borough of Newham and the Committee's views were sought. They were recommended to delegate authority to the Head of Development Control to send comments to the London Borough of Newham. These would be finalised to take account of any further comments from the Design Review Panel after their meeting the next day. There were also a number of outstanding issues which officers were currently discussing with the applicant, including concern with respect to the bulk of the upper levels of the building and the scale and composition of the northern elevation, compliance with the S106 agreement with respect to the provision of cycle parking within the development and the location of community facilities and those raised by Transport for London about the relationship with the bus station.

7.3. Members noted that the S106 agreement required the inclusion of small businesses in the office space and welcomed the applicant's statement that the aim of the Complementary Retail floorspace, as referred to in planning permission 07/90023/VARODA was to include small local shops in the shopping centre and that discussions were taking place locally to achieve this.

7.4. The applicant also stated in response to a question, that consideration had been given to the location of plantrooms, which would not be scattered around the roof.

7.5. Members agreed that if there were adverse comments affecting the application following the meeting of the DRP and the discussions between officers and the applicant, that the proposals should be brought back to Committee before the application was considered by the London Borough of Newham so that these could be taken into account; but they were confident in generally welcoming the proposals.

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

the Committee

a) AGREED that, subject to the delegation in d) below, the London Borough of Newham be advised that the ODA Planning Committee generally considered the application for the Retail Centre, Leisure uses and car parking to be acceptable;

b) NOTED that a number of outstanding matters should be resolved prior to determination by the London Borough of Newham including

   i. The bulk of the upper levels (leisure 'boxes' and car parking) and the scale and composition of the northern elevation is of concern to officers and should be reviewed by the Design Review Panel with their comments taken into account by the Council;
   ii. cycle parking needs to be readdressed in terms of provision within the retail centre for staff and visitors so as to accord with the statements regarding cycle parking set out with the Zone 1 Masterplan and the S106 agreement;
   iii. Clarification from Transport for London with respect to the compatibility of the proposals with the new bus station;
   iv. Details of the locations and floorspace quantum of the community facilities as required by the S106 agreement to be shown on the submitted drawings;
   v. Details regarding Secure by Design as incorporated into M2-M6 should be provided for consideration by London Borough of Newham
   vi. The requirements of Condition B10 are not yet fully met as material samples have yet to be provided and therefore, this requirement should either be resolved prior to consideration by London Borough of Newham or the London Borough of Newham be advised that this Condition cannot be fully discharged..

c) ADVISED that the London Borough of Newham should consider the following conditions and informative:

   i. The applicant to provide a document detailing safety measures in the vicinity of the Eastern Egress Bridge and northern entrance into the retail centre (including treatment of waste compactors) to the LPA for approval to ensure public safety in this location.
   ii. Details of public circulation areas within Northern Arcade and Wintergarden at both Levels 08 and 14 to be provided, as required by the S106 and the Open Space Strategy approved under the original outline permission.
   iii. Details of the M2 elevation between the gridlines C25 and C26 as they relate to the entrance to the Retail Centre from the Eastern Egress including joinery detail, automation of the doors, any colour treatment, indication of signage, location of doors, and treatment of the corridor leading to the the Northern Arcade including elevations and the returns of shops alongside.
   iv. Details of typical entrances to retail centre and shops, and shopfront signage and joinery; at 1:10
   v. Signage strategy to be provided

vi. Details of Glazed Link between D3 and M5/M6 including elevations, roof plan, underside plan, lighting locations, supporting piers, and indication of materials to be approved pursuant to condition B10.
vii. Details of entrance to 'spiral' car park ramp from Station Avenue
viii. Details of the numbers and profile of servicing movements as it relates to the Servicing and Waste Strategy.

Details of the treatment along the western side of the retail centre, in the event that the M1 Building and associated glazed link are not developed out.

Informative: the applicant is advised of their obligations under Condition B10 of planning permission 07/90023/VARODA which requires full details (including samples) of all materials to be used on all external surfaces to be provided to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, prior to their use within the site.

d) DELEGATED authority to the Head of Development Control to review the final response to the London Borough of Newham in light of the Design Review Panel comments and, subject to the satisfactory resolution of all outstanding matters, to confirm that the ODA Planning Committee has no objections to the grant of permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in c) above and send comments to the London Borough of Newham taking account of the Committee's views as expressed above.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

8.1. Members noted that there would be a briefing and Committee meeting on 12 August 2008.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 8.10 pm

Signed: Z. Baldry Date: 28/10/2008

Chair