OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY
Planning Decisions Team

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: **MINUTES OF 58th COMMITTEE MEETING**
Held on 12 January 2010 at 18.00

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

Present:

Lorraine Baldry	Chairman
David Taylor	Deputy Chairman

Local Authority Members:

Cllr Geoffrey Taylor	LB Hackney
Cllr Rofique Ahmed	LB Tower Hamlets
Cllr Terry Wheeler	LB Waltham Forest

Independent Members:

Mike Appleton
Celia Carrington
William Hodgson
Dru Vesty
Janice Morphet

Officers in attendance:

Vivienne Ramsey	ODA, Head of Development Control
Anthony Hollingsworth	ODA, Chief Planner Development Control, Planning Decisions Team
Chris Lelliott	ODA Planning Decisions Team
Matthew Foy	ODA Legal Adviser, Planning Decisions Team, (Pinsent Masons)
Richard Smith	ODA Transport Adviser, Planning Decisions Team (Halcrow)
Susan Krouwel	ODA, Committee Secretary

1. APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 1)

1.1. Cllr Conor McAuley sent his apologies as he was unable to attend the meeting.

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

2.1. There was an update for Item 5.

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?'

Members confirmed that the personal interests recorded 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 57th Planning Committee Meeting.

4.2. Following a query raised at the previous meeting Pinsent Masons had advised that it was possible to "dress up" concrete barriers on a road provided that the performance and effectiveness of the barriers was not compromised. The Head of Development Control agreed to circulate Pinsent Masons' advice on this matter to members.

5. 09/90294/FULODA, 09/90295/AODODA & 09/90296/FULODA – Lea Interchange (Pre-Games, Games, Post Games and Legacy Transformation Phases) and Waterden Road

(AGENDA ITEM 5)

09/90294/FULODA

Full planning application for highway junction works in relation to the construction of the Lea Interchange. This application details highway junction works proposed during the pre Games and Games phases.
PDZs 5 and 7

09/90295/AODODA
Partial Discharge of conditions LTD.18, LTD.10 and LTD.20 of planning permission 07/90010/OUMODA for the construction of Waterden Road as Legacy Transformation development
PDZ 5

09/90296/FULODA
Full planning application for highway junction works in relation to the construction of the Lea Interchange. The application details highway junction works proposed during the Post Games phase and Legacy Transformation.
PDZs 5 and 7

5.1. Selina Mason and David Martin spoke in favour of the proposals on behalf of the applicant. They explained that the applications (the first legacy transformation applications) had been brought forward because of the aim to open the Park in Spring 2013, which was earlier than previously planned. The schemes proposed included elements, such as the sub-base for Waterden Road, which would be constructed during the pre-Games phase, covered during Games and then used post games to ensure early transformation.

5.2. They confirmed that the design had been revised following feedback given previously by the Committee, particularly on pedestrian and cycle connectivity, and that they had tried to balance the needs of all the users in the design. Advanced stopping lanes had been provided at junctions for cyclists, in addition to the off carriageway cycle lanes, following a request from Hackney Borough Council. It was stated that the streetscape design of Waterden Road had been developed in accordance with best-practice, with low kerbs, boulevard style planting and minimisation of street clutter, and it is suitable for a road with an intended 20mph speed limit. Precedents included the Mall and Birdcage Walk. It was acknowledged that further streetscape design and landscape work was necessary for the Lea Interchange. Illustrative drawings had been submitted to PDT, but the landscape detail was being prepared as part of the broader parklands and public realm work in this area.

5.3. Councillor Vincent Stops, Chair of Hackney Planning Committee, requested to speak. He explained that his comments were based on the objections raised by Hackney Borough Council officers. He raised an objection to the Lea Interchange design and proposed that a T-junction formation could be provided instead. He also objected to the proposal for Waterden Road on the basis that it was a dual carriageway and that the wide, straight design would encourage vehicles to speed. He indicated that if Waterden Road were to be offered for adoption by Hackney then the Council would introduce a series of measures to ensure that it would limit vehicle speed. He emphasised that cyclists should be able to use the road, and explained that he was concerned about the permeability of the Park from Hackney Wick. He requested that the road be designated as 20mph and suggested that the design be submitted to a design review panel. He stated that the design for Waterden Road wasn't in accordance with the precedent set in previous approvals for this road to include a dedicated bus lane.

5.4. A Planning Officer gave a presentation on the applications. He explained that the schemes for both Waterden Road and Lea Interchange had been subject to amendments in light of PDT and consultee comments. The Metropolitan Police and ODA Security team had advised that pedestrians and cyclists should be excluded from the Lifeline route during the pre-Games phase. He drew members attention to the update report and that additional comments on the amended proposals had been received from LB Hackney, but that these confirmed that the Borough still objected to both the Waterden Road and Lea Interchange applications.

5.5. A member asked whether the potential impact on traffic flows of a smaller junction at the Lea Interchange had been assessed. Richard Smith, ODA Traffic Adviser (Halcrow), confirmed that if the interchange was significantly reduced traffic would be diverted elsewhere, in particular through the Athletes' Village, which had not been designed for large traffic volumes.

5.6. A Planning Officer explained that CABE had been consulted on the streetscape design and that the proposals were in accordance with the approved Urban Design and Landscape Framework Streetscape Components addendum document for the Olympic Park which had been subject to consultation with both CABE and the host Borough with no objections. The PDT officer commented that the design quality of the Waterden Road scheme was in accordance with relevant best practice guidance and was acceptable. Whilst Lea Interchange was not as advanced in terms of streetscape design, it was considered that the principles were acceptable and that further detail of landscape and streetscape is secured by the recommended conditions. For Lea Interchange, PDT officers considered that the design team had struck a balance between the topography of the site, highway safety requirements, design quality, priority for pedestrians and cyclists and the pressure to transform the site quickly. . The officer also confirmed that an alternative T-junction design proposal had not been received from Hackney. The applicant confirmed that the design team had explored an alternative option of a connection between H01 and the Lea Interchange, but that this was found not to be feasible on highway safety grounds due to the difference in topography in the area.

5.7. Concerns were raised by a member about the potential speed of vehicles along Waterden Road. A Planning Officer recognised that the design of the streetscape, which gave priority to pedestrian movements across the road, both at signalled and non-signalled crossings, as the principal method to limit traffic speed, might not in the initial period after transformation pedestrian be of a level to alone slow the traffic on Waterden Road. However, the introduction of other physical measures in the highway to reduce speed would not be in accordance with best practice streetscape design. PDT's Legal Adviser confirmed that it would not be possible to impose a planning condition limiting the road to a 20mph speed limit as this is covered by other legislation. A member suggested that other methods to slow traffic could be considered, such as traffic lights programmed to turn red at set intervals. Members agreed that the applicant should bear in mind the psychology of drivers and the importance of conveying to them through the design of the road that they were travelling through a park with pedestrians. It was also suggested that an informative be added stating that the preferred speed limit should be 20mph.

5.8. A member queried whether raised crossings were allowed on bus routes. A Planning Officer explained that TfL had responded to the consultation but had not raised any objections to the crossings.

5.9. A member commented that all roads within the Olympic park should be designed as streets, with pavements of both side of the road, to avoid an appearance akin to a motorway or similar major road.. A concern was raised that not all of the streets in the Lea Interchange currently proposed pavements on both sides (in particular on the north side of the road leading to Bridge H01) so that drivers would understand the nature of the road better. . The applicant explained that the retaining wall for the Lea Interchange was necessary because of a 3m drop, but that there was sufficient width for a pavement to be added to the north side of the road leading from the H01 bridge. A member also noted that there were also small areas of land in the design that were currently reserved for landscaping that could come forward as potential development plots.

5.10. A planning officer confirmed that provision of pavements could be covered by a condition of the recommended planning permission. This would require the applicant to bring forward the provision of a pavement on the north side road leading from the H01 bridge and elsewhere on the south side of the Lea Interchange...

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

the Committee

i) **Planning application 09/90295/AODODA**
APPROVED the details submitted in relation to the construction of Waterden Road as a partial discharge of conditions LTD.18, LTD.19 and LTD.20 of the Olympic Facilities and their legacy Transformation Planning Permission 07/90010/OUMODA subject to the conditions and informatives identified in the committee report and update report and the addition of an additional informative that the speed limit along Waterden Road should be 20mph;

ii) **Planning application 09/90294/FULODA**
APPROVED the full planning application for highway junction works in relation to the construction of the Lea Interchange during Pre-Games and Games in accordance with the details submitted for approval subject to the conditions identified in the committee report;

iii) **Planning application 09/90296/FULODA**
APPROVED the full planning application for highway junction works in relation to the construction of the Lea Interchange during the Post Games phase and Legacy phase in accordance with the details submitted for approval subject to the conditions identified in the committee report and an additional condition securing the provision of a pavement to the northern side of the

road leading from Bridge H01 into the Lea Interchange and on the south side of Lea Interchange.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 7:10pm.

Signed: J. Boehm Date: 23/3/2010

Chair