

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: FINAL MINUTES OF 72nd COMMITTEE MEETING
Held on 26 October 2010 at 18.00

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

Present:

Lorraine Baldry	Chairman
David Taylor	

Local Authority Members:

Cllr Terry Wheeler,	LB Waltham Forest
Cllr Geoffrey Taylor,	LB Hackney
Cllr Judith Gardiner,	LB Tower Hamlets

Independent Members:

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, Planning Decisions Team
Allan Ledden	ODA Legal Adviser, Planning Decisions Team (Pinsent Masons)
Sarah Merritt	ODA Legal Adviser, Planning Decisions Team (Pinsent Masons LLP)

1. APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 1)

1.1. There were apologies from Cllr Conor McAuley, LB Newham.

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

2.1 An update to Item 5 was provided by a PDT Officer.

2.3 Requests to speak against the recommendation were received from Debbie Allaire (LB Tower Hamlets Access Officer), Arnold Ridout (LCC), Chloe Fleck, Agent for Clemence and Porter Architect (4 Roach Road) for Item 5. Requests to supporting the recommendation were received from Selina Mason (ODA Deputy Head of Design) and Greg Holme (Allies and Morrison architects) for Item 5.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM 3)

Vivienne Ramsey 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, 6 and 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 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 71st Planning Committee Meeting.

5. APPLICATION NUMBER 10/90344/FULODA – Western Bridges (AGENDA ITEM 5)

Full planning application for the construction of two permanent pedestrian and cycle bridges; Bridge H10 to the east of Wallis Road and Bridge H14 to the east of Roach Road, including:

- 1. Preparatory works including bulk earthworks for the creation of landform to finished levels, including retaining structures and construction of piling and foundations;*
- 2. The laying of surface water drainage;*
- 3. Construction of bridge structure including abutments, retaining walls, bridge decks, parapets and handrails including material details;*
- 4. Construction of approach ramps including the laying out of hard and soft landscaping including the installation of stairs, rest areas, parapet and handrails and planting of trees, climbers, lawn and meadow grass;*
- 5. Construction of a lift at the western approach to Bridge H10.
H10 And H14 'Western Bridges', Olympic Park, London, E15*

5.1 A PDT Officer gave a presentation on the submission and referred members to the Update Report that had been provided in relation to this item.

5.2 Ms Debbie Allaire, Access Officer for LB Tower Hamlets, explained that while LB Tower Hamlets welcomed the principle of the link, there were concerns regarding the length of the ramp. She acknowledged that LBTH's previous comments did not accurately assess the length of the eastern approach ramp and agreed that 45m was accurate as set out in the officers' report. However, in LB Tower Hamlets view, 45m was an excessive distance. Ms Allaire queried whether an opening bridge had been considered. The width of the ramp was also an issue as at 1800mm it would be difficult for two wheelchair users to pass one another. The same issue would arise with cyclists. A sharp turn at the Eastern approach was mentioned as being of concern. Ms Allaire stated that a ramp of 4m width and with better design would sit on the Western side of the bridge whilst the Eastern side would appear less well thought through. There were various pinch points which were of concern to LB Tower Hamlets. Overall, the design lacked *joie de vivre*.

5.3 Mr Arnold Ridout, London Cycling Campaign ("**LCC**"), explained that the LCC welcomed the improved accessibility that the bridges would provide and would emphasise that the bridge will form part of a key cycle route from East to West. There will in future be an increasing number of commuter cyclists, especially as there are limited cycling options along Stratford High Street. In the LCC's view, the Western approach to the bridge is inadequate. In its view, a bridge without a cycle ramp would not be a cycle bridge, instead it would be a blockage to the cycle route. If a ramp was not possible immediately, then LCC would support a condition to ensure that cycling facilities are provided in Legacy. LCC would agree with LB Tower Hamlets that a 2m wide ramp is insufficient for two-way cycling when combined with wheelchairs and pushchairs. In addition, LCC felt

that British Waterways' acceptance of a 3m towpath was un-ambitious. The original vision was for 4m on each side and as the towpath is a strategic route, a 3m (and in places 2.7m) towpath will cause an unnecessary bottleneck.

5.4 Chloe Fleck confirmed that the Update Report provided by the PDT Officer dealt with the points that she had proposed to make. She therefore did not propose to speak.

5.5 Selina Mason, ODA Deputy Head of Design, and Greg Holme of Allies and Morrison gave a presentation. A member queried whether both objectors and supporters of the application were being treated equally when they were speaking from different parts of the room and the supporters had slides to illustrate their points. The Chairman confirmed that objectors and supporters of the application had all been invited to bring slides and Allan Ledden confirmed that all were being treated equally.

5.6 Selina Mason described the brief that had been given by the ODA to Allies and Morrison and emphasised that there were significant design constraints that had had to be taken into account in designing the bridges. At H10 the preference was for a ramp but due to space constraints a lift was the preferred solution. H14 was constrained to the East but complies with the ODA's design standards. An opening bridge was considered but British Waterways does not support such bridges due to maintenance considerations and given the frequency/number of craft using the Lea Navigation.

5.7 Greg Holme showed slides of the bridges as designed and described how Allies and Morrison had interpreted the brief and the focus that had been given to the public realm elements of the design. Materials had been carefully chosen and stakeholder comments had been taken on board.

5.8 The PDT Officer responded to Debbie Allaire, referring members to p64-66 and paragraph 7.65 of the Committee Report and stating that an opening bridge had been considered but that British Waterways has a policy of not supporting such structures for maintenance reasons. In relation to the narrowness of the ramp, the option for pedestrians of using the stairs should reduce the numbers using the ramp. As such, the ramp was deemed to be acceptable. Condition WB17 which requires the realignment of the PDZ4 stitch should reduce the journey distance by 15m. In addition, the bridges would both be replaced by permanent highway bridges during the Legacy phase. Graded access to these permanent bridges would be provided.

5.9 The PDT Officer responded to Arnold Ridout, referring members to p9 of the Update Report provided. The stairs are intended to disperse pedestrians so that the use of the ramp is made easier. An alternative solution at bridge H10 was set out in the Update Report provided but the length of the ramp (70m) and the doubling back on itself that would occur make the lift the preferable solution. The constraints imposed by British Waterway's navigational requirements meant that a step or ramp free option was not possible within the amount of land available to develop the bridges. The replacement of the bridges with permanent structures in Legacy will deal with many of the concerns.

5.10 In response to a query from a member, the PDT Officer confirmed that the

narrow width of the towpath was due to space constraints. PDT Officers confirmed that British Waterways objection had been withdrawn and so they are clearly happy with the width of the towpath.

- 5.11 A member then queried whether the joint use of the bridges by cyclist, pedestrians, pushchairs and wheelchairs had been considered, or whether it had just been pedestrians and wheelchairs. The PDT Officer confirmed that this had been considered but as the greatest number of users would be able-bodied pedestrians, the use of the stairs to disperse pedestrians away from the ramps meant that the design was considered suitable. PDT Officers confirmed that the width of the ramps was not ideal but on balance and given the constraints the assessment was that it was acceptable. The Officers confirmed that the bridges had been the subject of review by both the ODA Built Environment Access Panel and the GLA Access Officer and no objections to the eastern ramp at H14 had been received.
- 5.12 A member queried whether a commuted sum had been explored to encourage British Waterways to accept an opening bridge solution. The Head of Development Control confirmed that the ODA had had extensive discussions with British Waterways. A PDT Officer reminded members of British Waterways function as a navigation authority. PDT Officers confirmed that as far as ODA PDT was aware, it was an in principle objection by British Waterways and that at no point in any discussion or correspondence with PDT had British Waterways indicated that it would be prepared to allow a swing/lifting bridge if sufficient funding to cover the management and maintenance of such structures could be provided. The current application was a solution that met British Waterways' objection and met the relevant conditions of the 2007 Olympic planning permissions to deliver two pedestrian and cycle bridges prior to the opening of the transformed venues and parkland.
- 5.13 A member queried whether the bridge extending over the loop road had been considered. A PDT Officer stated that this would require a long ramp and that traffic underneath the bridge would make the alignment difficult. The member then queried whether paragraph 7.113 of the Committee Report (dealing with the installation of a gate to allow the waterside to be secured) would be conditioned. PDT Officers confirmed that conditions WB4, WB17 and 18 dealt with security but that there were issues with fencing off parts of the public realm. Officers confirmed that they considered the wording of WB4 to be sufficient to cover future management, maintenance and use of the riverside space at H10, but would review it again in light of the Member comment.
- 5.14 The member then queried the colour of the concrete to be used on the Western approach. PDT Officers confirmed that discussions with the applicant had been had and that the PDT's preference was for a darker shade. The applicant had provided some justification for why this could not be achieved. Condition WB13 requires a sample of the concrete finish to abutments and retaining walls and this was considered the appropriate mechanism to determine the quality and tone of the concrete finish.
- 5.15 A member then queried the degree of consultation that had been undertaken, particularly with respect to the design and appearance of the bridges. A PDT Officer confirmed that CABA supported the design, although LB Tower Hamlets did not and questioned whether community involvement in the design would

have been as better approach. The member was referred to paragraphs 6.1-6.4 of the Committee Report for details of who was consulted at pre-application stage. 1,927 leaflets had been issued along with drop in sessions and targeted consultation. There were generally limited comments on the design and the appearance of the bridge at pre-application stage and those received post submission were set out in the report. Officers were satisfied that the design and appearance of the bridge would represent a positive intervention.

- 5.16 A member raised the issue as to how likely it was that the lift would be adequately maintained and repaired. PDT Officers confirmed that condition WB4 dealt with this issue but acknowledged that relying on a lift was not an ideal solution but the only one reasonable given the identified constraints. The member also felt that the H14 ramp was too long and too narrow. The member queried why additional land had not been compulsorily purchased and why the bridge did not cross the loop road and into the park. PDT Officers stated that there were constraints on the bridges that were not ideal but officers had balanced the option for early delivery of the bridges in time for the Olympic Games against not having those early connectors. The Legacy highway bridges would deliver a wholly multi-modal access and the Olympic Park Legacy Company had written to confirm that it would be bringing forward proposals for such bridges as part of the legacy communities development. The impact and accessibility of these bridges would be appropriately assessed at that time. On balance, the application is felt by the PDT to be acceptable.
- 5.17 A member was concerned to ensure that the planting material used in the landscaping was not grass due to it being hard to maintain. PDT Officers confirmed that an informative could be added to deal with this issue in addition to the requirements for planting details set out at condition WB14.
- 5.18 A member gave the view that the application was the best solution available at the moment. A second member stated that it was important that the issues were dealt with when the Legacy permanent highway bridges were put before Committee. The member was not clear why the condition proposed by the LB Tower Hamlets (that permanent bridges be required) was not used by the PDT. PDT Officers confirmed that this was because it would be an unnecessary duplication of an existing condition on the 2007 Olympic permission which secures the provision of highway bridges related to legacy phase development in PDZ4 and 5.
- 5.19 There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED that:

The Committee:

APPROVED planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives listed in the Committee Report with the removed amended or replaced conditions as set out in the Update Report and with the additional informative referred to at 5.19. The recommendation was approved by members with two abstentions.

6. APPLICATION NUMBER 10/90401/FULODA - 204-206 Leyton Road, Stratford, E15 1DT (AGENDA ITEM 7)

Retention of an existing three storey community building (D1) including on site car parking. Planning permission is required as the development was not built in accordance with approved plans for the previous planning approval Ref: P./02/1215, which was granted in 2004.

- 6.1 A PDT Officer gave a presentation and explained that the item had been deferred from the previous Planning Committee meeting in order for PDT Officers to provide members with a report including options for any relevant enforcement action, should the Committee be minded not to agree the S106 Agreement.
- 6.2 The PDT Officer stated that whilst the building had not been constructed in accordance with the previous planning permission, the appearance of the building was, in the PDT's view, not such as to be significantly harmful to the streetscape. The PDT Officer also confirmed, together with PDT's Legal Advisor, that confirmation had been received from the applicant's solicitor that the applicant had agreed to the terms of the proposed s106 Agreement.
- 6.3 The PDT officer also clarified that the Environment Agency's comments related to groundwater contamination, rather than flood risk. LB Newham's Environmental Protection Team was comfortable that there was not a significant likelihood of contamination given historical land use and the use of hard cover at the Site. Noise and transport issues arising from the operation of the development were covered in the report and Officers considered that there were no detrimental impacts on these grounds.
- 6.4 There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED that:

The Committee:

- i) **AGREED** to resolve to grant planning permission subject to entering into a s106 Agreement as described in the relevant Committee Reports; and
- ii) **AUTHORISED** delegated authority to the Head of Developmental Control to complete the s106 Agreement including the negotiation of any minor changes that might be considered necessary and to issue the decision notice

7. DELEGATED AUTHORITY REPORT (AGENDA ITEM 8)

- 7.1 The Head of Development Control confirmed that the report and appendices before members set out what the PDT had done over the previous 6 months under delegated powers. The Head of Development Control was due to report to the Board both on the delegated powers used and the activities of the Planning Committee.

7.2 A member queried an item on p1 and Vivienne Ramsey confirmed that the item only related to the issuing of a decision notice that the Committee had approved once a s106 Agreement was completed.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS (AGENDA ITEM 9)

There being no other business the meeting closed at 19:55pm.

Signed: Z Boardman

Chair

Date: 25/1/2011