

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: FINAL MINUTES OF 76th COMMITTEE MEETING

Held on 8 February 2011 at 18.10pm

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
Cllr Judith Gardiner	LB Tower Hamlets
Cllr Conor McAuley	LB Newham

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
Richard Griffiths	ODA Legal Adviser, Planning Decisions Team (Pinsent Masons LLP)
Sarah Merritt	ODA Legal Adviser, Planning Decisions Team (Pinsent Masons LLP)

1. APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 1)

1.1 There were apologies from Mike Appleton and Saba Master

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

- 2.1 An update to Items 7 and 9 were provided by a PDT Officer.
- 2.2 Requests to speak were received from Patrick Grincell, Mark Aldis and William Lowe on behalf of the applicant for Item 6, David Cassells and Rob Lord on behalf of the applicant for Item 7, David Cassells and Martin Love on behalf of the applicant for Item 8 and Byron Davies on behalf of the applicant for Item 9.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM 3)

The Head of Development Control 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, 7, 8 and 9'

'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 76th Planning Committee Meeting.

5. LONDON BOROUGH OF WALTHAM FOREST CORE STRATEGY (AGENDA ITEM 5)

- 5.1 A PDT Officer gave a presentation summarising PDT's proposed response to the London Borough of Waltham Forest's 'submission' stage Core Strategy. The Officer noted that it continued to be the case that there were no substantive issues and that comments from the last stage in the consultation have been satisfactorily dealt with.

- 5.2 The Officer requested that the Committee agree the comments set out in the Report to Committee with additional wording to deal with implementation and delivery.
- 5.3 A member requested that a short paragraph be added setting out clearly how the document and in particular the infrastructure delivery plan, will be updated periodically.
- 5.4 There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED that:

The Committee:

- i) **AGREED** the comments set out in the Report to Committee together with the amendments referred to at paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3; and
- ii) **AUTHORISED** the Head of Development Control to provide final written comments to the London Borough of Waltham Forest as set out in the Report to Committee and incorporating the additional comments referred to at paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3 and to make any further minor amendments considered necessary.

6. APPLICATION NUMBER 10/90545/REMODA – MSCP

(AGENDA ITEM 6)

Submission of revised reserved matters for the Multi Storey Car Park (MSCP) during the games, transformation and legacy phases, pursuant to condition OD.5.1 of outline planning permission reference 07/90010/OUMODA. The proposals differ from the previously approved details (ref:09/90059/REMODA) through omission of the metal profile cladding from the MSCP during the games phase (the previously approved details proposed installation of the cladding during games phase) and the installation of single colour metal profile cladding to the MSCP in the transformation and legacy phases (the previously approved details proposed metal profile cladding painted white to the exterior and green to the interior).
MSCP, PDZ 5

- 6.1 A presentation was given by Patrick Grincell, Mark Aldis and William Lowe on behalf of the applicant. The presentation explored the location of the site, its planning history and the design and technical concepts behind the proposed changes to the approved scheme. It was noted that reserved matters for the design of the MSCP had been previously approved by the Committee in July 2009.
- 6.2 The amendments to those approved reserved matters relate to the metal profile cladding, and the white exterior and green interior finish to the cladding, which is to be installed prior to the Games.
- 6.3 The applicant explained that the metal cladding could not be installed prior to the Games for security reasons. Whilst the metal cladding could be installed post Games, the applicant explained that there were technical difficulties with having a dual colour profile. First, the dual colour scheme meant that the warranty being offered by suppliers was only 15 years, whereas the applicant required a 25 year warranty. Second, the applicant informed members that there would be a strong risk that the appearance of the cladding would deteriorate quickly as the dual colour

scheme would be 'weaker' due to having a join between the colours. Therefore, the applicant proposed a single white colour scheme.

- 6.4 A PDT Officer gave a presentation which focussed on the planning history of the site, the Officer's views on the acceptability of the scheme and the proposed conditions. The Officer concluded that as a single colour would be more durable, this would be preferable than having a dual scheme that deteriorated quickly. In terms of timing of the installation of the cladding, the Officer concluded that due to the security concerns and with the imposition of conditions requiring the installation of the cladding post Games, any short term harm would be outweighed by the longer term benefits.
- 6.5 A member asked whether maintenance and management of the carpark would be covered by a strategy on the same. A PDT Officer confirmed that a condition could be imposed that dealt with this issue. An advisor to the applicant also confirmed that the relevant warranty included a requirement for regular cleaning.
- 6.6 A member sought confirmation that the cladding post Games was not in respect of the whole building. The Head of Development Control confirmed that the cladding would only be installed on the permanent parts of the building, with the remainder of the building being removed post Games in accordance with the planning permission.
- 6.7 A member then sought to clarify the reasons for originally granting permission for two colours to be used in the design of the building. The Head of Development Control confirmed that at the time that the original application was approved, a two colour scheme was thought to be the best design solution. However, that was before research had been carried out as to the durability of a dual colour scheme.
- 6.8 A member queried whether any other solution had been examined that could replace the cladding whilst meeting the security concerns, such as a fabric wrap. The member was concerned that without any covering, advertisement boards would be placed on the building. The Head of Development Control informed the Member that not only would planning permission be required for any advertisement hoardings but there would also be security concerns with advertising hoardings on the building.
- 6.9 A member then sought clarity on the security concerns relating to the cladding proposed for the building. Due to matters of security being discussed, the Chairman cited Standing Order 19 of the Standing Orders and Terms of Reference for the ODA Planning Committee which states that "all meetings of the Planning Committee shall be held in public, save for those items that need to be confidential or exempt information by virtue of commercial, legal or other permitted reasons under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and any amendments made to it, and under any other applicable legislation dealing with the closure of information". At that point, all members of the public and other attendees of the meeting left the room save for all members of the Committee, Richard Griffiths (Legal Advisor), the Chief Planner (Development Control) and security personnel from the applicant.
- 6.10 Upon the completion of the security related queries from members and applicant responses to the same, all members of the public and other attendees of the meeting returned to the room.
- 6.11 There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED to:

AGREED to resolve to grant approval for the revised reserved matters application, in order to discharge part (i) of condition OD.5.1 (details of layout, scale, appearance and materials used) of outline planning permission reference 07/90010/OUMODA, for the reasons given in the Report to Committee subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Report to Committee and subject to the condition referred to at paragraph 6.5 above.

7. APPLICATION NUMBER 10/90558/FUMODA - WARTON ROAD (AGENDA ITEM 7)

Full Planning Application for Temporary Southern Access Security Plaza Vehicle Screening Area comprising use, operation (Pre-Games only), street furniture, surfaces/finishes, layout and drainage in accordance with the submitted details. Southern Access Security Plaza Vehicle Screening Area, Warton Road, Stratford, PDZ 8

- 7.1 A presentation was given by David Cassells and Rob Lord on behalf of the applicant. The presentation explored the location of the site, the reasons for it being selected, its planning history, the design of the site and referred to the need for LB Newham to approve a related application for development on the highway next to the application site. Both noise and traffic assessments were stated to have been submitted with the application.
- 7.2 The applicant explained that four alternative locations had been examined. One was dismissed as the site was not large enough, another was dismissed as it would be highly disruptive to the local traffic network, the other two were dismissed as they were already being used during the Games.
- 7.3 The applicant confirmed that the operation element of the application was for pre-Games only. In addition, the canopy shown on the drawings was not part of the application and would come forward at a later date but that all materials to be used in the proposed development would be as approved under other Olympic applications. The applicant confirmed that walkers and cyclists would not be subject to screening in the proposed development.
- 7.4 A PDT Officer gave a presentation which focussed on the key considerations for the site, referred to objections to the development and issues with noise and traffic. The Officer confirmed that the development would match the Park wide furniture and that the fencing would be consistent with the fencing across the Park. The Officer informed members that the issues raised by the Environment Agency regarding the River Wall was satisfactorily covered by the proposed conditions.
- 7.5 In terms of security issues raised by local residents, the Officer reminded members that alternative locations had been assessed by the applicant and the application site was considered to be the most appropriate. Due to the development's importance in the over-all security of the Park, Officers were satisfied with the location.
- 7.6 Other local resident objections related to noise and traffic impacts. The Officer explained that additional noise assessments, including the cumulative impact of both bus lay-by and VSA screening operations, had been carried out which concluded that noise would be at an acceptable level and that PDT's environmental consultants concurred with this conclusion. Furthermore, an amendment to the

proposed noise condition was detailed in the Update Report. In terms of traffic, PDT's transport consultant had recommended that with management arrangements in place, the traffic impact would be acceptable.

- 7.7 A member asked a question regarding the security concerns that residents may have with the development being located close to residential developments. The Chairman confirmed that the query would be dealt with once the Committee had moved to being *in camera* under Standing Order 19.
- 7.8 A member asked a question about the likelihood of traffic queuing as a result of the development. A PDT Officer confirmed that queuing was not expected to be a significant issue based on the implementation a management plan to mitigate and respond to the possibility of traffic congestion. The Chairman confirmed that this could be discussed in more detail once the Committee had moved to being *in camera* under Standing Order 19.
- 7.9 There being no other non-security related questions, the Chairman cited Standing Order 19 of the Standing Orders and Terms of Reference for the ODA Planning Committee which states that "all meetings of the Planning Committee shall be held in public, save for those items that need to be confidential or exempt information by virtue of commercial, legal or other permitted reasons under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and any amendments made to it, and under any other applicable legislation dealing with the closure of information". At that point, all members of the public and other attendees of the meeting left the room save for all members of the Committee, Richard Griffiths (Legal Advisor), the Chief Planner (Development Control) and security personnel from the applicant.
- 7.10 Upon the completion of the security related queries from members and applicant responses to the same, all members of the public and other attendees of the meeting returned to the room.
- 7.11 A member raised a query regarding the level of decibels of the proposed noise condition set out in update Report. The applicant confirmed that it was comfortable with the restrictions set out in the condition and a PDT Officer confirmed that the conditions had been drafted in consultation with PDT's environmental consultants. The applicant confirmed that the condition as proposed was workable.
- 7.12 There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED to:

AGREED to resolve to grant full planning permission for the reasons set out in the Report to Committee and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Report to Committee (including the Update), subject to any consequential or necessary changes and amendments to the conditions set out in the Report to Committee

8. APPLICATION NUMBER 10/90556/FUMODA - EASTERN AND N23 VEHICLE SCREENING & 10/90555/AODODA - LOCOG Welcome Centre (AGENDA ITEM 8)

10/90556/FUMODA

N23 VSA Plaza - Full Planning Application for the use, operation (pre Games and Games), layout, surfacing/finishes, drainage, street furniture (including fencing,

vehicle containment and signage) and security equipment for construction of a temporary Eastern Vehicle Access Plaza and VSA.

Eastern Vehicle Access Plaza and VSA – Full Planning Application for the use, operation (pre-Games only) layout, surfacing/finishes, drainage, street furniture (including lighting columns, vehicle containment, signage and fencing) and security equipment for construction of a temporary Eastern Vehicle Access Plaza and VSA (PDZ 11, Olympic Park)

10/90555/AODODA

Submission of details in relation to the Olympic Village 'LOCOG Welcome Centre' Operational Screening Centre for the layout, surface/finishes, drainage, street furniture and CPSS pursuant to conditions D.0.20, OD.0.23 and OG1 in accordance with the submitted details.

Olympic Village 'LOCOG Welcome Centre' Operational Screening Area, Chobham Farm (To The West Of Leyton Road)

- 8.1 A presentation was given by David Cassells and Martin Love on behalf of the applicant. The presentation covered both applications and dealt with the layout and location of both sites and how both sites would operate in practice.
- 8.2 A PDT Officer gave a presentation which focussed on the key considerations for the sites, the design of the sites and issues concerning noise and access as well as mitigation measures. The Officer set out views on the acceptability of the schemes.
- 8.3 A member queried the planning history of the sites and a PDT Officer summarised the relevant history.
- 8.4 There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED that:
- i) **AGREED** to resolve to grant planning permission for the “slot-in” application (10/90556/FUMODA for the reasons set out in the Report to Committee and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Report to Committee, subject to any consequential or necessary changes and amendments to the recommended conditions in the Report to Committee; and
 - ii) **AGREED** to resolve to grant the partial discharge of conditions OD.0.20 (engineering works), OD.0.23 (surface water drainage) and OG.1 (security arrangements) of permission 07/90010/OUMODA subject to the informatives and conditions set out in the Report to Committee.

9. APPLICATION NUMBER 10/90540/FULODA (AGENDA ITEM 9)

Erection of two 2 storey buildings comprising of 1987sqm of restaurant floorspace (Use Class A3) and 720sqm of leisure floorspace (Use Class D2) and 305sqm of ancillary external seating space located within the adjacent public realm area. Chestnut Plaza, Zone, Stratford City Development, Stratford Rail Lands, Stratford, London

- 9.1 A presentation was given by Byron Davies for the applicant. The presentation covered the layout and location of both sites, the proposed uses of the site as well as the design concepts behind the application.
- 9.2 The intention behind the applicant is to create an interesting restaurant quarter and a lively public space. The facades of the buildings would be towards Chestnut Plaza and to the rear of the buildings would be future development plots. The two buildings, M7 and M8, form two bookends. The roof would be flat, which would enable a future tenant to use the roof as outside space.
- 9.3 A PDT Officer gave a presentation which focussed on the key considerations for the application, the planning history of the site, the design of the site, accessibility, sustainability and a late consultation response from the GLA. Due to the site's planning history the Officer confirmed that GLA had withdrawn its request for a Crossrail Contribution.
- 9.4 A member asked a question about the substantial nature of the buildings compared to the temporary nature of the permission being applied for. The PDT Officer and the applicant confirmed that full planning permission was being applied for and that the nature of other buildings around the development meant that changes to the development may be required in the future, when the M7 office development came forward. These would, however, be dealt with by way of a separate planning application.
- 9.5 There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee **RESOLVED** to:
- i) **AGREED** to resolve that a Section 106 Agreement be entered into to ensure that the full planning application is subject to the extant Zone 1 Stratford City Section 106 Agreement;
 - ii) **AGREED** to resolve to grant delegated authority to the Head of Development Control to complete the Section 106 agreement and issue the consent; and
 - iii) **AGREED** that the London Borough of Newham be advised that the ODA Planning Committee has no objections to the grant of permission, subject to the above s106 Agreement, but ask that the London Borough of Newham consider the imposition of conditions and informatives to cover the matters set out in the Report to Committee (including the Update).

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS (AGENDA ITEM 10)

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

Signed:



Chair

Date:

27/09/2011