OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY
Planning Decisions Team

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: **FINAL MINUTES OF 95th COMMITTEE MEETING**
Held on 8 May 2012 at 18.00

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

Present: Lorraine Baldy, Chairman

David Taylor, Deputy Chairman

Local Authority Members:

Cllr Terry Wheeler	LB Waltham Forest
Cllr Conor McAuley	LB Newham (Items 1- 5 only)
Cllr Judith Gardiner	LB Tower Hamlets

Independent Members:

Mike Appleton

Celia Carrington

William Hodgson

Janice Morphet

Dru Vesty

Officers in attendance:

Vivienne Ramsay,	ODA, Director of Planning Decisions
Anthony Hollingsworth,	ODA, Chief Planner Development Control, Planning Decisions Team
Richard Griffiths,	ODA Legal Adviser, Planning Decisions Team (Pinsent Masons)
Jamie Lockerbie,	Secretary (Pinsent Masons)

1. **APOLOGIES** (AGENDA ITEM 1)

1.1 There were apologies from Cllr Geoffrey Taylor.

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

2.1 There were updates for Items 5, 6, 8 and 9.

2.2 The Order of Business would be as set out on the Agenda and requests to speak would be dealt with on an Item by Item basis.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM 3)

The Director of Planning Decisions 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, 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 judgment 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?"

The Members of the Planning Committee 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 94th Planning Committee Meeting.

5. **BA LIVE SITE – 12/90042/FUMODA**

Erection of a temporary 39m-long elevated structure in the River Lea, comprising 2 LED screens, stage with lighting, and back-of-house technical facility located between the screens, served by a single access bridge from the western bank, to create a "Live Site" for the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

5.1 The applicant gave a presentation. The applicant explained that BA re-launched its brand last year and this development provided an opportunity to support the London Olympic Games and the overall aim of this proposal was to enhance peoples' experience of the 2012 Games. The proposed development is a joint project between BA and LOCOG. The site is at the heart of the Olympic Park at its northern end. The proposal aims to create a 'Henman Hill' type experience for visitors to the Olympic Park.

5.2 The applicant stated that an engineering solution was needed to address flood management issues and an open brief was given to consider the overall concept of the proposals. The focus of the architects' work has been on reducing the size of the development, reconciling its curved form with engineering requirements and making the hospitality elements less prominent. The final design is therefore of a reduced size at two thirds of the length of the previous concept. The proposal is now 39 metres long. An emphasis has been given to stage and screen. Only one bridge is now needed to connect the screen to the river bank which results in a minimal impact on the biodiversity of the River Lea.

5.3 The screen will function during the day and then will continue to be active an hour or so after dusk, which during July will mean it is active until approximately 10:30 pm. After sunset the screen requires only about 10 per cent of the light output that is required during the day.

5.4 Sustainability requirements focus on embodied energy and the lifecycle of materials used for construction. The structure, screens and timber decking all constitute 98 per cent of the structure's weight and can all be reused or recycled.

5.5 Building in the river is a challenge. The structure is light and easy to assemble with 31 days of construction time. The columns that support the structure sit on a metal plate which in turn sits on the riverbed rather than being piled into the riverbed as was the case with the previous proposal. Engineers can correct minor movement of platform because of this.

5.6 A PDT officer then gave a presentation. The application site within the River Lea is mostly in Planning Delivery Zone 5 (PDZ5) although as the boundary between PDZs is the centre of the river, the eastern part of the site is within PDZ6.

5.7 Consultation responses were received from British Waterways, DC CABE, Environment Agency, LB Newham, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, the Metropolitan Police, Natural England and Thames Water. The response from the Environment Agency has been used to draft the conditions and further details are set out in the committee update for Item 5. The Environment Agency had particular concerns relating to cross bracing and further details are set out in the committee update.

5.8 The loss of Metropolitan Open Land that would result from this temporary development is acceptable given the special circumstances of hosting the 2012 Games. The crowd management effects of the development are a positive element. The revised design addresses previous PDT concerns as to the proposed bulk of the development. Most of the materials can be reused and recycled. Some further conditions are proposed and these are set out in the committee update for this Item.

5.9 It is PDT's conclusion that the proposal allows for proper preparation for the Olympic Games in accordance with the London Olympic Games and Paralympic Games Act 2006 and it also accords with the London Plan, the London Borough of Hackney's UDP and Core Strategy as well as the London Borough of Newham's UDP and Core Strategy.

5.10 A Member asked if there was any hospitality element in the development now. The Applicant replied that there is not as all hospitality is now provided for in the Olympic Hospitality Centre.

5.11 A Member queried why the legs of the structure were "boxed in". The Applicant replied that this is to maximise the area of water flow. The structure's legs are formed of tubes and then clad so that they do not become debris collectors. Debris will deflect from the legs and then can be easily collected.

5.12 A Member enquired as to how mitigation measures will be funded should they be required once the structure is removed. The Applicant replied that there are two types of potential mitigation being mitigation relating to planting and to the riverbed. The structure of this development is different to that proposed by BMW as this development requires no piling. The Applicant confirmed that they will carry out a survey before works commence and then a final detailed survey upon removal of the works. No adverse impacts are expected in relation to the riverbed but, if required, a light touch remedial scheme could be undertaken.

5.13 A Member again asked the Applicant who would pay for any mitigation work in the event it was required. A PDT Officer confirmed that condition seven covers removal and reinstatement and that PDT could enforce this condition in the event that remediation work was not undertaken.

5.14 The Applicant stated that a contingency has been planned into the budget for the development to cover the cost of any remediation work that might be required in relation to ecology or the riverbed. This contingency money will be held in trust until the end of the development's life.

5.15 A Member asked where power for the development comes from. The Applicant replied that power is taken from a nearby transformer substation. The Member followed up by asking where the cabling would run to connect the development to this substation. The Applicant replied that the cabling would run both above and below ground. The Applicant stated that all cabling would be removed and the cost of doing so comes from the overall LOCOG budget. The Member concluded by stating that he wanted to know why the development was so high and so ugly. The Member did not consider the development to be in the spirit of the ecology of the Olympic Park and stated that he would not be supporting the proposal.

5.16 There being no further questions the Committee took a vote and (by 8 in favour and 1 against):

(i) **AGREED** to grant delegated authority to the Director of Planning Decisions to consider the additional information submitted and continue liaison with the Environment Agency on the cross bracing details, to make the resulting necessary changes to the conditions and informatives, and:

(ii) to **GRANT** planning permission for the Live Site

Cllr Conor McAuley left the meeting.

6. **MEGASTORE – 12/90087/AODODA**

Submission of details reserved by condition relating to the appearance, general layout, and height of the Olympic Megastore pursuant to condition PPRG.3 (Temporary Buildings) of permission ref. 11/90324/VARODA.

6.1 A PDT Officer gave a presentation. This application is pursuant to condition PPRG.3 of the PPR permission for PDZ4. The construction of the Megastore structure is well underway on site. It will be the largest shop on the Olympic Park site being 50 metres wide, 80 metres deep, with a maximum height of 9.1 metres. The eastern elevation is glazed. The indicative 'look' to be applied is shown on the committee report and update.

6.2 The Environment Agency, Thames Water, Metropolitan Police LVRPA, LFEPA and DC CABE provided consultation responses. DC CABE consider that 'look' will improve the building and should be applied to all elevations and it proposed that this is secured by condition (condition two as detailed in the Committee Report). The Applicant has requested that condition two be removed. However, PDT Officers recommend retention of this condition to ensure that a suitable scheme is approved and implemented.

6.3 The PDT Officer acknowledged that this building needs to be improved by the addition of 'look'. The structure of the building will be leased and so can be re-used. Its design will only be acceptable if 'look' is applied to all elevations.

6.4 The PDT Officer concluded that the proposal would allow for proper preparation for the Olympic Games in accordance with the London Olympic Games and Paralympic Games Act 2006 and that it also accords with the relevant planning policies of the London Plan and also the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.

6.5 A Member agreed that the condition to require 'look' to be applied to all elevations should be applied.

6.6 A Member asked if the proposal included any external staircases? The PDT Officer responded that there were no external staircases.

6.7 A Member said she preferred an earlier indicative design for the 'look' to that shown in the committee update.

6.8 There being no further questions the Committee took a vote and unanimously (Cllr Judith Gardiner was absent for the vote having left the meeting):

(i) **APPROVED** the submitted details in order to partially discharge condition PPRG.3 of permission 11/90324/VARODA subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

7. **WAYFINDING – 12/90117/AODODA**

Submission of details for 2 no gantry signs, 5 no primary beacons, 6 no zone beacons for wayfinding pursuant to condition OG.3 of permission ref. 11/90313/VARODA and compatible conditions on slot-in permission for the Games phase parklands and public realm.

7.1 A PDT Officer gave a presentation. This application seeks approval for 11 wayfinding beacons in the Olympic Park, and two gantry signs on bridge F10 to help guide people from the main entrance point to the venues across the Park. The wayfinding beacons would be in two sizes, 7.4m high and 14.6m high, with a steel frame and tensile fabric panels. The gantries would be 10m high with tensile fabric and black painted steel.

7.2 Consultation responses were received from the Environment Agency, Thames Water, the Metropolitan Police, LVRPA and DC CABE. The concerns of the Metropolitan Police have been addressed by LOCOG's lighting proposals and DC CABE admire the design.

7.3 The loss of Metropolitan Open Land that would result from this temporary development is acceptable given the special circumstances of hosting the 2012 Games. The components of the beacons can be reused and so are considered to be sustainable. There are no amenity or contamination issues.

7.4 The PDT Officer concluded that the proposal would allow for proper preparation for the Olympic Games in accordance with the London Olympic Games and Paralympic Games Act 2006 and that it also accords with the relevant planning policies of the London Plan and also the three boroughs' planning policies.

7.5 There being no further questions the Committee took a vote and unanimously (Cllr Judith Gardiner was absent for the vote):

(i) **APPROVED** the submitted details for the wayfinding markers proposed subject to the condition and informative as set out in the report to allow the discharge of conditions:

- OG.3 of permission ref. 11/90313/VARODA (for the two proposed gantries and three wayfinding beacons proposed in PDZ5).
- PPRG.3 of permission ref. 11/90317/VARODA for the three beacons in PDZ2 and the eastern side of PDZ4.
- PPRG.3 of permission ref. 11/90324/VARODA for the two beacons within PDZ4.
- HFOD.17 of permission ref. 10/90488/FUMODA for the northern-most beacon in PDZ5.
- VOG.3 of permission ref. 11/90315/VARODA for the large beacon in PDZ6.
- PPRG.3 of permission ref. 11/90318/VARODA for the zonal beacon in PDZ6.

Cllr Judith Gardiner returned to the meeting.

8. **ACER – 12/90137/AODODA**

Erection of a temporary sponsor showcase pavilion (pursuant to condition OG.3 (temporary buildings) in respect of planning permission ref. 11/90313/VARODA).

8.1 The Applicant gave a presentation. The Applicant stated that it has come up with a striking design for this three storey structure. Two of the floors are for public access and the third is a VIP floor.

8.2 The Applicant explained that the structure is of steel construction and cladding and has an area of 400 square metres. The lower part is clad with black glass with the large LED screen situated above. In front of LED screen are 15 moving steel shutters. The queuing system is on the ground floor and the visitor experience being on levels one and two. The Applicant then showed some visuals of the inside of the structure. The top floor is for VIP guests. This area has a terrace area which overlooks the Olympic Park.

8.3 A PDT Officer then gave a presentation. This application proposes the design of the temporary structure which would be the ACER sponsor showcase. The details are submitted pursuant to condition OG.3 of the 2007 Olympic and Paralympic Facilities and Legacy Transformation planning permission (now permission reference 11/90313/VARODA) and are in accordance with the parameters approved for the Common Domain.

8.4 No substantive consultation responses were received and DC CABE broadly support the proposals.

8.5 The loss of Metropolitan Open Land that would result from this development is acceptable given the special circumstances of hosting the Olympic Games. The design is considered appropriate to the site context. The Applicant has not provided materials samples or samples of the colour proposed for the plant located at the rear of the showcase and therefore these are matters that will need to be approved at a later date. Officers consider the proposal to be acceptable subject to the colour of the plant being approved.

8.6 The PDT Officer concluded that the proposal would allow for proper preparation for the 2012 Games in accordance with the London Olympic Games and Paralympic Games Act 2006 and that it also accords with the relevant planning policies of the London Plan and also the London Borough of Newham's Core Strategy and UDP.

8.7 A Member said he thought the showcase was aesthetically displeasing. The Member believed that if other members were minded to approve the application they should impose a condition to require that the plant located at the rear should be hidden. The Member also stated that using more air conditioning is not acceptable to the ethos of a green Games and that natural ventilation should be used as much as possible. A PDT Officer reported that PDT shared the Member's concerns but there is a need to ventilate this structure and PDT consider air conditioning to be acceptable in this case.

8.8 There being no further questions the Committee took a vote and (by 7 in favour and 1 against):

(i) **APPROVED** the submitted showcase details to partially discharge condition OG.3 of permission reference 11/90313/VARODA, subject to the condition and informatives in the report, including the first informative being amended as set out in the update report.

9. **SAMSUNG – 12/90148/AODODA**

Submission of details for the Samsung sponsors showcase pursuant to condition VOG.3 (Temporary buildings) of permission ref. 11/90315/VARODA (Velopark permission).

9.1 The Applicant gave a presentation and explained that the Samsung showcase has an area of 400 square metres. The structure consists of a simple platform with glass structure. The structure has been used in other locations and the Applicant is proposing to reassemble it on the Olympic Park. Rather than announcing the Samsung brand name the Applicant has attempted to encourage human contact. The Applicant showed a corporate video to explain more about the glass structure on the platform which is known as 'PIN'.

Judith Gardiner left the meeting.

9.2 The Applicant explained that they are planning to reuse the structure again in the UK following the end of the Games. The Applicant then showed a further video explaining how the 'PIN' structure is assembled. A prototype was built in Hanover, Germany, this was then moved to Earls Court and will be moved to the Olympic Park and then onwards around the UK. One hundred per cent of the structure will be reused.

Cllr Judith Gardiner returned to the meeting.

9.3 A PDT Officer gave a presentation. This approval of details application seeks approval for a temporary structure in Planning Delivery Zone 6 which would form the Samsung sponsor showcase. The Applicant has provided materials samples and these could be seen on table behind Members.

9.4 The PDT Officer reported that the consultation responses were received from British Waterways, DC CABE, the Environment Agency, LFEPA, LVRPA, the Metropolitan Police, National Grid, Natural England and Thames Water. Comments from DC CABE are set out in the committee update.

9.5 The PDT Officer further explained that the design is within the parameters approved by the previous Common Domain permission. The proposals are also in accordance with UDLF for temporary overlay structures. The main ramp across the centre of the showcase is shown to have a gradient of 1 in 17 for a length of 7m. This is steeper than usually accepted in the Olympic Park (1 in 21 is the maximum set by the ODA's Inclusive Design Standards), however in this instance the constrains of this showcase's site, the existing slope in the concourse as well as the relatively short length of the ramp, it is considered acceptable in this case. The structure will be reused elsewhere after the Games. Air conditioning is proposed to ventilate the structure but PDT consider this to be acceptable given the reuse of the structure elsewhere in Europe.

9.6 The PDT Officer concluded that the proposal would allow for proper preparation for the 2012 Games in accordance with the London Olympic Games and Paralympic Games Act 2006 and that it also accords with the relevant planning policies of the London Plan and also the London Borough of Newham's planning policies.

9.7 A Member asked about CABE's comments detailed on the committee update. Is an informative sufficient to require the Applicant to provide detail of the screening design? The PDT Officer responded that a screening application has been recently received and will be dealt with in due course.

9.8 A Member said it is important to make sure that the wood used in the timber decking is sustainably sourced. He seemed to recall that one of the post-Games park hubs needed wood so could the decking be donated for use in a children's playground? The Applicant agreed to look into this.

9.9 There being no further questions the Committee took a vote and unanimously:

(i) **AGREED** to grant delegated authority to the Director of Planning Decisions to consider the handrail details and material samples submitted, and to make the resulting necessary changes to the condition and informative setting out the outstanding elements required for condition VOG.3 to be fully discharged, and to issue the decision notice **APPROVING** the submitted details.

10. DELEGATED DECISIONS REPORT

10.1 The Director of Planning Decisions stated that this was for noting.

10.2 ODA PDT will finish their planning functions at end of September but are intending to come back to ODA in October to give a report of officers' activity over whole six years of PDT activity.

10.3 The last committee is due to take place on 25 September.

10.4 A Member asked if there would be a site visit on 12 June. The Director of Planning Decisions responded that a date prior to lockdown in early June was being looked into.

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There being no other business the meeting ended at 19.23.

Signed: Chair

Date: