OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY
Planning Decisions Team

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: **MINUTES OF 98th COMMITTEE MEETING**
Held on 25 September 2012 18.00

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

Independent Members:

Mike Appleton
Celia Carrington
William Hodgson
Janice Morphet
Dru Vesty

Officers in attendance:

Vivienne Ramsey	ODA, Director of Planning Decisions
Anthony Hollingsworth	ODA, Chief Planner Development Control, Planning Decisions Team
James Lockerbie	ODA Legal Adviser, Planning Decisions Team (Pinsent Masons)
Saba Master	ODA Board Secretary

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 The order of business was unchanged.

2.2 There were requests to speak from Ted Allett, OPTEMS Chairman, for Item 5.

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 and 6.

'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?'

The remaining 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 97th Planning Committee Meeting.

4.2 Action point 4.1 – The Director of Planning Decisions presented a proposal to the Planning Committee, prior to the final meeting. The Committee have provided comment on the proposal to the Director of Planning Decisions.

4.3 Agenda Item 6- Gainsborough School Pedestrian Bridge – The Director of Planning Decisions reported that this item had been deferred as there was no agreed solution. LLDC have had further discussions with residents; have met with English Heritage to look at different options and; have met with

Gainsborough School about the ramp issue and the reduction of car parking space. As of yet there is no revised proposal.

5. Submission of 2012 Olympic Park Transport and Environmental Management Strategy (OPTEMS) pursuant to Schedule 4 of the September 2007 section 106 agreement.

5.1 Ted Allett, Chairman of OPTEMS, gave a presentation. He reminded the Committee that the 2007 Olympic Park planning application included a Transport Assessment. Section 106 required the ODA to pay a £20m contribution to ensure the operation of OPTEMS. The 2007/8 OPTEMS established to mitigate the predicted Transportation Effects pre-Games and through the Legacy Transformation Phase.

5.2 Ted Allett went through the timeline of the four previous strategies and explained that Appendix E showed the schemes at the various stages:

- **2008 -** establishment of the procedures/proforma etc.
- **2009** – 28 schemes approved totalling £11.4m which included the TfL SCOOT programme at £3.7m.
- **2010** – 16 of the 28 approved in detail at a cost of £5.8m.
- **2011** – 12 schemes totalling £5.3m added to the programme.

5.3 In addition, a graph was shown which represented the use of funds, (not in the main report), from the amount approved in principle, the amount for administration and the remaining amount.

5.4 The funding position, as of July 2012, is that approximately £16.9m of funding had been approved, in principle, by the OPTEMS Group for the programme of schemes brought forward from the 2011. This represented an increase from the £16.3 approved, in principle, in the 2011 Strategy.

5.5 In conclusion, Ted Allett reported that the next steps would comprise of bringing forward detailed cost plans for schemes approved in principle only; implementing schemes and reporting progress (and in particular to report schemes that would not be proceeding); managing the migration of OPTEMS from the ODA to LLDC and; to produce an exit strategy to prepare for handover to the Legacy Transport Group.

5.6 A PDT Officer gave a presentation and reported that the framework of the OPTEMS Group is to identify and take forward mitigation measures required, as set out as an obligation in Schedule 4 to the section 106 agreement. In addition, OPTEMS will address the Transportation Effects which is a requirement of the OPTEMS contribution of £20m to be paid by the ODA. There have been four previous OPTEMS strategies.

5.7 The PDT Officer went through the OPTEMS 2012 Strategy and highlighted the following:

- The 2012 Strategy provides a status report on the 36 schemes included in the 2011 Strategy and an additional urgent scheme by LB Newham which was approved funding post 2011 Strategy.

- Due to the uncertainties around sufficient third party funding coming forward and allocation of funds, the Group decided not to commit or reserve funds for a possible further extension of the Cycle Hire Scheme into the Olympic Park and surrounding areas.

- At the end of July, approximately £16.9m of funding had been approved in principle by OPTEMS for the programme of schemes brought forward from the 2011 Strategy (up by £0.6m).

- At the end of July, £12m of expenditure had been committed towards 33 out of the 37 programmed schemes (of which £7.3m has been spent).

- 24 schemes have been completed and 3 feasibility studies have been completed. In addition, 10 other schemes will be completed by early 2014.

5.8 The PDT Officer showed the Committee photographs of various completed schemes and reported that there would be 12 new schemes in 2012 aimed at improving connectivity to and from the Olympic Park for pedestrians, cyclists and buses. A map showed the location of the schemes across the 4 boroughs; LB Hackney – 4 schemes; LB Newham – 4 schemes; LB Tower Hamlets – 3 schemes; and LB Waltham Forest – 1 scheme.

5.9 The four host borough, Royal Borough of Greenwich, TfL and LTGDC were all consulted. Approval was given by the Group subject to limited changes discussed at the August, (update of Strategy to reflect latest funding position and provide the ODA with photographs of completed schemes), and September, (final version submitted prior to submission to PDT), OPTEMS meetings. It was considered unnecessary for PDT to further consult the OPTEMS Member organisations on the submitted Strategy due to the extensive input from and consultation with OPTEMS Members in the formation of the Strategy and Member satisfaction with the draft 2012 Strategy at the August and September meetings.

5.10 The PDT Officer reported that the key considerations of the OPTEMS Strategy were as follows:

- The requirements of Schedule 4 had been met.

- The 2011 programmed schemes progressed with £16.9m of committed expenditure.

- Condition OD.0.43 can be discharged

- 12 new schemes at £2.6m

- Approximately £2m in contingency remains

- The administration funding of £1.1m is to be released,

- PDT Officers are satisfied with OPTEMS transfer to LLDC.

5.11 In conclusion, PDT believes that the 2012 OPTEMS Strategy complies with the requirements in paragraph 6.2, Schedule 4, of the section 106 agreement for an annual Strategy, and contains the necessary information. The implemented schemes have focussed on improving connectivity to and from the Olympic Park with some schemes close to the Park boundary such as Dace Road, Monier Road and LB Newham's Park access scheme (N26). The PDT Officer reminded the Committee that with planning permission for the Legacy Communities Scheme likely to be granted at the end of September, subject to many conditions and a section 106 agreement, the Legacy Transport Group (LTG) that is intended to be established will take over the role and responsibilities of OPTEMS as well as its own additional obligations. PDT will continue to work with OPTEMS in its role at the LLDC to ensure a smooth transition.

5.12 A member asked if the Hackney Wick scheme would be developed or if the funding would be allocated to an alternative road scheme. Ted Allett explained that LB Hackney had asked for £1-2m additional funds and although OPTEMS are supporters of this scheme an additional £1-2m is deemed excessive.

5.13 A member pointed out that that although the work OPTEMS has undertaken covers a wide area the majority of the public are unaware that the schemes are related to the Olympic Games. It was agreed that the Director of Planning Decisions would forward this concern to LLDC and that street signage would be erected as appropriate to events.

5.14 A member expressed concern that although connectivity has been addressed to some extent, the North East section of the Olympic Park still required attention and questioned whether funding would be available for the Leyton Mils development. In addition, the member pointed out that section 106 funding remained available for Lea Bridge Station and whether OPTEMS be looking to support this project. Ted Allett explained that OPTEMS have supported the project from other routes and that Lea Bridge Station was not a priority for OPTEMS.

5.15 A member requested clarification on how demands from the Masterplanners going forward would be accommodated. The LTG Chair reported that the LTG would have a similar role to OPTEMS and that LTG would be responsible for spending the remainder of the funding with any balance of funding transferred to LTG.

5.16 The Chair of the Planning Committee, on behalf of the ODA and the Planning Committee, thanked Ted Allett and his team for all his hard work on the OPTEMS Strategy.

5.17 There being no further questions, the Committee took a vote and unanimously voted to:

APPROVE the submitted 2012 Strategy.

6. Summary of activities of the Planning Committee and PDT Officers since September 2006.

6.1 The Director of Planning Decisions introduced this item and reported that a similar report was being presented to the ODA Board at its September 2012

meeting. As this was the final meeting of the ODA Planning Committee it was deemed more appropriate for the Planning Committee to receive a report similar to the Board report summarising the work of the LPA since September 2006.

6.2 The Director of Planning Decisions reported that Appendices 1, 2 and 3 gave a summary of the Committee and PDT activity from September 2006 until mid September 2012. Since September 2006 the Planning Committee have met 98 times to consider planning applications as well as reports on other matters, such as agreeing comments on Host Boroughs emerging development plan documents. The Planning Committee received 277 reports with around 2600 applications decided. The Planning Committee has also met for briefings and site visits on 104 occasions.

6.3 The Director of Planning Decisions thanked the Planning Committee for its continuing support to PDT and that it was to the Committee's credit that whilst always mindful of the Olympic Act and the programme imperatives of the project the Committee has not been content to accept poor design and also sought to ensure quality of details and outcome. The Director of Planning Decisions believed that the right balance was found by the Committee between facilitating the momentum of the project overall whilst being robust in its views and seeking to influence the detailed design at an early stage so as to improve the outcomes. In particular the Committee was particularly consistent in connectivity, design and legacy issues.

6.4 On behalf of the Planning Committee, a member expressed thanks to the Director of Planning Decisions, PDT and Pinsent Masons for their continued hard work. The member pointed out that the items started at the Planning Committee would now be adopted as common practice and the Committee/PDT need to be recognised in the innovation of this process.

6.5 The Chair of the Planning Committee also expressed thanks to the Director of Planning Decisions, the Chief Planner of Development Control and PDT. The Chair highlighted the work over the past 6 years, the amount of reports produced and read. The Chair commended all those present at the Committee meeting and wished them all the best for their future endeavours.

7. Any Other Business

7.1 There being no other business the Chairman, for the last time, called the meeting to an end.

The meeting ended at 18.40.

Signature  Date 21/5/2013

Chair