

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

9 January 2007

AGENDA ITEM: 4

SUBJECT: **MINUTES OF 4th COMMITTEE MEETING**

Held on 12 December 2006 at 18.00

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

Present: Lorraine Baldry Chairman
David Taylor Deputy Chairman

Local Authority Members:

Cllr Rofique Ahmed – LB Tower Hamlets
Cllr Conor McAuley – LB Newham
Cllr Geoff Taylor – LB Hackney
Cllr Terry Wheeler - LB Waltham Forest

Independent Members:

Michael Appleton
William Hodgson
Janice Morphet
Dru Vesty

Officers in attendance:

Vivienne Ramsey ODA, Head of Development Control
Dawn Blackwell ODA, Legal adviser, Planning Decisions
Team, (Pinsent Masons)
Vanessa Brand ODA, Committee Secretary

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

1.1. Apologies were received from Celia Carrington who was unable to attend the meeting.

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

The Chairman drew attention to updates to the reports circulated in respect of:

Item 5

- New recommendations

Item 7

- New recommendations

There would be speakers both for and against the recommendation on Item 5

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM 3)

3.1. In respect of item 5 the following personal interests were declared. These were not prejudicial interests. The Chairman declared a personal interest as Chairman of the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation. Janice Morphet declared a personal interest relating to her daughter who is employed by a firm of solicitors acting for the Stratford City development on work not connected with that contract. David Taylor declared a personal interest in relation to his instructing Anthony Curnow of Ashursts, Solicitors who was to speak for Stratford City, in an unrelated matter.

4. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING (AGENDA ITEM 4)

4.1. The Committee:

AGREED the Minutes of the 3rd Committee meeting held on 28 November 2006

4.2. The various identified actions arising from the previous meeting were reviewed and the following points reported upon and/or noted:

4.2.1. Para 7.2 key points for consideration would be highlighted at the beginning of each paper from the new year

4.2.2. Para 7.2 officers would report back to the Committee on the result of negotiations and provide progress reports at periodic intervals on implementation and monitoring of any S106 Agreement negotiated as a result of a Committee decision.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

5. ENCLOSURE OF 320M LENGTH OF RAILWAY LINE; DEMOLITION OF POWERHOUSE BRIDGE; CONSTRUCTION OF TWO NEW BRIDGES AND INFILLING OF CHANNELSEA RIVER PLANNING APPLICATION 06/90005/FUMODA (AGENDA ITEM 5)

- 5.1. The Committee took into account the Update which had been circulated. This item had been deferred from the previous Committee Meeting to allow all parties to discuss the possibility of agreeing a solution in relation to an original Grampian condition imposed on a consent under the Transport Works Act for Stratford International Station. The Head of Development Control introduced the item and reported that it had not proved possible to reach agreement. However, London and Continental Railways, one of the joint applicants had offered to give a unilateral undertaking about the provision of an Eastern egress from the new station and the submission of details which, with the new DLR link and an agreed pedestrian route through the new Stratford City Shopping Centre, might serve to satisfy the Grampian condition on the original consent. The enclosure of the section of the line for which consent was sought required an integrated programme of works, including possession of the railway, which had been booked for January/February, and the diversion of an EDF cable. The works were critical to the construction of the Stratford City Zone 1 and to the wider Olympic programme. Officers recommended that the application be approved and that authority be delegated to the Head of Development Control to conclude negotiations on a unilateral undertaking which would ensure the design, provision, and opening of an Eastern egress from the new station to a specified timetable, and to issue the decision with the conditions set out in the report.
- 5.2. Ron Brewer of TravelWatch and Paul Bowker of Newham Borough Council, also representing Southeastern Railways, addressed the Committee. They were concerned that the original Grampian condition should be met or an appropriate alternative solution be agreed.
- 5.3. Anthony Curnow, representing Stratford City Developments Ltd addressed the Committee in support of the recommendation. The applicant recognised the concerns about the Grampian condition but was equally concerned that the timescale for possession of the railway in January/February could not be delayed without radically affecting the timing of the whole development. He supported the proposal that negotiations could be satisfactorily delegated to the Head of Development Control.

The Committee considered the report, noted the update including the revised recommendation, and took into account the representations made. The Committee were concerned that the original requirement to provide an appropriate link between Stratford International and Stratford Regional stations must be met. They noted that the proposed enclosure of the railway was incompatible with the construction of a travelator on the alignment envisaged in the original Grampian condition. Members therefore generally wished to be satisfied that a satisfactory alternative link (with initial temporary measures as necessary) would be constructed and opened to serve trains stopping at the International Station and connect to the

surrounding area, and for the Olympics. They also noted that Newham Borough Council agreed in principle to LCR offering a unilateral undertaking in place of having a Grampian condition to deal with the provision of a pedestrian link. The Committee wished to be satisfied that any undertaking would provide an appropriate alternative solution and expressed their regret that that LCR had not been represented at the meeting.

5.4. A motion was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred. There being no further questions, the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED that the Committee agreed that:

the application should be deferred

**6. UNDERTAKE EARTHWORKS AND REMEDIATION AT ARENA FIELD, EASTCROSS
PLANNING APPLICATION 06/90007/FUMODA
(AGENDA ITEM 6)**

6.1. The Committee considered the report outlining the application for the site made by London Development Agency (LDA) and the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA). The Head of Development Control introduced the item.

6.2. After discussion of the officers' report, there being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED unanimously in accordance with the recommendation that:

- a) planning permission be GRANTED as described in the report subject to the conditions and informatives set out therein; and
- b) the Reasons for Approval be AGREED

**7. MIXED USE REDEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE A 27 STOREY TOWER AND SIX STOREY STREET BUILDING WITH ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING ON THE SITE AT 80-92 HIGH STREET, STRATFORD
PLANNING APPLICATION 06/90011/FUMODA
(AGENDA ITEM 7)**

7.1. The Committee took into account the Update which had been circulated and considered the report outlining the application for the site made by Manser Homes Ltd. The Head of Development Control introduced the item.

7.2. The Committee noted that the proposed building adjoined the Olympic Park and that a condition about approval of details was proposed to safeguard the site of a possible new pedestrian bridge across the High Street and that two additional conditions were proposed to protect local residents' amenities. The application had previously been considered and approved by Newham Borough Council and in a stage 1 consultation by the GLA, but these matters remained outstanding. As the local planning authority since 7 September, ODA was now responsible for taking the application forward. The Committee were informed that the applicant was keen to implement the permission quickly and the construction work would therefore not affect the Olympic Games.

7.3. After discussion, there being no further questions, the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED in accordance with the revised recommendations but with an amended condition 1, that:

- a. the reasons for approval as set out in the Update circulated at the meeting and in the report to Newham's Development Control Committee of 19th July 2006 should be AGREED;
- b. planning permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions set out in the Update circulated at the meeting and in the report to Newham's Development Control Committee of 19th July 2006 (save as in c below), and the minutes of that meeting, and subject to completion of an agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Heds of Terms to be those set out in the report to Newham's Development Control Committee of 19th July 2006);
- c. but that condition 1 set out in the report to Newham's Development Control Committee of 19th July 2006 be amended to read

the development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than the expiration of TWO YEARS from the date of this permission

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

- d. authority be DELEGATED to the Head of Development Control to frame the detailed wording of the two additional conditions to ensure greater protection of local residents' amenities (to ensure that local residents' access is not blocked during construction, and that the contractors provide a hotline for notification of complaints)
- e. they AGREED to confirm to the Mayor of London that the ODA is minded to approve the application; and
- f. subject to any direction by the Mayor of London, authority be DELEGATED to the Head of Development Control to complete the legal agreement and issue the decision

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS (AGENDA ITEM 8)

8.1. The Committee were concerned that the illustrative and background material provided with several of the applications considered had not allowed them to understand fully the proposals and their implications. They recognised that where applications had been transferred, they should not normally reconsider the issues which had already been determined, but it was vital that they were able to take a properly considered view about applications for which they were the responsible authority. Officers must therefore obtain from applicants and display at the meeting appropriate material sufficient to locate, explain, and illustrate the proposals and any implications.

Action: Head of Development Control

8.2. The Committee noted that

- 8.2.1. further briefing sessions on future applications would assist Members to understand new applications
- 8.2.2. ODA's design review panel would comment on proposals within the Olympic Park and give independent advice to the Planning Committee
- 8.2.3. where necessary officers were seeking to ensure through discussion with statutory consultees that conditions requested were only applied to an appropriate consent and were proportionate to the works proposed.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 7.55 pm

Signed



Chairman

Date 9/1/2007