

**OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY
ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 51st COMMITTEE MEETING
Held on 25 August 2009 at 18.00

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

Present:

Lorraine Baldry	Chairman
David Taylor	Deputy Chairman

Local Authority Members:

Cllr Geoffrey Taylor	LB Hackney
Cllr Terry Wheeler	LB Waltham Forest
Cllr Rofique Ahmed	LB Tower Hamlets

Independent Members:

Mike Appleton
Celia Carrington
William Hodgson
Dru Vesty

Officers in attendance:

Anthony Hollingsworth	ODA Chief Planner Development Control, Planning Decisions Team
David Horkan	ODA Planning Decisions Team
Chris Lelliott	ODA Planning Decisions Team
Allan Ledden	ODA Legal Adviser, Planning Decisions Team, (Pinsent Masons)
Susan Krouwel	ODA, Committee Secretary

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

- 1.1. Apologies were received from Conor McAuley and Janice Morphet, who were not able to attend the meeting.

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

2.1. There were Updates for items 5 and 7.

Item 5 - Streetscape for zones 3-6 Athletes Village

- Response received from DfT
- Revised drawing numbers

Item 7 – Bridge E13/U05

- Amendments to the Committee Report
- Amendments to recommended conditions
- Further consultation responses

Item 6 – Stratford Box Thames Water Pumping Station was withdrawn.

2.2. The order of business was unchanged.

2.3. Representatives of the applicants had requested to speak in favour of Items 5 and 7.

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 Items 5 to 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 personal interests recorded were correct. None of the personal interests were considered prejudicial.

4. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING (AGENDA ITEM 4)

4.1. The Committee

AGREED the Minutes of the 50th Planning Committee Meeting.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

5. APPLICATION NUMBER: 08/90364/REMODA (AGENDA ITEM 5)

Streetscape for zones 3-6 Athletes Village

Application for the approval of reserved matters associated with the:

1. Layout, alignment and widths of carriageways and footways including cycleways, on street parking zones, loading bays, refuse collection zones, bus priority measures, signal controlled junctions and pedestrian crossings including siting of traffic and pedestrian crossing signals; 2. Layout of the International Station Bus Interchange to include bus manoeuvring and layover areas and taxi waiting areas; 3. Creation of finished levels for primary, secondary and tertiary roads, including any associated earthworks; 4. Location of soft landscaping and planting zones; 5. Installation of lighting including siting and height of lighting columns; and; 6. Siting of bus stops and street furniture associated with all primary, secondary and tertiary roads and the bus station within Zones 3-6. pursuant to Conditions B1 and B8 of outline planning permission 07/90023/VARODA being details of layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping.

Zones 3-6, Stratford City Development, Stratford, London E15

- 5.1. Craig Becconsall (Lend Lease) spoke in favour of the proposals on behalf of the applicant. Following the discussion of the proposal at the previous Committee meeting they had considered the Committee's concerns about the provision of off-carriageway cycleways on some roads and on-carriageway cycle lanes on others, and the detail of the junction crossings for cyclists. Four options were reviewed, set out in the addendum report, and the applicant had concluded that Option Four was the best approach. Option Four retained the off-carriageway provision, with the addition of advisory cycle routes on the carriageway. The proposals had been discussed with the London Borough of Newham, Sustrans, and the London Cycling Campaign.
- 5.2. A Planning Officer then gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report and took into account the update which had been circulated. The response from the Department for Transport requesting that the current Road Safety Audit is used to inform the final design of the bus interchange was noted.
- 5.3. The Committee noted that whilst discussion had taken place with cycling groups, there had not been time for them to respond formally to the revised proposal. The Committee raised concerns with the consequent limitations of the options appraisal, in particular that each of the comments in the Pros and Cons of each of the Options had not been addressed in the level of detail preferred (for instance what would be the impact on bus speeds identified as a Con in Option 2?) The Committee also commented that the report did not

cover their concerns about the logic and practicality of the proposed crossings as previously expressed.

- 5.4. A Committee member clarified that the concern raised has not been with the proposed provision of off-carriageway and on-carriageway cycling on different roads in itself, but with the detailed execution of the plan, which had appeared very complicated, particularly at crossings. Concerns about the practicality of the designs (such as the proximity of possible parking spaces to the proposed off carriageway cycleway and consequent conflict with vehicle users) along the Frigoscandia Way/ Second Avenue North roads, was expressed. Also, the proposed red line application boundary was such that it was unclear about what was being delivered with respect to cycle facilities just outside the site boundary, but which formed part of the overall package of streetscape/cycle provision.
- 5.5. A Planning Officer explained that a separate planning application has been submitted to cover those parts immediately to the north of Frigoscandia way. The ODA's proposals for the legacy Transformation phase treatment of the area to the north of Frigoscandia Way are also due to be submitted in due course. This would help to give a more complete picture of the plans. The Planning Officer also responded to the concerns expressed about the impact on bus speeds and stated that the crossings had been amended following the submission of the streetscape scheme to ensure a consistency and logic of design approach. Planning Officers acknowledged the concerns raised about the execution of the detailed design of the northern section of Frigoscandia Way and Second Avenue North and recommended that this could be excluded from the approval recommended for the wider streetscape scheme, with enhanced details of this part of the site coming forward via suitably worded conditions. In response to Planning Committee's concerns about ensuring that an off-carriageway scheme is implemented in full following the Games, Planning Officers confirmed that implementation could also be secured as the proposal comprises details for a scheme that had already been granted planning permission and implementation has commenced.
- 5.6. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED that:

the Committee

- i) **APPROVED** application 08/90364/REMODA for the reasons given in the report and grant full planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in the report and agreed to delegate to the Head of Development Control the power to impose a suitably worded planning condition which ensures that further details of the Frigoscandia Way/Second Avenue North are submitted for PDT's approval

6. APPLICATION NO: 09/90115/FULODA (AGENDA ITEM 6)

Erection of buildings for a water pumping station including a sample room, control room, transformer kiosk and main chamber.

- 6.1. This item had been withdrawn.

**7. APPLICATION NOs: 09/90158/REMODA and 09/90159/FULODA
(AGENDA ITEM 7)**

09/90159/FULODA

Full planning permission for the proposed refurbishment and extension of Bridge E13. Approval is sought for raising the permanent bridge surface, provision of new parapets and handrails, bridge lighting, deck surfaces, addition of temporary cantilevered extensions and installation of bollards.

09/90158/REMODA

Reserved Matters Application providing further details of Underbridge U05 in relation to design, external appearance and materials pursuant to condition OD.0.19 of the Olympic Facilities and Legacy Transformation Application (07/90010/OUMODA) and to discharge condition 1 of planning permission 08/90177/REMODA.

- 7.1. James Lough (Arup) and John Carpenter (Allies & Morrison) gave a presentation on behalf of the applicant illustrating the proposals for Underbridge U05 and Bridge E13. They explained that U05 had previously been seen and approved by the Committee, and that this was a reserved matters application. E13 was a 'slot-in' application as it was not part of the 2007 Olympic planning permissions. The land bridge L02, which had been approved in 2007 is now not to be implemented.
- 7.2. The Games condition of E13 would be a timber deck with parapets and a temporary steel deck. The spacing of the bracket design would remain the same in legacy, and the handrail would remain, as it was necessary for safety. There would be a shallow gradient that was within accessibility guidelines. The corner would have adjusted levels and a temporary deck. The width in legacy would be 11.2m.
- 7.3. A Planning Officer then gave a presentation to the Committee who considered the report and took into account the updates. The materials were consistent with others in the park, and with bridge L01 to the north, and the parapet colour was also used elsewhere on the Park. No objections had been received. The proposal for warning signs had been withdrawn. There were further conditions to come forward relating to paint samples and lighting.
- 7.4. The Committee welcomed the improvements in the design, including the removal of steps and improved parapet and transition details, and agreed that the proposed appearance of the bridge in legacy was an improvement.
- 7.5. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED unanimously that:

the Committee

- ii) **APPROVED** application 09/90159/FULODA for the reasons given in the report and grant full planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in the report and the update report; and

- iii) **APPROVED** a partial discharge of Reserved Matters for application 09/90158/REMODA for the reasons given in the report; and
- iv) **APPROVED** the discharge of condition 1 of planning permission 08/90177/REMODA for the reasons given in the report.

**8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS
(AGENDA ITEM 11)**

8.1. A Planning Officer confirmed that the next Planning Committee would include an application for hotel development in Stratford City Zone 1. There would also be briefings on the Mayor's London Housing Design Guide consultation and the Workforce Travel Survey.

8.2. The meeting on 13 October was cancelled because the Chairman and Deputy Chairman were unable to attend. A new date of 6 October was proposed, members asked for the new date and expected start time to be emailed to them.

Action: Committee Secretary

There being no other business the meeting closed at 7:25 pm

Signature

Z Beldin

Date

10/11/2009

Chair