

**OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY**

**ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 53rd COMMITTEE MEETING**

Held on 06 October 2009 at 18.00

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

---

**Present:**

Lorraine Baldry                      Chairman

**Local Authority Members:**

Cllr Geoffrey Taylor      LB Hackney  
Cllr Terry Wheeler        LB Waltham Forest (Items 1-7)  
Cllr Rofique Ahmed        LB Tower Hamlets  
Cllr Conor McAuley        LB Newham

**Independent Members:**

Mike Appleton  
Janice Morphet  
Celia Carrington  
William Hodgson  
Dru Vesty

**Officers in attendance:**

Vivienne Ramsey	ODA, Head of Development Control
Anthony Hollingsworth	ODA, Chief Planner Development Control, Planning Decisions Team
Alex Savine	ODA, Planning Decisions Team
Nathan Te Pairi	ODA, Planning Decisions Team
Catherine Sherwin	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 David Taylor, who was not able to attend the meeting.

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

2.1. There was an Update for item 7.

Item 7 - 09/90182/FULODA Bridge 1

- Amendment to clearance above Network Rail Lines and therefore amendments to the footways on either side of the bridge.
- Amended recommendation requesting delegated authority to resolve the final details.

2.2. The order of business was unchanged.

2.3. Representatives of the applicants had requested to speak in favour of Items 7 and 8.

## **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 5-8.

'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 52<sup>nd</sup> Planning Committee Meeting.

- 4.2. The Chairman paid tribute to Vanessa Brand's contribution during her time as Secretary to the Committee and asked for a minute's silence to be held in her memory.

## **5. TOWER HAMLETS SUBMISSION CORE STRATEGY CONSULTATION (AGENDA ITEM 5)**

- 5.1. A Planning Officer gave a presentation to the Committee, who considered the proposed response to the consultation.
- 5.2. Members agreed with the proposed response but added that an indication of governance structures for delivering infrastructure investment in the future would be helpful in ensuring that the requirements for Fish Island would be incorporated into the process. It was considered that the delivery strategy should be included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Members also suggested that the response should question how decisions were going to be made on future infrastructure delivery beyond the initial period identified in the Delivery Plan. Members noted that the council appeared to have only held bi-lateral discussions with infrastructure providers, which meant that the potential for co-location of services may not have been fully explored. There appeared to be further potential for co-location of services in Fish Island. Members noted that the population growth model used did not appear to take into account existing capacity and provision.
- 5.3. The inclusion of a Delivery Plan in the strategy was welcomed, but it was noted that it was not sufficiently detailed for the impact on Fish Island to be fully understood. It was suggested that a distinction between schemes that are committed and funded and those that are not be made within the document. Also, any assumptions about developer funding should have been made within the context of the forthcoming introduction of new rules, which would treat developer funding as the option of last resort.
- 5.4. Members discussed the reference to a possible waste management facility being developed on Fish Island, which had been included in an earlier version of the strategy. The potentially large size of energy from waste facilities was noted, and their related traffic volumes. However, members recognised that the strategy now referred to a general waste management facility, that the Fish Island South Strategic Industrial Land area identified was generally appropriate and that its location on Fish Island was only a possibility. A Planning Officer confirmed that this was outside the ODA's area.
- 5.5. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee unanimously **RESOLVED** that:

the Committee

**AUTHORISED** the Head of Development Control to provide final written comments to the London Borough of Tower Hamlets as set out in the report, taking into account the Committee's comments and any further minor amendments considered necessary.

## 6. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MANUAL (AGENDA ITEM 6)

- 6.1. A Planning Officer gave a presentation on the proposed revisions to the Development Control Manual. Members noted the exemplary presentation of the report in particular the PDT Paper on the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and the 'Duty to Involve'.
- 6.2. Members discussed the proposal to replace the development threshold approach in the Scheme of Delegation with a more generic set of criteria relating to the significance of the development. Members requested the wording in point 2.4.1 to be amended to 'significant or potentially contentious nature'.
- 6.3. There being no further comments the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee unanimously **RESOLVED** that:

the Committee

- a) **NOTED** the Paper at Annex 1 on the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.
- b) **AGREED** the changes to the Scheme of Delegation in Appendix D of the Development Control Manual as set out at Annex 3 of the report and **AUTHORISED** the Head of Development Control to report the agreed amended Scheme of Delegation to the ODA Board for its approval.
- c) **AGREED** the updated Development Control Manual in Annex 4.
- d) **DELEGATED** authority to the Head of Development Control to make any consequential or minor changes to the Development Control Manual.

## 7. 09/90182/FULODA BRIDGE 1 (AGENDA ITEM 7)

Construction of pedestrian footbridge to the north of the existing Temple Mill Lane Bridge.

*Temple Mill Lane, Stratford City, Northern Access Footbridge, Stratford, London E15*

- 7.1. Martin Knight (Knight Associates) spoke in favour of the proposals on behalf of the applicant. He explained that Network Rail had recently increased the required clearance by approximately 300mm, to 5.5m. To achieve the increased clearance the bridge would need to be raised on the western side by approximately 1m.
- 7.2. A Planning Officer gave a presentation on the proposal, explaining that provision for cyclists had been added to the bridge in the eastbound direction, to address concerns that had been raised by a number of parties regarding cycle safety.

- 7.3. Members welcomed the improved design of the bridge. The potential impact of the raising of the level of the bridge at the western end, in terms of both accessibility and design, was discussed. The applicant explained that they had not been able to provide drawings of the tilted bridge due to time limitations (Network Rail has only very recently requested the additional 300mm height). The applicant also explained that the level difference when expressed over the 40m length of the bridge was unlikely to be perceptible with respect to the deck surface. The tipping of the bridge could result in a revised design that would be asymmetrical, with a slight curve. The level on the west side was flexible, which would help to achieve the required height. Officers confirmed that in accordance with the update report, they were seeking delegated authority to consider the amended design, if Members were satisfied with the overall design and appearance of the bridge. Members requested that officers in particular ensure that the parapet elements retain their vertical expression.
- 7.4. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee unanimously **RESOLVED** that:

the Committee

- a) **DELEGATED** authority to the Head of Development Control to approve the application for full planning permission, following receipt of satisfactory amended plans to show the full extent of revised footway approaches to the west and east of Bridge 1 and subject to there being no substantive objections to these amendments arising from consultation undertaken following submission.
- b) **DELEGATED** authority to the Head of development Control to make any consequential or necessary changes to the recommended conditions and informatives as outlined in the Committee report as a result of the amended plans.

*Cllr Terry Wheeler left the meeting.*

**8. 09/90115/FULODA – STRATFORD BOX THAMES WATER PUMPING STATION (AGENDA ITEM 8)**

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

*Olympic Park PDZ 9 Stratford Box, North Of The Lea Curve And South West Of The Balancing Pond.*

- 8.1. Neil Young (John Lyall Architects) spoke in favour of the proposals on behalf of the applicant. He confirmed that the proposal was part of a network of new pumping stations in the Lee Valley designed to augment water supply during drought conditions. The pumping station had been broken down into a number of structures to minimise its impact on the open surroundings. He explained that the design had been altered so that the buildings had less rigid geometry, and they had been reduced in size. The nature of the design meant that no security fence would be required. The brickwork would provide surface patterning through the use of bricks with a glossy finish, which would reflect the light, and bricks with a matt finish.

8.2. A Planning Officer gave a presentation, explaining that the site, which was Metropolitan Open Land, Green Space to be Protected and a Site of Nature Conservation Importance as designated in the LB Newham UDP. It had been chosen after a sequential analysis of available sites around the CTRL box had been undertaken, which had not identified any other suitable sites. The officer explained that the very special circumstances to justify development in MOL were set out clearly in the report. In addition, Grampian conditions were recommended which appropriately secured off-site ecology mitigation and open space provision within the Olympic Park. A financial contribution had been sought from the applicant in lieu of off-site provision of open space in the Stratford City development. This was fully explained in the report and is proposed to be secured by unilateral undertaking.. It was explained that agreement had not yet been reached on the level of the applicant's financial contribution, but that officers were confident of doing so. However, should the final sum offered by the applicant not be agreeable to officers, then the application would be brought back to the Committee for resolution...

8.3. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED that:

the Committee

a) **APPROVED** the application for the reasons given in the report and granted planning permission subject to:

(i) the satisfactory completion of a unilateral undertaking under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to deal with the matters set out at section 6.13.7 of the report;

(ii) the conditions and informatives identified in the report.

## 9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS (AGENDA ITEM 9)

9.1. The next Committee meeting would be on 27 October. The briefing session would start at 3:15pm and include a Project Update from ODA Design and Regeneration, a presentation on progress on the sustainability Annual Monitoring Report, and a presentation from LOCOG on their proposed 'kit of parts' and the village overlay.

9.2. Members requested that the drawings in reports be larger, preferably one to a page.

*There being no other business the meeting closed at 7:30pm.*

Signature



Date 10/11/2009

Chair