

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF 64th COMMITTEE MEETING
Held on 27 April 2010 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 Rofique Ahmed	LB Tower Hamlets (for items 1-5)
Cllr Conor McAuley	LB Newham

Independent Members:

Mike Appleton
Celia Carrington
William Hodgson
Janice Morphet
Dru Vesty

Officers in attendance:

Vivienne Ramsey	ODA, Head of Development Control.
Anthony Hollingsworth	ODA, Chief Planner Development Control, Planning Decisions Team
Richard Ford	ODA Legal Adviser, Planning Decisions Team (Pinsent Masons)
Saba Master	Committee Secretary

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

1.1. There were apologies from Cllr Terry Wheeler, LB Waltham Forest.

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

2.1. There were updates for Items 5, 6, 7 and 8.

2.2. The order of business was unchanged.

2.3. There were requests to speak from:

Item 5:

Tom Bogdanowicz – London Cycling Campaign
Mark Harton – Manor Garden Society
Nick Williams – LB Newham 2012 Unit
Owen Whalley – LB Tower Hamlets, Head of Planning
David Rossi – Eastway users Group
Alison Nimmo – Olympic Delivery Authority
Andrew Altman – Olympic Park Legacy Company

Item 6:

Selina Mason – Olympic Delivery Authority

Item 7:

Tom Bogdanowicz – London Cycling Campaign
Owen Whalley – LB Tower Hamlets, Head of Planning (in the event did not take up the agreement to speak on this item)
Selina Mason, Olympic Delivery Authority

Item 8:

Craig Becconsall (Lend Lease) & Nick Hughes (Vogt)

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 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 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 other personal interests recorded 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 63rd Planning Committee Meeting. A Member of the Committee requested that for future Minutes when comments commending a proposed development are made by Members of the Planning Committee in consideration of a planning application, that these should also be minuted.

5. 09/90408/AODODA, 09/9049/AODODA, 09/90410/FUMODA, 09/904011/ADODA, 09/90412/ADODA, 09/90420/AODODA, 09/90434/AODODA, 09/90435/AODODA, 09/90436/AODODA, 10/90015/AODODA, 10/90105/AODODA, 10/90106/AODODA, Olympic Park, Parklands and Public Realm – Post Games Transformation (AGENDA ITEM 5)

Parklands and public realm for the post-Games Transformation phase, including surface water drainage, earthworks, hard and soft landscaping, allotments, cycle circuit and mountain bike trails, street furniture and car parking.

5.1 A PDT Officer reported on the twelve (11 no. discharge of conditions and 1 no. 'slot-in' application for planning permission) related planning applications for the transformation of the Parkland and Public Realm (PPR) after the close of the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

5.2 Collectively these planning applications would provide 60.2 hectares of the total proposed required quantum of 102ha of Legacy Open Space within the Park, as set out in the 2007 Olympic, Paralympic Facilities and their Legacy Transformation planning permission. The proposal included the one mile road cycle circuit and 6.5km of mountain bike tracks and trails, but did not, at this stage include the detailed designs for approved BMX circuit. The scheme also proposed 2.1hectares of allotments, split between two sites (PDZ7 in the north of the Park and PDZ8 in the south), new and modified bridges and underpasses to accommodate the road cycle circuit and the landscape works which would both retain those soft landscaped areas provided for Games and new areas of parkland and planting following the removal of Games phase concourse. It was explained that the transformation works would commence following the Games and that the applicant anticipated that initial areas of the Olympic Park would be opened up to the public in May 2013.

- 5.3 The PDT officer explained that a number of consultation responses had been received on the applications and that these were set out in an appendix to the report. The principal issues raised by consultees were explained when the Officer presented the key issues for consideration. These included the principle of the development and its relationship to the 2007 Olympic and Legacy Facilities planning permission; the design and appearance of the park, including the facilities considered necessary to support a future public park; the proposed large area of concourse proposed for PDZ2 and its likely future use; interim landscape zones and in particular the requirement for landscaping to development platform edges; the landscaping proposed at bridge F10; the issues associated with both the road cycle circuit and the mountain bike trails, including issues of connectivity and accessibility to the parkland adjoining these facilities; allotment provision and retention; lighting of the park and public realm; provision for pedestrian and cycle routes and how these linked with routes outside the Park; Biodiversity (the scheme provides 37.2 hectares of the required 45 hectares of habitat required by the 2007 planning permission); sustainability; and management and maintenance of the Park during post games transformation phase.
- 5.4 The PDT Officer concluded that the applications were recommended for approval, with a comprehensive list of conditions, including Grampian conditions, which appropriately addressed the concerns raised by consultees and PDT as well as requiring further details of the proposed designs.
- 5.5 The following Speakers addressed the Committee in objection to the recommendation:
- 5.6 Tom Bogdanowicz, London Cycling Campaign, gave a presentation. In particular LCC would like to see the adoption of the UK and TfL standards for facility design in the Park; requested that the ODA seek the review and approval of the existing designs by the Cycling England and TfL teams; a commitment should be given by the ODA to a modal share for cycling which is comparable with that of the LB Hackney (8%); more cycle parking in line with TfL Guidance should be provided at venues to cater for events; the adoption of a 20mph speed limit in the park; and the best use made of the specified urban design guidance and non-motorised user safety audits. He sought a deferral of the applications to allow this to be done.
- 5.7 Mark Harton, Elected Chair of the Manor Garden Society, gave a presentation. Their concerns included that the Local Authorities had originally stated in the first planning permission for the Games that the requirements of the Manor Garden Society would be fulfilled in legacy, with permanent allotments of an equivalent or better size and quality but they saw a failure by the ODA to follow this principle. They also felt that consultation with MGS by the ODA had been inadequate; raised concerns that the allotments proposed were split into two sites given that the Society is close knit; cited concerns about statutory protection for the allotments and the need for local authorities to make allotment provision. There were also concerns regarding the proposed wind turbine site which is adjacent to the allotment area and sought further work from the ODA to be clear that there would be no health risks due to exposure. It was also stated that the proposed enclosure to the Eton Manor allotment site would not be adequate to ensure the necessary seclusion for allotment holders and that a boundary wall, similar to that previously at the site, rather than a fence is preferred.

5.8 Nick Williams, Director of LB Newham 2012 Unit, gave a presentation. He stated that LB Newham is not objecting to the applications but requested that they be deferred. He questioned why there were gaps relating to maintenance depots, children's areas, toilet facilities, cafes and related facilities necessary to support a park of the size proposed, which made the applications incomplete. As there was no apparent urgency to start the work these could be designed and included within the scheme submitted for approval.. Secondly, as there has, as yet, been no public consultation regarding the Mayor's Visitor Attraction; the Arcelormittal Orbit, he stated that the implications of the impact of the visitor flows on the Park area could not be taken into account and properly planned for. He stated that it would be sensible to defer the application in order to scrutinise the Arcelormittal Orbit at the same time. Thirdly, and the main objective of LB Newham, was the future operation of the main stadium island which they saw as vital to the Park. Granting consent when the future use of the stadium was unclear was risky and did not conform to the IAAF requirements for a warm-up track within walking distance of the stadium would be premature. Clarity was necessary on the stadium use and the implications that this might have for the re-engineering of the southern part of the Park to accommodate such use, before a decision should be taken.. LB Newham did not feel the application delivered a Park in a way that most visitors would understand was typical of a Park,. This is an essential place making element.

5.9 Owen Whalley, LB Tower Hamlets, reported that the Borough supports overall regeneration of the Park but had major concerns about these applications. Firstly, the residents to the west of the Park would be disadvantaged due to a lack of connectivity as certain bridges were no longer coming forward, and the Borough had therefore developed an alternative connectivity and way finding map showing routes they wished to see brought forward. Secondly, the proposals lacked the necessary facilities to make the Park meet the Metropolitan Open Land designation requirements (a concern shared by LB Newham and LB Hackney) and does not comply with the London Plan 2008 or the draft Plan 2009. Thirdly, there has been a failure to deal with the temporary use/landscaping of development platforms. It was not acceptable for the development platform sites to be hoarded up with no public access. There was a missed opportunity to use the areas as temporary open spaces. It was stated that the determination of the applications should be deferred as without the details above being fixed and detailed designs included, determination would be premature.

5.10 The following Speakers made representations in support of the recommendation:

5.11 David Rossi, Eastway Users Group, reported that the former users of the Eastway were in favour of the applications as it would mean a proper legacy facility, with clear boundaries to allow cycle racing to have priority on public spaces and take cycle complexities into account.

5.12 Alison Nimmo, ODA, and Andrew Altman, OPLC gave a joint presentation. Alison Nimmo reported that the applications were necessarily a work in progress due to the nature and speed of the applications and the desirability of fixing some parameters for both detailed design work to commence and as a baseline for the OPLC's Legacy Masterplan Framework. The £350m allocated budget also would be unlocked for detailed design and implementation work as

a result of the applications being approved, rather than being potentially used as contingency. They felt that an appropriate balance between the requirements of pedestrians and of cyclists had been achieved and that there would be ongoing engagement with key stakeholders on the detail design. Funding for the Park facilities had been secured and detailed design work could now commence. It was acknowledged that this was a key missing piece in the application but that the ODA was willing to be bound by the recommended conditions requiring these facilities. Andrew Altman reported that the OPLC had worked closely with the ODA on the application to provide a solid baseline for the future of the Park. This was a phased process and it was fundamental to secure the application now to assist the delivery of the Legacy timetable.

- 5.13 Members asked when further detail in relation to the Legacy use of the Stadium and the Park would be coming forward and why the application could not be deferred until then. Andrew Altman reported that OPLC was working on its masterplan review and that they hoped to be in a position to fix further work during the course of this year with a decision on the stadium expected by April 2011 as an indicative deadline date.
- 5.14 Members asked for clarity on the use of Grampian Conditions. PDT Officers reported that Grampian conditions meant that as well as a requirement to do something there was a restriction that unless something happens, something else cannot go forward. Grampian conditions have been selectively used as a mechanism to reinforce a condition requirement when a matter was particularly strategically important to secure. PDT officers had raised the prospect of securing relevant 'Grampian' requirements by section 106 agreement to allow a more sophisticated approach to be taken, but both the ODA and OPLC had confirmed that it would not be prepared to do this.
- 5.15 PDT Officers clarified that the ArcelorMittal Orbit location was within the PDZ2 area. PDZ2 and its future interim use and temporary and permanent landscape treatment was governed by a recommended Grampian condition
- 5.16 Members asked for clarification to if they were agreeing the amount of hard standing or not. PDT Officers confirmed that on the face of it they were but subject to a condition in relation to temporary and permanent provision which would enable a reduction of the amount of hard standing. However, it could not yet be determined how much less retained concourse is necessary for future removal until clarity is provided by the OPLC on its interim use strategy for this area.. Members asked that it be made specific that no approval was given to the amount of hardstanding shown on the plans to date. It was agreed by PDT officers that this could be further clarified in the permission/conditions.
- 5.17 Members asked whether the issue of securing finance for the scheme as stated by the applicant in its presentation, was a material consideration for the Committee. PDT's Legal advisor confirmed that the delivery of the proposals, including the funding for them was a material consideration, but the weight to be given to this consideration was for the Committee to determine.
- 5.18 Members asked which condition was dealing with the detail of the mountain bike track which extends into East marsh along the River Lea tow path. A PDT Officer confirmed that there are conditions which deal with issues of details of the trails (in particular PGT.71) and if there wasn't sufficient detail of the design of this area this could be clarified in the condition.

- 5.19 Members asked about the provision for cycling facilities in light of the comments made by LCC. Officers confirmed that in this application and those transformation streets proposals reported later on the agenda, PDT had pushed the applicant design team regarding cycling issues and compliance with standards. In terms of LCC comments, on-street demarcated lanes would be compliant with TfL cycle design standards and on cycle parking provision at venues, these were in excess of London Plan standards. It was acknowledged that the provision for cycle parking at venues did not meet the provision in the TfL design guidance for full capacity events, but that this could be secured if appropriate as part of the venue event management plans and venue travel plans required by the conditions on the 2007 planning permission..
- 5.20 Members asked why parameters were being required of the YO3 Bridge and why had it not yet been designed in detail. A PDT Officer replied that the approach to seeking approval for parameters and then preparing detailed designs was consistent with the process followed for other bridges within the Olympic Park. . Members concern about the apparent 'over-engineered' parameters sought for approval was noted and this issue would be followed up with the applicant in the detailed design discussions to follow in response to the recommended condition which requires approval of the final design of this cycle bridge. A Member confirmed support for the officers' comments on the appearance of bridge Y01 and the need for further deign enhancement which is a requirement of the recommended conditions.
- 5.21 Members asked about clarity on the boundary screening and the quality of the soil for the allotment areas and what is the statutory position regarding protection of the allotments. A PDT Officer reported that the ODA were remediating the soil to an acceptable standard and this was governed by condition. In relation to screening, although privacy and seclusion were important factors at Eton Manor there was a move away from having it surrounded by a wall. The allotments are proposed to be set back from Temple Mills Lane by a landscaped bund and in addition, the ODA was committed to undertake more hedge planting inside the fence line to both soften the appearance of the fence and provide seclusion for the allotments..
- 5.22 In relation to statutory protection, the PDT Legal officer explained that the position was that prior to the bid the pre-existing allotments were not statutorily protected and the land where the allotments are shown in this application are not currently owned by the Local Authority so are also not statutorily protected. However, there was a condition requiring long term management and maintenance, including the long term future of the allotments, to be provided by the end of 2012. In practice, this is likely to be included in the LMF application. At that time, planning mechanisms could be considered to secure the long term maintenance of the allotments if that should be desired.
- 5.23 Members asked if the LB Tower Hamlets issues regarding severance be resolved through condition. PDT Officers referred members to the Corporate Commitment letter submitted by the OPLC which confirms its intentions to comply with the requirements of the 2007 Olympic planning permissions which are that three highway bridges are provided in the Legacy phase. Officers explained that for the post Games transformation phase, it was agreed in 2007 that three pedestrian and cycle bridges would be provided across the Lee Navigation. This is secured by condition and ODA and OPLC has confirmed

that it will comply with details of the bridges to be delivered by the ODA to be submitted to PDT for approval at the end of May this year. Regarding connectivity issues generally, Officers confirmed that a comprehensive assessment has been made of the proposals against the 2007 commitments and the scheme is generally compliant. Where departures are proposed these have been carefully considered and either meet or exceed the connectivity requirements set by the 2007 permission.

- 5.24 Members questioned whether the Park appeared to be designed as a coherent piece and whether the concept of a functioning park was absent in the proposals. PDT officers explained that although there were 12 different applications, the park and public realm proposals had been designed coherently and consistently and that this included the highways application reported later on the agenda. It was acknowledged though that the design is still something of a work in progress, but where there are gaps or elements of the scheme which are unsatisfactory, such as PDZ2 and the park facilities, these are suitably secured by condition.
- 5.25 Members discussed the possible implications of deferral of the applications in terms of the risk to funding for the Park and whether there was a strong timing reason not to wait until further design work had been undertaken in order to ensure that full value for public money was secured. Some Members indicated that whilst there was a lot to commend in the applications, the issue of whether there were benefits in deferring a decision for a period was key.
- 5.26 PDT officers confirmed that there was sufficient within the applications and conditions to recommend that the applications could be determined. The benefit of maintaining momentum in the delivery of a large redevelopment project was emphasised and that in light of comments by the OPLC in terms of the future use of the stadium and LMF, deferral of the application for a short period of say 3-6 months would not have any clear benefit.
- 5.27 Members asked whether the objecting Boroughs had taken into account the risks of deferral in terms of funding. The Borough representatives responded that there was no certainty on this but re-iterated their concerns nonetheless. Some Members pointed out that any new administration would be looking to cut budgets and to this degree there was some urgency to proceed. A firm business case would be required to present to Treasury to ensure funding.
- 5.28 Members asked questions regarding the development platform hoardings. A PDT Officer reported that a condition had been proposed and this dovetails with the 2007 s.106 requirement for landscaping of the development platforms to be undertaken as appropriate. In terms of interim uses of the development platforms, PDT officers confirmed that this was not included either in the 2007 applications or this set of applications. This would come forward as part of the LMF proposals. If an interim use was subsequently applied for which was not supported, it could be refused. The OPLC confirmed that this will be addressed in the LMF and the temporary uses strategy.
- 5.29 It was agreed that condition no PGT 77 (as set out in the Update to members) regarding PDZ2 should be revised to incorporate a requirement to require the approval of the local planning authority to the final quantum of concourse to be retained in PDZ2; that PGT.71 on Cycle Track and Mountain Bike Trails should require details of the mountain bike trail as it relates to the East Marsh link

along the east bank of the River Lee; and that the requirement for landscape details shall be added to the requirements in PGT.84 (as set out in the Update) concerning Allotments. Members also agreed that with respect to the long term management and maintenance of the Park, any future submissions pursuant to conditions on this issue should be submitted alongside the LMF and should also included in its scope the undeveloped development platforms. Officers confirmed that this would be dealt with by way of an Informative..

5.30 There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee unanimously AGREED that:

the Committee

- i) **DELEGATED AUTHORITY** to the Head of Development control to grant planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out and discharged or partially discharge the conditions set out and in the Update Report, subject to any consequential or necessary changes and amendments to the recommended conditions.
- ii) **AGREED** the conditions and reasons for approval for the slot-in application as set out and any amendments included in the Update Report and in accordance with the requests by Members at the Committee meeting (as identified in paragraph 5.29 above).

6. 10/90057/AODODA UDLF Transformation Streetscape Components Appendix (AGENDA ITEM 6)

Urban Design and Landscape Framework Transformation Streetscape Components Appendix document submitted pursuant to Condition 2 of approval of details 08/90196/AODODA dated 27 May 2009.

- 6.1. A PDT Officer explained that the submitted UDLF Transformation Streetscape document accompanied the application reported later on the agenda for post Games transformation streets. It sets out the design intent and component elements for the transformation streetscape. The Officer explained that the key considerations were those of the detailed design and specification of materials; design quality and integration with Transformation Park and Public Realm; and consideration against relevant technical and design guidance for streets, including the DfT's Manual for Streets, TfLs Streetscape Guidance document the OITAA Technical Guide and host Borough guidance. The issue of street tree provision was also presented as was the content of the Update report covering comments from LB Waltham Forest and that the recommendation be amended to refer to the February 2010 rather than January 2010 version of the document.
- 6.2. Selina Mason, ODA Design and Regeneration, gave a presentation. She reported that the UDLF and the proposals for streetscape character and design intent within it had been prepared in conjunction with the Park and Public Realm, Olympic Village and Westfield design teams, in order to ensure a coherence of design approach and specification of components including street lighting and furniture.

- 6.3. Members questioned the proposed amount of asphalt that would be used. A PDT Officer reported that asphalt was an acceptable surface in difficult conditions and that it was included in many of the Borough's guidance. However, the proposed extent of asphalt use within the Park was still to be determined as its use was not considered to be appropriate in all of the areas currently proposed, principally Temple Mills Lane. This was one of the issues to be resolved as set out in the recommendation. Officers referred Members to Appendix 2 which provides extracts from relevant Borough streetscape guidance.
- 6.4. PDT officers explained that it was intended to secure the additional information or amendments to the document to cover the points set out in the recommendation. A final version of the document would then be issued for approval. Officers assured the Committee that the references to 'adequate' in the points in the Recommendation did not imply a lesser quality of material would be acceptable.
- 6.5. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee unanimously RESOLVED that:

the Committee:

DELEGATE APPROVAL of the February 2010 Transformation Streetscape Components UDLF Appendix document to the Head of Development Control subject to the receipt of further information which addresses the points set out in the Recommendation contained in the report and Update report.

7. 09/90417/ADODA Legacy Transformation Highways (AGENDA ITEM 9)

Partial discharge of conditions LTD.18 and LTD.19 of planning permission 07/90010/OUMODA (Olympic Facilities and their Legacy Transformation Planning Application) and discharge of condition LOD.2 of planning permission 08/90194/FULODA (Olympic Loop Road) for the construction of Legacy PDZ's 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 15

- 7.1 A PDT Officer presented the application. The proposal was for a partial discharge of conditions LTD.18 and LTD.19 of planning permission 07/90010/OUMODA and discharge of condition LOD.2 of planning permission 08/90194/FULODA (Olympic Loop Road) for the construction of Legacy Transformation Highways development in accordance with the plans and details submitted with the application. The application proposals sought the approval of the highway layout; the alignment, materials and finishes of footways, cycleways and shared surfaces; and the alignment and details of verges. Officers were recommending approval for the proposals subject to conditions regarding the future provision of road L03, securing the provision of SCOOT technology at relevant junctions to enhance capacity at peak periods; White Post Lane Bridge Upgrade; Landscaping to E28 Link; and reserving the final details and specification of the surface finishes to footpaths and cycleways.
- 7.2 Tom Bogdanowicz, London Cycle Campaign (LCC), speaking against the recommendation, stated that consultation with Safer London could be undertaken to determine if the Roundabout and the Left hand Loop was

agreeable. He recommended that the proposals be reviewed in detail by Cycling England.

- 7.3 Selina Mason, ODA, reported that the ODA was working with LCC regarding the connectivity of the cycle network and would take forward a further detailed design within the parameters agreed. Potential Bus stop locations were being investigated, in relation to the 2007 application.
- 7.4 Members asked what guarantee the Bus Operator had provided to ensure their buses would operate. The applicant team reported that there had been extensive discussions with TfL, Westfield and Stratford City. PDT officers confirmed that there was section 106 funding for services in the post games transformation phase Routes have been identified and it was TfL's decision as to which routes would be used. No guarantee could be given that Operators would definitely operate the buses but there was every reason to suppose they would wish to, particularly given the extent of funding negotiated with the assistance of TfL for bus services in both the Olympic and Stratford City 106 agreements.
- 7.5 Members questioned the appropriateness of the Roundabout at Temple Mills and whether it should be removed. A PDT Officer confirmed that the proposed cycle lane around the roundabout could be reviewed again. The roundabout itself has been approved for Games phase use. The applicant design team confirmed that an initially intended signalised junction at this location north of the velodrome was no longer capable of implementation due to the presence of utilities infrastructure. Work had been done to avoid the inclusion of a roundabout but on safety grounds, this was the only acceptable solution. It was agreed that this issue should not be progressed.
- 7.6 A PDT officer confirmed that LB Tower Hamlets comments regarding the quality of the Kings Yard access road (road E28) had been addressed. The road is constrained by retaining structures and a footway is only possible on the east side of the road. Landscaping proposals, secured by condition, would ensure that there would not be any highway barriers to the back edge of the footway and given that this is a largely temporary road pending long term resolution via a new road at L03, officers are content both with accessibility and quality of streetscape in this location.
- 7.7 There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee unanimously AGREED that:

the Committee:

- i) **AGREED to APPROVE** details submitted in relation to the construction of Waterden Road as a partial discharge of conditions LTD.18 and LTD.19 of the Olympic Facilities and their Legacy Transformation Planning Permission 07/90010/OUMODA and approve a discharge condition LOD.2 of planning permission 08/90194/FULODA.
- ii) **AGREED** the reasons for approval; and
- iii) **AGREED** to grant planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives detailed in the Officers Report and the Update report.

**8. 10/900021/FULODA MR 1 Stratford City
(Agenda Item 8)**

Application for full planning permission associated with the; 1. Layout, alignment and widths of carriageways and footways, on street parking zones, loading bays, refuse collection zones, cycleway connections, bus priority measures, signal controlled junctions and pedestrian crossings including siting of traffic and pedestrian crossing signals; 2. Creation of finished levels, installation of in-ground services including any associated earthworks; 3. Location of soft landscaping and planting zones; 4. Installation of lighting including siting and height of lighting columns; and; 5. Siting of bus stops and street furniture; As they relate to MR1 (formerly Frigoscandia Way and Temple Mills Lane East).

Zones 3-6, Stratford City

- 8.1 Craig Becconsall (Lend Lease) and Nick Hughes (VOGT) gave a presentation where full permission was sought for the new road MR1 which completes the northern section of the streetscapes of Zone 3-6.
- 8.2 A PDT Officer presented the report with the main issues and considerations being the Highway design and layout, parking and servicing, hard and soft landscaping.
- 8.3 Members requested assurance that the width of the junction between MR1 and MR4 was acceptable. The PDT Officer reiterated this assurance and reported that the reduced carriageway and speed restrictions would assist.
- 8.4 Members reported their concern regarding the maintenance of planting and to ensure that road closures were not require to provide maintenance. This was noted.
- 8.5 There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee unanimously RESOLVED that:

the Committee:

APPROVED that permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report and the update report.

9. Delegated Decisions Report

- 9.1 A PDT Officer reported that this was the third report that Members had received detailing the decisions taken by officers under delegated authority.
- 9.2 The Chair reported that this report had been submitted to the ODA Board who expressed their thanks to the PDT and the Planning Committee and recognised all their hard work.
- 9.3 The Committee:

NOTED the report and attached schedules on decisions taken by officers under Delegated Authority from 1 October 2009 to 31 March 2010.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 22.05.

Signed: Z Beldin

Date 24/8/2010

Chair

