

## **9<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting: 30 November 2006**

Sir Roy McNulty (Acting Chairman), Lorraine Baldry, Tony Ball, Sir Howard Bernstein, Barry Camfield, Neale Coleman, Stephen Duckworth, Christopher Garnett, Sir Peter Mason, Baroness Sally Morgan, Kumar Muthalagappan, Sir Nicholas Serota, David Taylor

### **APOLOGIES**

All Board Members were present

### **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

As an employee of the GLA, of which the LDA is a separate functional body, Neale Coleman declared a personal non-prejudicial interest.

### **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING & ACTIONS ARISING**

The Board agreed the Minutes of the 8<sup>th</sup> Board meeting held on 26 October 2006.

They reviewed the various actions arising. The Chairman suggested that Members could review the Corporate Plan and other work stemming from the Board's strategic role at an 'awayday' in March 2007. He also reported that he was discussing the membership of the Risk Committee with a view to it starting work early in 2007. The Risk Committee Agendas would then be circulated to all Board Members in advance.

### **CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

Sir Roy reported that common themes were emerging from his discussions with Members. They wanted more clarity about the role of the Board as a non-Executive body. There was a general recognition that this must include strategic issues linked to the Corporate Plan. Members also wanted to see ODA taking a clear stance on communication, which might sometimes be distinct from the DCMS's position. He himself would write a paper on the role and functioning of the Board for the next Board Meeting once the initial results from the Executive's strategy work were available.

### **CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT**

The Chief Executive drew attention to a number of points:

Good progress was being made on the Powerlines Undergrounding project and the cracking which had been identified was not structural

The CPO decision was expected in mid December but there was likely to be a legal challenge in relation to two sites within the CPO area. Newham Council would consider the planning application for the relocation site at Major road in January 2007.

The advantages of using the alternative rail site at Temple Mills were now generally agreed but final agreement on funding arrangements was awaited.

The NAO value for money report was not yet agreed. He wanted to ensure that there were no inconsistencies between the figures included which, in his opinion, could give a misleading impression of the costs and funding.

The Board were concerned that ODA's position on the budget was not clear either to the media or in reporting to Parliament. They noted that discussions were taking place with DCMS to reconcile any variances in the detailed figures, but that the budget figures would only be fully clarified during the first quarter of 2007. David Higgins was emphasising to Ministers that public discussion about the level of the ODA budget was liable to influence contractors and therefore have an impact on costs.

The Board also noted that there would be a presentation on skills and employment to the next Board Meeting and asked that future reports should include a section about workforce issues

## **COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE**

The Board welcomed the paper on regeneration as a sample briefing and noted that briefing would be circulated for Members' use. It was agreed to consider how the daily press cuttings service could meet Members' needs. They also noted that briefing sessions would be arranged regularly before Board Meetings.

The Director of Communications reported that the local community consultation had been very successful and that other means of engaging the public directly were being explored. Stakeholder bulletins were issued regularly. An information kiosk would be established in Stratford early in 2007 and a consultant had been appointed to develop a visitor centre with Newham Borough council. This would probably be on a site identified on the Greenway with a tower to allow the public to view works on site. Members suggested this might be the subject of a design competition.

Members noted that the London 2012 branding would be relaunched in March 2007 and that a London 2012 blog was being launched.

## **MASTERPLAN – PLANNING APPLICATION**

EDAW had largely completed working out the technical logistics of the Masterplan and ODA had suggested the appointment of an additional adviser to help develop the vision for the Park.

The Olympic Park planning applications, which were to be made in late January 2007, would build on the concept approved in the original consent. They would be based on a series of parameters to provide maximum flexibility: for example, to allow for detailed changes in levels if additional remediation proved necessary. The applications would be accompanied by a series of technical documents which were not part of the application but which would set the context for consent. The Commitment to Sustainable Regeneration (to be discussed later) would be one of these documents.

There would be three applications for:

- site preparation works
- Olympic and legacy facilities
- temporary facilities associated with the Games

There would also be a separate application for c1200 housing units on the Clays Lane site to form part of the Olympic Village built by the Stratford City development partner. The residential floorspace allocated within the Stratford City development was expected to provide around 80% of units for the Olympic Village. It was probable that only some 600 more would be needed, but obtaining consent for twice as many would ensure that ODA could meet its commitments to LOCOG. The total number of units

needed to house the athletes had not increased, but the earlier timing of the development could affect the overall balance in relation to issues such as residential occupancy and access to schools. Discussions were in progress with the GLA about the percentage of affordable housing to be included in that site and about the use of renewable energy.

The diagram illustrating proposals for the post-Games development would be included with the applications to indicate what was intended, but planning applications for the Legacy Communities would be prepared over the next two years in consultation with local communities. These applications would be designed to comply with the Olympic Area Planning Framework (OAPF) due to be adopted by the GLA in January 2007. The OAPF was developed to complement the original Olympic planning permission but planning policy was developing, particularly in relation to residential density and to sustainability. The final application would be in outline for implementation by the LDA after the Games.

The local community consultations had attracted more than 6000 people. The major concerns emerging had been:

- affordability – of tickets for the Games, and affordable housing afterwards
- the need to develop the local skills base to ensure job opportunities for local people
- doubts about the degree of ODA commitment to renewable energy
- likely impact on daily life through noise, dirt, traffic congestion etc during construction
- cost of maintenance resulting in neglect and decline in the longer term

The applications had been developed to address all the key issues demonstrating ODA's commitment to: sustainability, particularly renewable energy; design quality; quantity and quality of Legacy Parkland justifying the temporary loss of open space; long term management and ecological impacts/mitigation of the Parkland and long term management of venues for local people; dealing with the flood risk and improving water quality through impoundment; maximising access to employment opportunities for local people; and affordable housing. Planning consent would set the physical framework for management of the Games on which work was continuing with LOCOG.

The Board noted the importance of ensuring that planning applications were technically sound to avoid delays through call-in and/or judicial review. They welcomed the commitment to inclusive design and were keen that the applications should provide the maximum scope for creative design and innovation.

## **SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY OVERVIEW**

The recent publication of the Stern report was an indication of the growing importance of the sustainability agenda. ODA's Sustainable Development Strategy would be a critical document accompanying the planning applications at the end of January. The draft strategy would be brought to the next Board Meeting but the Board's approval of the overall approach was being sought in advance because realistic and deliverable sustainability targets demonstrating ODA's commitment to this area of policy needed to be finalised.

National, regional, and local policy was developing rapidly. For example, the Building Regulations were changing and developments would need to aim for a 15% higher building efficiency over and above Building Regulations 2006 from energy efficiency and demand reduction measures. To meet the new policies being introduced by GLA

the whole site would need to deliver 20% of energy from on-site renewables: approval of the wind turbine would be essential to help meet this target. The targets for water could be achieved through a variety of measures. Rainwater harvesting would enable achievement over and above this target. The targets for waste management had been discussed with the contractors who were content to meet the 90% target for recycling material from demolition and arisings on site. In addition ODA had commissioned a bespoke sustainability assessment methodology from the Building Research Establishment for Olympic venues (BREEAM) and is proposing ODA commits to an 'excellent' standard. Discussions with industry had also shown that they were very supportive of the commitment to identify, source, and use environmentally and socially responsible materials. The proposals had been discussed with the Delivery Partner and ODA aimed to

- set and meet stretching targets to minimise carbon emissions,
- optimise the opportunities to design out waste and maximise reuse and recycling of material
- identify, source, and use environmentally and socially responsible materials
- protect and enhance the biodiversity and ecology of the Lower Lea Valley and other venue locations
- optimise the opportunities for efficient water use, reuse and recycling and
- optimise positive and minimise adverse impacts on land, water, noise, and air quality

In discussion the Board noted that:

- since the granting of the original Olympic consent greater emphasis was now being placed on sustainability and renewable energy and ODA would have to comply with higher standards
- although there might be some cost implications in setting high targets in some areas, such as energy, costs were not expected to rise, and targets were stretching but achievable.
- the separate draft Equality and Diversity Strategy would be presented at the next Board meeting and published for consultation later in January.

The Board endorsed the overall approach outlined in the paper and approved the key targets for discussion with stakeholders and as commitments in the planning application.

## **STRATFORD CITY AND THE OLYMPIC VILLAGE**

The Board heard a presentation about the Stratford City development which explained how the design of the Athletes' Village fitted with the rest of the Olympic Park and showed that, after the Games, both the Olympic Park and the Stratford City development would be fully integrated into the wider area. Diversity of design within the Masterplan was fundamental to the Stratford City brief and developments would be individually designed within the overall framework.

The location of the Village had been adjusted since the Bid. Some 80% of the Village would be on Stratford City land, for which planning consent had been approved, depending on how much of Clays Lane had to be developed. The timetable for development of this area had been brought forward and some temporary structures serving the Village would be built on land which would be developed later. Most of the

Village would be built for long-term residential use though, during its occupation by athletes, the population of the area would be doubled. There would be associated open space and areas of public realm that would enhance the athletes' experience of the Games. Within the Stratford City land the existing consent would apply, modified where necessary by new S73 planning applications. Zonal Masterplans would be submitted for planning approval. Environmental compliance would be monitored across the whole site.

Whilst most of the land for the Village was ready for development, the land at Clays Lane and the adjacent site had still to be remediated. This land would be prepared jointly by ODA and Stratford City with sufficient housing to ensure that all the athletes could be accommodated. It would include 50% affordable housing and would comply with the London Plan policy in terms of environmental and sustainability issues.

The Board then considered a recommendation about the choice of a Development Partner for Stratford City noting, however, that negotiations were still in progress. ODA were actively involved in the discussions and considering what contribution they might make to bringing forward the development in time for the Games. Members noted that the two consortia bidding to develop the Village were bidding on the basis of the existing consents with commitment to a mix of residential with family housing and associated amenities and public open space. ODA's own commitments to sustainability and environmental issues were essential to comply with, and improve upon, the existing S106 agreement. Members also noted that the Design Review Panel appointed by CABE had been critical of the overall Stratford Vision for the residential village.

After discussion the Board agreed in principle to the recommendation identifying the preferred development partner for the Olympic Village but retaining the second bidder as a reserve developer. They requested a future report setting out the detailed terms of any contract before final agreement.

## **ENABLING WORKS – STRATEGY TO OBTAIN INVESTMENT DECISION APPROVAL**

The Board had given approval for novation of the contracts for the enabling works from LDA at its October meeting. The procedure being adopted for this project was unconventional in order to allow work to proceed as land became available for remediation and to meet the timetable for the construction of venues. Each zone would be treated individually in accordance with the agreed contract procedures and the full business case would be brought to the next Board meeting. However, it was proposed to seek approval before that for the full project from the Olympic Programme Review Group (OPRG) in December 2006 so that work could continue on site in the new year. There would be regular reports to the Risk Committee and to DCMS and OPRG to provide assurance that the budget was under control and that risk management procedures were being applied.

The Board noted that the procedure would allow for packaging the enabling works in ways which would allow flexibility to adopt suitable techniques as further detailed investigation progressed. After discussion the Board agreed the approach in principle subject to receiving a detailed business case and risk report at their next meeting.

## **ODA BOARD STANDING ORDER 1 – AMENDMENTS TO CLARIFY SEALING**

The Board approved the amended wording of Standing Order 1 paragraph 32 as follows (words in **bold** added):

**Except where otherwise determined by the Board**, the application of the seal of the ODA shall be authenticated by the signature of the Chief Executive and the Finance Director. In the absence of the Chief Executive, the application of the seal shall be authenticated by the signature of the Finance Director and the Property Director and in the absence of the Finance Director by the signature of the Chief Executive and the Property Director.

#### **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The Chairman said that, following the discussion with the Secretary of State earlier in the afternoon, he would write confirming the Board's wish to work with her on the appointment of a new Chairman.

*There being no other business the meeting closed at 5.25 pm.*