

OLYMPIC DELIVERY AUTHORITY

ODA PLANNING COMMITTEE

28 August 2007

SUBJECT: DRAFT MINUTES OF 11th COMMITTEE MEETING
Held on 14 August 2007 at 14.00

Circus One, Stratford Circus
Theatre Square, London E15 1 BX

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
Celia Carrington
William Hodgson
Janice Morphet
Dru Vesty

Officers in attendance:

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Vivienne Ramsey | ODA, Head of Development Control |
| Richard Ford | ODA, Legal adviser, Planning Decisions Team, (Pinsent Masons) |
| Vanessa Brand | ODA, Committee Secretary |

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

There were no apologies

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

2.1. In respect of Item 5 the Chairman drew attention to updates to the report as circulated:

Item 5

There were

- 2 Addendum reports;
- draft S106 Agreement laid on the table;
- revised Chapter 8 of the report with recommendations updated from both Addendum Reports 1 and 2 including all amended conditions;
- Informative paper relating to Condition LTD.27 laid on the table.

2.2. The order of business was unchanged.

2.3. There were 15 requests to speak. All of these were agreed

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 revised paper for Item 3 which has been circulated lists interests which they have declared which appear to be personal interests relating to Item 5.

'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?'

3.2. Members confirmed that the personal interests read out were correct and the following additional interests were declared:

3.2.1. William Hodgson declared that he knew personally Councillors Vincent Stops and Christine Boyd, who had registered to speak in their capacity as elected Members of Hackney Borough Council.

3.2.2. Conor McAuley and Terry Wheeler both declared a personal interest as Borough Council representatives (of Newham and Waltham Forest Borough Councils respectively) on the five Borough Committee overseeing Training and Employment programmes.

3.3. None of the declared interests were prejudicial interests.

4. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING (AGENDA ITEM 4)

4.1. The Committee

AGREED the Minutes of the 10th Planning Committee Meeting

4.2. There were no matters arising.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

07/90011/FUMODA – Site Preparation Planning Application

07/90010/OUMODA – Facilities and their Legacy Transformation Planning Application

5.1. The Committee considered the report and took into account the Updates which had been circulated, the revised chapter 8 of the report setting out the recommendations and amended conditions, and the informative paper relating to condition LTD.27.

5.2. The applications before the Committee related to site preparation for development in connection with the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games and Legacy Transformation, comprising works and uses of land to facilitate the development of Olympic and Paralympic facilities and their legacy transformation and for the transformation itself.

5.3. As members of the applicant ODA Promoter team, Alison Nimmo, ODA Head of Design and Regeneration, and Jason Prior, EDAW, gave a presentation setting out the works for which planning permission was sought. Together with other representatives of the applicant they responded to questions from the Committee, covering the following areas:

5.3.1. examples of the types of targets set to achieve sustainable development were given;

5.3.2. an explanation was given as to the location of the CCHP Plant in King's Yard;

5.3.3. reference was made to the letter dated 3 August 2007 (1st Addendum Report, Appendix 1) setting out the applicant's request for extended core working hours which would help to stagger access to the site by construction workers and reduce the impact on local residents and local transport;

5.3.4. in response to a question about the links which would be created to surrounding areas in the Legacy Transformation and Legacy Phases, the Head of Development Control referred to the plan showing permeability of the site Appendix 14 of the in draft S106 Agreement; and

- 5.3.5. an explanation was given regarding the IBC/MPC relationship to Hackney Wick Station.
- 5.4. The Head of Development Control then gave a presentation to the Committee describing the applications and explaining the Updates and the officers' recommendations. She explained, inter alia, that the applications were designed to allow flexibility of development at different rates in different areas: a number of development platforms would be created but the applications did not include the post-Games development which would be created on those development platforms in Legacy. There was a single Environmental Statement which provided a systematic assessment of both applications. A number of minor impacts had been identified and mitigation measures recommended all as described in the report with the imposition of appropriate conditions. Overall, save for the departures referred to in the Committee Report, the applications were generally in accordance with national, regional, and local policy and the departures, most of which were temporary, were outweighed by the overall benefits.
- 5.5. She explained that work on the site would continue for around 7 years except for the period of the Games and that there was the potential for significant impact on local residents and the surrounding areas. A number of measures for mitigation were proposed and were considered satisfactory subject to conditions and a S106 Agreement as recommended. In particular there had been discussions about the proposed hours of work with both the applicant and the Borough Environmental Health Officers (EHO). On much of the site, the PDT considered that extended working hours would not be problematic.
- 5.6. Richard Ford set out for the Committee the specific differences between the PDT's recommendations about normal working hours and the applicant's preferred arrangements which would give, inter alia, longer working hours and earlier start-up times as well as seasonal adjustments.
- 5.7. The Committee noted that, taking into account the Stratford City development there would be more than 20,000 workers per day arriving on site. The Committee asked whether the agreed hours of working would constrain arrival and departure times and not encourage staggered hours of working to avoid conflict with peak hours of traffic movement in the local area. The Head of Development Control stated that the applicant was expected to make an application under the S61 procedure of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 and that it was expected that longer hours including evening and weekend working would be agreed by all the Borough EHOs for most of the site. The PDT understood that the host boroughs were establishing a joint system to ensure an efficient service with funding from the applicant. This would normally permit decisions to be made well within the maximum 28 day limit and would protect residents whilst allowing development to proceed. This general approach was common practice. Commuting workers would not normally be permitted to park on site but it would be important for the applicant to manage logistics and the Code of Construction Practice allowed for a transport plan to integrate management of the construction sites.
- 5.8. It was reported by the Head of Development Control that there had been extensive pre- and post-application consultation by the applicant and PDT had carried out further post-application consultation, including of the statutory consultees. The greatest number of responses received had been about the Legacy cycling facilities. The proposals were not the same as those

approved in 2004. The application for Legacy facilities was in outline but the Eastway Users Group had made representations that the proposed VeloPark was too small and that there had not been consultation with users about the changes. The Users group considered that cycling as a sport should be given priority. It was recommended that when the detailed Legacy cycling facilities were submitted, there should be full consultation with statutory and non-statutory parties including user groups and consideration should be given to overall provision in East London taking into account the facilities at Hog Hill and the enhanced Olympic site. The Head of Development Control referred to the assessments at Chapter 6 of the report and in the 2nd Addendum report which had included giving appropriate weight to the 2004 planning permission. Having considered all representations and considerations, the PDT were recommending that a condition should be imposed (condition LTD.11) detailing cycling facilities which must be provided by fixed dates after the Games.

5.9. It was reported by the Head of Development Control that the applications had been fully assessed including taking into account all representations received and the additional information submitted following the first round of consultation. The scale and type of proposals as amended were considered acceptable and the Committee was recommended to approve the applications subject to a number of conditions and informatives and to a S106 Agreement being signed. If agreed the applications would be referred to the Mayor of London and to the Secretary of State.

5.10. Further to a tabled amendment by PDT officers at the beginning of the Committee meeting (and available in the public papers) arising from discussions with the applicant, the Committee agreed to include the following informative in place of the amendment proposed in the Second Update Report to condition LTD.27, (i.e. to add in "including any financial support proposed to public transport authorities to cover the cost of public transport provision as a result of spectator travel") as an informative to be read alongside recommended condition LTD.27 (Event Management):

'It is the expectation of the Local Planning Authority that the information to be provided by the developer pursuant to condition LTD.27 regarding arrangements for transport of spectators will address, amongst other things, the level of confidence that any necessary public transport services will be provided, whether subsidy has been requested by public transport operators in relation to such services and, if so, whether such subsidy could reasonably be considered to be justified in the circumstances'

5.11. The Committee asked a number of questions, including those detailed above and the following:

(a) Whether the applicant consulted the IOC over the IOC requirements and the extent to which the IOC requirements had had to govern the proposals or whether the IOC could be asked to change any of their requirements. Alison Nimmo spoke on behalf of the applicant/ODA in response to this question and stated that the applicant had received a list of standard IOC requirements that must be met by a host city;

(b) A question regarding the permeability of the site, to which the applicant and PDT officers responded that permeability is captured by design and the

draft 106 agreement. The draft 106 agreement has annexed to it a plan showing the temporary access routes into the park which will be secured, subject to the provisions of the draft agreement, until the wider Legacy Communities Development is permitted and alters them as appropriate;

(c) A question concerning the relationship between the IBC/MPC building and the Hackney Wick Station. The applicant responded that the Hackney Wick Station has a road bridge that will take the IBC/MPC closer to the station. In addition, further infrastructure will be brought forward in the Legacy Phase and will be discussed with the Host Boroughs;

(d) Whether the park will be considered sustainable in 5 years time and be future proofed to allow adaptation to later sustainability aims. The applicant and PDT officers stated that it was considered that the Olympic Park had been future-proofed in sustainability terms as far as reasonably practicable given that some of the facilities were temporary and a combination of conditions and section 106 agreement provisions dealt with sustainability matters, e.g. an on site renewable energy target of 20 per cent, a target of 50% carbon saving overall and a transport by rail or water target. Some of the sustainable aspects of the park were also highlighted, including the CCHP plant (which will be constructed so that it can accommodate biomass fuel in the future) where waste heat from the plant will be reused, energy from buildings is designed to be used to help cool them down and some electricity will be generated from the wind turbine;

(e) A request that the applicant explain the location of the CCHP plant, to which the applicant responded that the location provides good connection to the National Grid, it is near the canal to allow biofuel to travel by water, the location is optimal for distribution of power, and it is outside the loop road. Alternative locations were considered but this was the best location in the circumstances;

(f) How the LMF will come forward in the future, to which the applicant responded that the 106 obligations help regulate this, with a target date of 2009 for the LMF to be published and a master outline planning application following on by the end of 2009;

(g) As to the risk of flooding on the Olympic site, to which the applicant and PDT representatives responded that flood risk assessments for the effects of the proposals on drainage took account of expected weather pattern changes brought about by climate change.

5.12. The following speakers addressed the Committee speaking against the Recommendations:

5.12.1. John Hawkrige, representing the National Governing Body of Cycling, SE Region spoke about their concerns for the damage done to the sport in London by the loss of the Eastway Cycle circuit, which had closed in 2006. He said, inter alia, that there was no certainty that Hog Hill, which had not yet opened, would be of appropriate quality or would be available after 2013 (there was a break clause in the lease allowing the London Borough of Redbridge to abandon the facility). He emphasised that the National Governing Body of Cycling, SE Region had understood there was a commitment that the ultimate Legacy arrangements would be at least as good as those which had

been lost and refuted the applicant's assumptions as set out in paragraphs 108-113 of Chapter 6 of the Main Committee Report. He referred to what he considered to be the effect of S.5 of the London Olympic and Paralympic Games Act 2006 and the Grampian conditions imposed on the 2004 planning permission.

5.12.2. David Rossi and Ms Leslie Everest, members of the Eastway Users Group, had similar concerns. They spoke about the loss of the 24 hectare space which had been a closed circuit and which had fostered the national and international success of young cyclists. They had dropped objections to the CPO in the belief that there was a commitment to create facilities that met their requirements and on the basis of reassurances they felt were given. They spoke of their objection to Legacy plans, making reference to Sport England's comments. Mr Rossi and Ms Everest felt that the Legacy commitment made by Lord Coe at the CPO Inquiry was not being delivered by this application as the interim replacement had not been delivered. They commented that previously schools were using the cycle track every day and that children are now no longer cycling. They were concerned that riders cannot train on the roads, but currently there is no other option. They are of the opinion that the Legacy cycle circuit is not good enough, as they need 6km off-road circuit and 1.6km road circuit which is designed for purpose.

5.12.3. Tom Ridge, representing the Save King's Yard Campaign, spoke about King's Yard as a collection of buildings of great industrial heritage interest recalling the past significance of the Lower Lea Valley. He spoke about the site being the most complete Edwardian Processors/buildings in London, emphasising their rarity and national importance. The Belfast truss roofs were particularly important as they were the only surviving ones in situ in London. The LDA recognised the buildings in their heritage audit and the Mayor's Report lists King's Yard as having a potential for conservation status. The campaign was supported by a number of heritage bodies including the Victorian Society, SAVE Britain's Heritage, and the Heritage of London Trust.

5.12.4. Tom Ridge spoke about encouraging the use of waterways for transport and recreational use within the Olympic Park. He suggested that if the jetties were not put in as part of the Olympic Games they never would be and that Prescott Lock was not needed. He considered that the Energy Centre should be relocated, using an alternative site near the Stadium where it could be associated with a local waterways centre and preserving the King's Yard buildings.

5.12.5. Murad Qureshi, Chair of London Waterways Commission, spoke about encouraging the use of the waterways. He supported the proposals generally but the Commission wanted to see improvements including the setting of specific targets for freight during construction, for increasing passenger movements, and in the design of the riverwalls. He suggested encouraging access to the games by foot given the uniqueness of this route (along the waterways).

5.12.6. Chris Gwyntopher, a local resident, and Mary Flanagan and David Milner representing the Nuclear Trains Action Group spoke about the risks arising from the transport of nuclear material by rail through the

site and considered that insufficient weight had been given to the threat arising from an accident or terrorist action. They requested that all transport of nuclear waste on trains should be suspended for the duration of the Games.

5.12.7. Katy Andrews and Laurence Wortley spoke as local residents. Katy Andrews was particularly concerned about the visual impact of the proposals including the venues, the 5 storey car park which would not be needed in legacy, the telecommunications masts and the wind turbine which they considered to be unattractive, a danger to migrating birds and of negligible value as a source of renewable energy. She was also concerned about the flicker effect of the wind turbine. Laurence Wortley suggested that all roads and buildings should be constructed with sound absorbing materials. He wanted the land bridge removed in Legacy and was concerned that the legacy design of the Park would not be suitable for sporting use. Mr Wortley asked that a date should be set for the restoration of the East Marsh site. He was also concerned about flood risk.

5.12.8. Councillor Vincent Stops spoke as Chair of Hackney Borough Planning Committee. The Borough Planning Committee generally supported the proposals and welcomed the regeneration benefits they would bring but remained concerned about 3 issues:

5.12.8.1. The photograph at p12 of the Main Report showed the strip of land along the towpath of the Lea Navigation opposite Hackney Wick. The proposed removal of trees would result in a loss of habitat and remove the visual green buffer between the waterway and the proposed large-scale development. His Committee wished to see the security wall set back some 30 feet to allow the preservation of this feature.

5.12.8.2. LB Hackney considered that a condition should be imposed so that no more than 203 car parking spaces were retained in Legacy. They also suggested that the multi-storey car park should be a temporary structure or that in Legacy it should be reconfigured and used for employment. This would be consistent with policies for encouraging pedestrian and sustainable transport.

5.12.8.3. LB Hackney wanted to attract high quality employment and considered that B8 use should be very restricted. Only if proper marketing failed to attract high quality employment use should conditions on B8 use be relaxed.

5.12.9. Councillor Christine Boyd spoke as Ward Councillor for Hackney Wick and Chair of the Regulatory Committee. Like Councillor Stops she supported the Games and had similar concerns which related particularly to the aspirations of Hackney Wick for high quality employment and to ensure that both permeability and access and high quality design of the environment were not compromised.

5.13. The following speakers addressed the Committee speaking in support of the Recommendations:

- 5.13.1. Tanni Gray Thomson spoke representing the London 2012 Sports Advisory Group and as a Paralympic athlete, about the importance of the sporting opportunities and the Legacy for both athletes and the community, as well as the social and economic benefits of the regeneration of East London. Tanni said she was pleased that this was the first time that the Olympics and Paralympics have been planned together.
- 5.13.2. Mary Reilly, Chair of the London Development Agency (LDA), which is landowner of the majority of the Olympic Park, spoke about the potential for regeneration of East London through the catalytic effect of the development proposals and the particular priority the LDA gave to the Lea Valley. The proposals would be the basis for maximising benefits during construction and in legacy. The LDA would be leading the development of the Legacy Masterplan Framework working with the Borough Councils, the LTGDC, and ODA and engaging with all other stakeholders. The Committee asked the question: to what extent will it be the LDA's intention to have B8 use on the park (as referred to by Councillor Stops in paragraph 5.12.8.3) and the response was that the LDA would work with the ODA to maximise employment looking at the optimum use. Employment opportunities will be addressed through the development of various mechanisms and frameworks.
- 5.13.3. Mohammed Abdul Rakib, a local resident, spoke in support of the proposals and the positive impact of the Olympics on the interests of children of the area.
- 5.13.4. John Burton, Director of Westfield, representing LCR and Stratford City Developments Ltd stated that Stratford City enthusiastically supported the proposals because the commitment to legacy was fundamental to the regeneration of Stratford. He cautioned that obtaining Stratford City's support had been difficult because of the complexities of the inter-related developments but that the ODA and Stratford City had talked and reached agreement, subject to finalising the drafting of specific condition wording and an amendment to the LMF schedule in the S.106 Agreement. However, he asked the Committee to be mindful of the need to safeguard the Legacy development of both the Olympics and Stratford City and to reinforce the London Borough of Newham's original intention through the Committee's consideration of the LMF application when submitted.
- 5.13.5. Sean Dawson, Chief Executive of the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority (LVRPA) spoke in support of the proposals which fitted within the Authority's wider remit for sporting, environmental, and social benefits. He spoke of biodiversity within the Olympic park and especially the restoration of habitats. The park would be a zone for sporting excellence of which the VeloPark would be a principal feature bringing together a range of cycling opportunities for elite athletes, schools and the community. LVRPA would work with British Cycling and the user groups to achieve their aspirations. In response to a question from the Committee he said that LVRPA expected the Velopark to attract over 100,000 users compared with c25,000 users of the former Eastway Cycle Circuit in 2004/05.

5.14. The Committee debated the proposals taking into account the various documents before them including the amended recommendations and the presentations they had heard.

5.15. Following discussion with the applicant, a tabled amendment had been made by PDT officers to include the following in place of the amendment proposed in the Second Update Report to condition LTD.27 (which had been to add in "(including any financial support proposed to public transport authorities to cover the cost of public transport provision as a result of spectator travel)") as an informative to be read alongside recommended condition LTD.27 (Event Management):

'It is the expectation of the Local Planning Authority that the information to be provided by the developer pursuant to condition LTD.27 regarding arrangements for transport of spectators will address, amongst other things, the level of confidence that any necessary public transport services will be provided, whether subsidy has been requested by public transport operators in relation to such services and if so whether such subsidy could reasonably be considered to be justified in the circumstances'

5.16. In relation to the issues about cycling facilities, the Committee were concerned about the reduced and constrained size of the site indicated. PDT officers drew their attention to the drawings of Legacy cycling facilities being indicative only. No sizes or final location had yet been specified and it was considered that there was sufficient flexibility within the proposals to allow for the development of appropriate facilities within the Park. PDT officers drew the Committee's attention to the fact that the size and design of the Olympic Park had altered since the 2004 permission and that it was necessary to consider the interests of different user groups in the new context. When details were formally submitted to the Committee, there would be the opportunity for interested parties to make further representations and that, whilst there was no commitment as yet to continued funding for the Hog Hill facility after 2013, it was hoped that this facility would be available. When assessing the facilities available for the Legacy Phase, the information then available concerning the Hog Hill facility could be appropriately taken into account.

5.17. Further to consideration of recommended condition LTD.11 (Legacy Cycling Facilities), related issues and Committee debate, in relation to the Legacy cycling facilities to be provided on the site, the Committee wished to ensure that the location and specification of the Legacy cycling facilities is considered before, alongside or as part of the LMF process and proposals are formulated and submitted as part of the outline planning application process for the Legacy Communities Development pursuant to the LMF process. The Committee requested officers to modify the conditions and section 106 agreement as appropriate.

5.18. Further to consideration of recommended condition LTD.24 (Retained Venues), related issues and Committee debate, in relation to the use of the Multi-Use Sports Venue in the Legacy Phase, the Committee wished officers to provide reassurance that the primary use of the MUSV will continue to be a sporting use in the Legacy Phase. Officers were asked to amend the condition as appropriate to ensure this use. The Committee also wished officers to amend condition LTD.24 to ensure appropriate regulation of non-

sporting events in Legacy Venues where they were to be used for events at less than full capacity or achieve that via another appropriate mechanism.

5.19. In relation to the proposals for regulating working hours on site the Committee were concerned that longer hours than those specified in the recommendation would be needed to relieve pressure on public transport. The Committee was made aware that these hours of working could be altered for particular dates and places in agreement with Host Borough EHOs. After discussion a series of votes were taken and further to consideration of recommended conditions OD.029 (Hours of Work) and SP.0.24 (Hours of Work), related issues and Committee debate, the Committee agreed:

5.19.1. The relevant conditions in the permissions to be amended to reflect normal working hours to be: Monday to Friday – 07:00 to 18:00; Saturday 07:00 to 14:00 and Bank Holidays to be treated as Saturdays; and

5.19.2. Guidance to be given to PDT officers that the Code of Construction Practice should allow repair and maintenance from 14:00 to 16:00 on Saturdays and Bank Holidays to be treated as Saturdays.

5.19.3. The Committee rejected the proposal that repair and maintenance be permitted on Sundays and voted for the recommended half hour start up and close down time either side of the core hours of work to remain as recommended.

5.20. Further to consideration of recommended condition LTD.8, related issues and Committee debate, the Committee agreed that it wished for an informative to be added to the grant of permission that the applicant/developer should formulate carefully proposals for warehousing falling within use class B8 such that there is no inappropriate level of warehousing applied for as part of the detailed applications/approval of reserved matters applications. Hackney Borough Council has expressed concerns about potential inappropriate levels of B8 use to which the applicant is advised to have regard.

5.21. In relation to the preservation of the buffer strip along the towpath the Committee asked for clarification of the applicant's position. Simon Wright, ODA Director for Utilities and Infrastructure, stated that it was necessary to preserve flexibility along the boundary to allow for the construction of the loop road and the possible need to move two old 42 inch water mains. He stated that the applicant intended to preserve as many trees as possible.

5.22. Further to consideration of the proposals which are shown as potentially removing the trees within the green buffer between the IBC/MBC and the edge of the site, and Committee debate, the Committee agreed that it wished for an informative to be added to the grant of permission that wherever reasonably practicable trees should be retained on the buffer strip.

5.23. Further to Committee debate, the Committee agreed that it wished for an informative to be added to the grant of permission that:

5.23.1. The applicant/developer should take into account in the design of the Legacy proposals the ease with which materials which are to be

the subject of Legacy Modification Works can be removed or modified in the most sustainable way, e.g. recycled or disposed of in sustainable ways.

5.23.2. The developer should seek to encourage operators of Venues, both during the Games and Legacy Phases, to adopt sustainable practices in their operation of the Venues, e.g. whether provision of bottled drinking water is necessary at events or whether water may be available free of charge from drinking water fountains, waste disposal practices etc.

5.24. Geoff Taylor requested further confirmation that there was no other alternative to locating the CCHP plant on the King's Yard site. PDT representatives responded to the question by saying that the original proposed location for the 2004 proposals for the CCHP plant was on the site of what is now part of the Aquatics Centre complex. However, the changes to the size of the park and the redesign, including the shafts associated with the underground power cable tunnels, the need to accommodate part of the Olympic Loop road and circulation space associated with the Aquatics Centre meant there was insufficient space for the CCHP plant in that location. During the CPO inquiry a number of alternative locations were debated, as was also set out in the Environmental Statement, and the western side of the site was identified as the best location for the CCHP plant. King's Yard was chosen as the specific site within the western location due to the only other alternative location being required for back of house facilities for the handball arena, and also because it was the right area in terms of high energy demand in that area, the proximity of watercourses, roads and various proposed utility networks.

5.25. There being no further questions the Chairman moved to a vote and the Planning Committee RESOLVED unanimously in accordance with the recommendations as amended, that, in respect of both applications Nos 07/9011/FUMODA and 07/9010/OUMODA and subject to the points recorded above being taken into account, they:

a) were minded to APPROVE the applications for the reasons given in the report as amended and to GRANT planning permission subject to:

(i) referring the applications to the Secretary of State (Government Office for London) and the Mayor of London and to any direction by the Mayor of London and the Secretary of State;

(ii) satisfactory completion of a legal document under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act and/or other enabling powers to secure the heads of such document set out in the report and appendices as amended thereto; and

(iii) the conditions and informatives set out in the report as amended

b) CONFIRMED that their decision had taken the environmental impacts and information into account, as required by Regulation 3(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 1999, and AGREED that following the issue of the decision a statement be placed on the Statutory Register confirming the main reasons and considerations on which the Committee's decision was based were those set out in the Planning

Officer's report to Committee as amended as required by Regulation 21 (1)(c) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 1999;

- c) AGREED to grant delegated authority to the Head of Development Control to consider any direction from the Secretary of State and/or other comments from the Mayor of London and generally to conclude negotiations in relation to the legal document and proposed conditions and informatives; and to make any consequential or necessary changes to the recommended conditions and informatives and legal document referred to above and to complete the legal document referred to above and issue the consent.

6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS (AGENDA ITEM 6)

6.1. The Committee congratulated the Head of Development Control and the Planning Decisions Team on producing a thorough and accessible report on this complex case and thanked them for their hard work in assessing the applications and assisting the Committee.

6.2. The Chairman reminded Members that the next meeting would be on Tuesday 28 August at Stratford Town Hall.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 8.30pm