### Key Issues –

The outline nature of the application presented the usual difficulties in terms of needing to define the basis of the assessment. This was compounded by an 18 year build out, and the need, therefore, to provide an assessment of some interim assessment years. An additional difficulty was the fact that the scheme is only one element of a number of different proposals that are likely to come forward in the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park in the coming years, including the redevelopment of the former Olympic stadium, the Olympic Legacy Supplementary Planning Guidance, and the potential for there to be interim uses before development parcels are eventually built out. A new approach to cumulative assessment was therefore required.

### Purpose of the project

The Olympic Park Legacy Company is tasked with planning the future of the Olympic Park following the end of the Paralympic Games, and post games transformation. The proposed Olympic legacy is to create new communities in the park, with a focus on high quality sustainable development, covering a wide range of residential types, from family housing with gardens to multi-story apartments.

### Description of the project

Covering an area of 64.48 hectares, in discrete areas lying within the Park, the main LCS planning application seeks outline approval for a mixed use development within the future Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park, Stratford. The development comprises mostly of residential uses, however there are other proposed uses as well, including some commercial and community infrastructure uses.
Lessons learnt
The extension of cumulative effects assessment beyond consented development and including development with only very general details, such as the interim uses, required the development of a ‘sensitivity test’ approach. This required a staged assessment, looking initially at the potential for the LCS to interact with other development for each of the topics assessed. Some, such as buried archaeology, had no meaningful linkages, whereas others such as traffic and transport required additional modelling and assessment. For interim uses we developed a filtering tool, to rule out those uses that are unlikely to result in a significant effect when considered with the LCS. For those with some potential to have an effect, we developed a reasonable worst case scenario for uses, which was tested for the year 2021. It was clear that for some topics, the sensitivity test would not be possible. For example, in the absence of any details, other than the potential use, we considered it impossible to reach a conclusion in terms of townscape effects, which can be subjective, even when full details are available.

Lessons learnt cont.
In addition, the very outline nature of the application meant that it was essential to fully understand the topic specific ‘basis of assessment’ to ensure that a ‘reasonable worst case’ was assessed, and that the outputs reflected the likely significant effects, rather than any effects however unlikely.

Another lesson learned was the importance of working with a future predicted baseline and interim assessment years. The LCS will be built out over 18 years. We selected two interim assessment years (2021 and 2026). The parts of the development already built form part of the baseline, however there was also a requirement for us to consider the total effect of the full 2031 build out on the 2013 receptor state – is this double counting the effects or is it valid for new receptor to also be considered a source of effects?
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