

# **NOGOE**

**No to Greenwich Olympic Equestrian Events**  
17 City Business Centre, Lower Road, London SE16 2XB  
[www.nogoe2012.com](http://www.nogoe2012.com)

Steve Pallett Esq  
Planning Department  
London Borough of Greenwich  
48 Woolwich New Road  
London SE18 6HQ

5th July 2010

Dear Mr Pallett,

Greenwich Park Application No 10/1437

Thank you again for arranging the meeting on 29th June. Although it was not the time or place to discuss them in detail, I trust that, before reaching a decision, you will seek LOCOG's observations on the many questions and comments that I sent you on the previous evening. They are intended to clarify, so far as that may be possible, the uncertainties and unknowns in the documentation that LOCOG submitted, so as to better inform you before a decision is reached. Having regard to the extreme sensitivity of the site and the fluidity of the proposals as they currently appear (noting that, within three weeks of the making of the application, revised documents were submitted), we feel that their clarifications should be an essential part of the decision making process.

In the meantime, there are three particular areas that were discussed at the meeting that I now wish to focus on. In respect of the first two (Roman archaeology and ecological issues), you offered to take up our concerns with English Heritage and Natural England respectively. I attach Rosie Hayles's presentation in relation to the former.

As to the latter, we note that Natural England has said that it is content with the proposals. However, in relation to the enhancement and reinstatement of the grassland, LOCOG has rated both the likelihood of failure in reinstatement by using green hay and the impact of failure as High (see the table on page 80 of the Cross Country Course Method Preparation Statement). For mitigation, it relies on the support of the Project Ecologist and the London Acid Grassland Group, of which Natural England is a member. As reinstatement of the current appearance of the Park (i.e. no visible damage to trees or residual evidence of the track) is a key requirement of great local concern, would you please ask Natural England to provide notes of the Acid Grassland Group's deliberations and any reports that they have or other members of the Group have produced on the proposals.

The third area concerns LOCOG's application for partial approval only to several of the conditions. Although I propose to concentrate on Condition 1, I think that LOCOG should be asked to identify those element(s) of the other conditions for which partial approval is requested.

However, Condition 1 is the fundamental condition, which is intended to ensure that the Park is restored to its present state. By 2015 there should, as we understand what LOCOG is saying, be no residual marks to indicate that it had been taken over as an Olympic site. To ensure that this is achieved, the Council has required a reinstatement plan, including a timetable and, critically, financial guarantees. Although there is some information in the documentation in respect of timetable and reinstatement of the cross country track, there is no document that is described as a Site Reinstatement Plan, which was the term used in Condition 1, and no mention of financial guarantees.

According to the Condition, no development can start until this critical document has been submitted and approved. We can understand that LOCOG may wish to deal with different parts of the site in different submissions. Even so, so far as that (large) part of the Park which is intended to accommodate the cross country is concerned, we would expect that, to ensure that you have the total picture of what is to be provided, you would wish to be informed about the totality of the development proposed. This should include lighting and fencing, generators and bunds, TV positions, public address systems, noise screening and measuring and so on (see Conditions 4 and 7 in particular).

We appreciate your wish to facilitate the developer as far as it may be possible, having regard to the Planning Board's decision. However, if there were to be partial approval only of some conditions (and in particular Condition 1), it seems to us that there is a real risk of the process going out of control. Condition 1 is the key to work starting. If work is allowed to start before the Site Reinstatement Plan and financial guarantees are in place (contrary to the Condition as originally imposed).

Having regard to the points made above and, in particular:

- the need, which LOCOG accepted last week, to ask the statutory consultees to comment on our concerns about the Roman archaeology and ecological protection/reinstatement,
- the lack of specificity as to which parts of which conditions approval was being sought at this stage, and
- the absence of a Site Reinstatement Plan, including the critical information on the financial guarantees,

our position at this stage is that the Council has insufficient information to approve LOCOG's application and it is asked not to do so until satisfactory information has been provided.

Yours sincerely,

John Hine  
Coordinator

Cc Tim Hadaway, Neil Smith and Neil Walker, LOCOG  
Cllr Geoff Brighty, London Borough of Greenwich  
Mark Camley and Derek Spurr, The Royal Parks

