

VCR:

Date: Monday, 31 March 2014

Location: Chamber, City Hall

Hearing: Convoys Wharf Representation Hearing

Start time: 4.00pm

Finish time: 7.00pm

Speakers:

Boris Johnson, Mayor of London

Anna Alger, Senior Associate, Property and Planning

Graham Clements, Senior Strategic Planner, Greater London Authority

John Miller, Head of Planning, Lewisham Council

Sir Steve Bullock, Mayor of Lewisham

Objectors:

Malcolm Cadman, Pepys Community Forum

David Fleming, Tenants Action Group

Ray Woolford, Lewisham People Before Profit

Helena Russell, local resident

Julian Kingston, the Lenox Project CIC

Bob Bagley, Sayes Court Garden CIC

Nic Durston, National Trust

Rt Hon Dame Joan Ruddock, Member of Parliament for Lewisham Deptford

Other Speakers from the floor:

Planning agent on behalf of applicant, Mark Gibney, BPTW Partnership

Duncan Hawkins, Archaeologist, CGMS

Alex Williams, Transport for London

Roo Angell, Sayes Court Garden CIC

VCR:

Date: Monday, 31 March 2014

Location: Chamber, City Hall

Hearing: Convoys Wharf Representation Hearing

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Good afternoon, everybody, welcome to this representation hearing about Convoys Wharf in Deptford. It looks like an absolutely fascinating case. I am going to begin by asking Anna to say something about the rules of engagement and what we can do and cannot do and all that kind of thing. Anna.

**Anna Alger (Senior Associate, Property and Planning):** Hi, I am Anna Alger, the lead adviser to the hearing. This is a public meeting and anyone can attend, however the hearing should not be filmed by anyone other than the Greater London Authority (GLA). We are following an agenda, which I hope you will have copies of.

The Mayor made a site visit to the application site on 24 February accompanied by officers, representatives from the council and the applicant. The site visit was conducted in accordance with the GLA's procedure on representation hearings and no representations were made to the Mayor during the visit.

All speakers today have been given an allotted time to speak as set out in the agenda. When it is your turn to speak, you will be asked to come forward to the table. We are recording the hearing today so it would be helpful when you come forward if you could clearly introduce yourselves before the start.

Speakers should try to confine their comments to material planning considerations and ensure that their comments do not conflict with the GLA's diversity and equality statement. All speakers will be notified 30 seconds before their time is up. Once speakers have finished there will be no further opportunity to speak unless the Mayor asks you a direct question.

If a member of the public interrupts the hearing at any point, the Mayor will warn them and may order their removal.

On this occasion the Mayor has used his discretion to extend the time limits to ensure as far as possible that he hears from as many interested parties as possible. Having heard all the representations the Mayor may decide he is able to take the decision today. However, if he decides that he needs more time, the decision will be made within five working days and posted on the GLA website, in which case we will notify the council, the applicant, anyone we have previously consulted, anyone else that made comments and any other person who has spoken here today of the decision by email or in writing.

Finally, we are not expecting an evacuation alarm today but should the alarm go off during the hearing, people will be directed towards the nearest evacuation route.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Anna, thank you very much. OK, well, let us crack on, folks and let us hear first of all from Graham Clements. Where is Graham?

**Graham Clements (Senior Strategic Planner, GLA):** Here, thanks very much, Mayor.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Graham who is going to take us through the view of the application from his point of view.

**Graham Clements (Senior Strategic Planner, GLA):** Thank you very much. I must start off with an apology, my presentation does not seem to be feeding through to our audio visual equipment at the moment. I understand someone is on the way. I will proceed and hopefully we will get some visuals --

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** I think just bash on. I think everybody knows it well enough.

**Graham Clements (Senior Strategic Planner, GLA):** -- in due course. I intend to use my presentation to draw out key themes within the representation hearing report and to set the context for the representations that you will be hearing this afternoon. The presentation will cover the site and surroundings, spatial quality context, the proposed development itself, the response to public consultation, Lewisham Council's representations, key planning issues, and our recommendation to the Mayor.

Starting with the site surrounding the spatial policy context. Convoys Wharf, as we know it today, is a vacant and derelict wharf site on the Deptford riverside. However, as we are all aware, this is a brown fields site with a distinguished history. It was established as a Royal dockyard during the 16th century and remained an important Naval dockyard through until the mid to late 1800s. It was also home to diarist and horticulturalist, John Evelyn, whose manor and garden at Sayes Court helped to pioneer various scientific and aesthetic horticultural practices in this country. Furthermore, we know that it was the desire to preserve the house and garden at Sayes Court which ultimately led to the creation of the National Trust. Sadly there is little of the site's rich history that remains above ground today.

The site is located obviously on the River Thames and is situated well in relation to much of London's other World City offer, which includes centres for business, culture and heritage, which you can now see on the screen. It is located within one of your opportunity areas, it is the Deptford Creek and Greenwich Riverside opportunity area, and the plan identifies this area as having an indicative employment generating capacity of 4,000 jobs and states that there is an opportunity to provide a minimum of 5,000 new homes here. The site is highlighted here in red and is located within Environment Agency Flood Zone 3, but it obviously benefits from Thames flood defences.

The public transport accessibility of the site is currently between one and two on a scale of one to six, six being highest. However, various transport interventions proposed as part of the scheme are expected to increase this to around three. The site is also situated quite close to

Deptford town centre and Deptford High Street which is just south of the site. There is a key pedestrian desire line from the site to Deptford High Street and Deptford rail station.

This is the site in a bit more detail, and actually this aerial photo is slightly out of date now. Many of those buildings have been demolished. As you can see, the Olympia building, which is in the centre, and we will look at it in a bit more detail shortly, is now fairly isolated on the 16.6 hectare site. As alluded to at the start, there is a significant amount of archaeology at the site and the applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of archaeological works to investigate these and the level of preservation. I will just whizz through some of the key elements of the archaeology. First is the double dry dock located here, and the Tudor storehouse located here which is a scheduled ancient monument. There are also various slipways at the site, one to five, two of which are located beneath the Grade II listed Olympia building. There is also the dock basin, various mast ponds.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Mast ponds?

**Graham Clements (Senior Strategic Planner, GLA):** That is right, that is ponds that they matured masts in, float them in. I am sure there will be members here that will be able to explain that to you in a bit more detail.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** You need a pond to mature your mast, do you? OK.

**Graham Clements (Senior Strategic Planner, GLA):** So mast ponds, and obviously the archaeology of Sayes Court Manor itself remains. So this slide identifies various heritage assets at the site and in the surrounding vicinity picking out the scheduled Tudor storehouse as well. You can also see at the bottom of the slide, just to the south, is the Deptford High Street conservation area. I particularly want to focus on the Grade II listed Olympia building which is at the heart of the site. You can see it here was originally constructed for ship building. You have obviously visited that on your site visit.

Adjacent to the site and originally forming part of the dockyard, is the Grade II listed master shiprights house and dockyard office. This is located on Watergate Street, and as I say, it directly fronts on to the area of the double dry dock and would have originally formed part of the dockyard. So this is the site highlighted in red, and in blue here is the Maritime Greenwich World Heritage site. You can see there it is spatially quite close, and as you would have seen on your site visit, when standing on the jetty, you can see the World Heritage site itself.

Just to quickly look at the townscape. It is predominantly residential in character surrounding the site, various estates. This is the eastern context, which is characterised by terraced housing, low-rise flats and various open spaces including Twinkle Park. To the south and west are Trinity and Sayes Court Estates, comprising a mix of flat accommodation between five and thirteen storeys. Notwithstanding this, the boundary of the site is characterised by Sayes Court Park and predominantly low-rise properties in Grove Street, Barnes Terrace, Leeway, Prince Street and Decca Street. To the north is Pepys Park and Pepys Estate. Whilst much of this area is characterised by low to mid-rise blocks, there are a number of tall buildings in the vicinity

ranging from 25 to 30 storeys. To the north, on the other side of the river, is obviously the Isle of Dogs, which is characterised by various low-rise residential typologies.

I will now briefly explain the development proposal. It is an outline application and the proposal is for refurbishment of the listed Olympia building, as part of a comprehensive redevelopment to provide up to 3,500 new homes, 50,000 square metres of business space, a working wharf, and a mix of uses including hotel, retail, restaurants and cafes and community space. It is also proposed to provide 1,840 car parking spaces, together with vehicular access and a river bus facility. The development is expected to create 1,200 temporary jobs during construction and 2,150 permanent jobs once the development is completed.

This diagram shows the parameter plan for the various plots within the master plan, and here we have overlaid the archaeology at the site and you can start to see the response of the master plan. Obviously there is a recollection, or a sort of recognition of the dockyard basin, although obviously some of the plots will encroach to a certain extent on the boundary of that, although, as this plan shows, there is potential for revealing the archaeology underneath these buildings for the dockyard basin and Sayes Court Manor as well. There are also slipway number one and the double dry dock which will be celebrated as new open spaces, which we will see in a minute, and the more fragile remains associated with the Tudor storehouse, and other slipways are proposed to be stabilised and preserved in situ and built over. A scheme of archaeological resource management is proposed to ensure that construction would not adversely impact on the archaeology.

This is the illustrative master plan which the applicant has developed in terms of demonstrating how the parameters of the outline scheme could be delivered and what that might look like. As you can see, the plan presents a good and legible grid layout, perimeter blocks providing well-defined and articulated and activated public spaces ensuring that private space within the residential courtyards is well used and that the spaces in the public realm are activated and feel safe through activation and overlooking. There are also various new open spaces, as you can see. There is a landscaped extension to Sayes Court Park, which will act as a green gateway into the site. Also a civic scaled Olympia Square at the heart of the site which will be part of the setting for the listed building, and a new Jetty Park as well which will act as a linear park and help to activate the riverside.

This just indicates the mix of uses and, as you can see, the edges of blocks at the ground floor are going to be very well activated and promoting a real hub and vibrancy to the heart of the site and also to the riverside. This diagram indicates the proposed storey heights across the master plan. The scheme proposes lower heights at the interface of the landward edges of the site. This is to help manage the interface between the scheme and the existing urban fabric, and also manages issues associated with neighbourhood amenity. Into the site the height increases and on to the riverfront also. There are three towers within the scheme, between 34 and 48 storeys. This shows the massing in 3D so you can get more of a sense of that. You can see that sort of low-rise rising up into mid-rise in the centre with a number of feature buildings, which are slightly taller, and then punctuation with the three tall buildings.

This is the response to the riverside, and again you can see the Jetty Park in particular helps to make this a visible and attractive riverside destination. The massing response, again you can see it responding to the edges of the master plan but also setting a good consistent datum and then landmarking through the use of tall buildings. This looks at the landscaping strategy, and as you can see it works well to integrate and link open spaces around the site concluding with Twinkle Park and Pepys Park and Sayes Court Gardens. You can start to appreciate the potential to deliver that landscape extension and Sayes Court Park in particular.

We will now look at some of the responses to public consultation. We will see a detailed summary is set out within the representation hearing report. First of all, in terms of your own representations when considering the application at the initial consultation stage, you stated that the application was supported in principle as it would deliver a major boost to jobs, growth and housing delivery at this vacant site. Notwithstanding this, you identified a number of issues that needed to be resolved in order to ensure compliance with the London Plan. Response to these issues is set out within the representation hearing report. Detailed consultation responses were also received from a number of statutory consultees and other bodies, including English Heritage, Environment Agency, Natural England, Port of London Authority (PLA), Thames Water and London City Airport.

The Port of London Authority is the only one of these bodies to have an outstanding objection to the case. In summary the PLA was broadly content with the proposal to reconfigure and reduce the size of the safeguarded wharf but stated that further commitments were required before it could be satisfied that the development would maximise the use of the river for freight. The PLA also raised concern with the proposed accesses across the wharf plot, including a Thames Path connection, stating that these would need to be designed particularly carefully in order to avoid inadvertently prejudicing wharf operations. A full summary of all representations to consultation is provided within the annual report and where necessary GLA officers propose relevant planning conditions and obligations as appropriate to address the matters raised.

We will now look at the neighbourhood responses. You can see there have been a number obviously, initially to Lewisham Council and then subsequently made to you, and also in response to your consultation on revised plans. So in total there are 69 objections that have been received, including an online petition which is 2,005 signatures at last count, and that was submitted only after you had achieved(?) the direction to take over the application. As part of this response, a number of key local community groups have voiced their concern with the scheme, including the Pepys Community Forum, Tenants Action Group, Lewisham People Before Profit, Deptford Is..., and the Crossfields Tenants and Residents Association. Further to this, a total of 18 representations of support were also received. The issues raised in response to local consultation are set out and considered in detail within the representation hearing report, however I will use the next couple of slides to briefly set out the key themes from the community objection and support.

Key themes of objection relate to loss of the wharf and employment generating land through the mixed use redevelopment, a lack of affordable housing, failure to promote social inclusion, concerns that the proposed height and scale and massing is inappropriate, concerns that the

scheme does not respond to the historic nature of the site and that it would cause harm to archaeology and listed buildings, failure of the master plan to successfully accommodate community projects, impacts on neighbourhood amenity including operational impacts of noise and dust associated with a working wharf, and impacts on daylight and sunlight and overshadowing from the proposed built form. Finally, adverse impacts on the highway and public transport network, particularly when the proposal is considered in conjunction with other approved development in the area.

Key themes of support relate to a perception that the redevelopment site is long overdue and that the scheme could improve the appearance of the area. Support was also noted for employment and local retail amenities proposed as part of the scheme, as well as additional housing and the new open spaces and Thames Path extension. There are also two community groups that made representations of comment, seeking to secure master plan modifications and commitments from the applicant in order to accommodate locally specific heritage led community projects. I will use the next couple of slides to briefly set out the projects concerned.

Sayes Court Garden horticultural programme; the Sayes Court Garden group seek to create a centre of excellence in urban horticulture for the public benefit and as a means of expressing the John Evelyn legacy and celebrating Sayes Court Manor and its historic garden. The project would include horticultural industry apprenticeships as well as learning opportunities across the educational spectrum, from healthy eating and sustainable food production to scientific research. The project is supported by the National Trust, Eden Project, Kew Gardens and various other groups and societies. In order to deliver the programme envisaged the community group has a number of specific requirements, including 1,500 square metres of floor space for the horticultural educational centre and a break-out into 1 hectare of cultivated or open space. The applicant has offered the community group terms for use of a building of the required floor space and open space of approximately 0.6 hectares. However, the community group maintains that 1 hectare of land is required to deliver the programme and that, as currently proposed, the master plan would prevent the project from being delivered.

Now we will move on to the Build the Lenox project. This project seeks to construct a full size replica of the 17th century warship, the Lenox, on the site of the former Deptford Royal Dockyard where it was originally built. The project vision also seeks to establish a construction training programme and on-going legacy scheme repairing other historic vessels in order to provide transferable skills in both modern and heritage construction techniques. The project is supported by the Royal Naval Dockyards Society, the Shipwreck Museum, as well as other various groups and societies.

The Lenox project team has identified the Olympia building as its preferred location for the project. Whilst this location would require reinstatement of a basin and waterway to the Thames, the community group particularly favours this scenario because it would offer a permanent home for the ship once constructed. Instead of this scenario, however, the applicant has offered the community group temporary use of the wharf site. The Lenox group has not accepted this offer, however, because it would not allow the project legacy to be delivered. I

discuss the proposed response to both of these community projects in more detail later on in this presentation.

We will now look at the representations made by Lewisham Council. You will of course be hearing directly from the council in due course. The council stated that it supports the principle of mixed use development at Convoys Wharf in accordance with the principles of core strategy, however Lewisham raised a number of concerns with respect to scale, massing and relationship with historic buildings and spaces, accommodation of community projects, scope for design and flexibility, transport issues and community benefits. Following consultation on revised plans and the publication of the representation hearing report the council stated that whilst modest progress had been made, the revisions and commitments proposed by the applicant did not go far enough in terms of addressing its concerns. In particular, Lewisham's Planning Committee expressed the view that the proposed master plan response to Sayes Court Garden and Build the Lenox community projects was inadequate and would fail to secure the futures of these projects.

The representation hearing report and associated addendums set out a full assessment of all the relevant material planning considerations in this case. However, for the purposes of this presentation I have chosen to articulate a number of key issues having regard to the facts of the case, common themes emerging from public consultation and the representations made by Lewisham Council. The key issues are: principle of development, scale massing response to heritage assets and scope for design flexibility, accommodation of community projects, transport, and housing and community infrastructure. We will also summarise other planning issues on the case.

First I will look at the principle of development in terms of its response to relevant planning policy. Much of the Convoys Wharf site is afforded strategic protection for river freight uses by the London Plan and the 2005 Wharf Review identifies the site as being viable for a range of cargo handling river uses. Notwithstanding this, given the constraints associated with the residential nature of the surrounding context, London Plan Policy 2.13 identifies Convoys Wharf as suitable for a regenerative mixed use redevelopment where wharf related issues could be resolved as part of a comprehensive development proposal to deliver new homes and jobs. Lewisham Core Strategy builds on this approach and identifies Convoys Wharf as having potential to be a wider regeneration catalyst for Deptford. Policy SSA2 in the Core Strategy provides a number of site specific qualities for Convoys Wharf. Collectively these seek to ensure that development of the site would not prejudice wharf operation and that it would make a major contribution to housing provision of up to 3,500 units and deliver employment opportunities and community facilities. Policy SSA2 also sets out a number of design objectives for the site and promotes the creation of a new destination on the Thames riverfront.

The proposal would provide 2.3 hectares of working wharf area at the master plan plot 21, and that is shown here in brown. This represents a 71% contraction in the area of safeguarded wharf currently at the site. Given the constraints of the context, GLA officers are satisfied that this level of reduction is appropriate in this case. In response to London Plan Policy and advice from the Port of London Authority, GLA officers propose a range of measures to facilitate the timely reactivation of this wharf. These will be secured by way of planning condition and/or

obligation, as appropriate. Further to this and the consideration within the representation hearing report, with respect to provision of housing, employment, community facilities and urban design, much of which I will also touch on as part of this presentation, GLA officers are of the view that the scheme accords with the relevant planning policy context for this site. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed comprehensive mixed use redevelopment of the site will provide valuable homes and jobs to catalyse the regeneration of Deptford, and that the principle of development accords with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the London Plan and the Lewisham Core Strategy.

In this section I intend to address matters with respect to the scale massing response and response to heritage assets and the scope for design flexibility. I will start this section by exploring the proposed response to the Grade II listed Olympia building. The master plan proposes to make Olympia the focal point at the heart of the site. The listed building will be set within a public square of more than 11,000 square metres. This is a visualisation of the listed building within the square. As you can see it will be well activated by uses within the building and on the periphery of the square. The offsetting of the master plan alignment from the listed building also ensures that the building would be celebrated as distinct and different from the master plan, but obviously still well integrated with it. A reflective pool in the public realm is also proposed to recall the memory of the historic basin. The master plan layout places Olympia at the heart of the site and provides two ground approaches to the listed building; the green gateway from Sayes Court Park and a route from the river bus pier and Jetty Park at the waterfront. This is the proposed view of Olympia from the river. GLA officers are of the opinion that the listed building would be suitably prominent and that buildings either side would contribute positively to the framing of this view. Overall, GLA officers are satisfied that the proposed development will enhance the setting of the Grade II listed Olympia building.

We will now look at the master shipwrights house and dockyard office which is Grade II\* listed. This diagram shows the interface, that is obviously the listed building there, and you can see it is proposed to front the new public space which will be defined by the building line of the listed building and that of the adjacent plot, I think it is plot 1, and that is the double dry dock public space, and that obviously provides a vastly improved setting for the listed building. This is in a bit more detail on the landscaping approach to that dock, and boundary treatments will be developed further at reserve matters stage. Again, the listed building here, obviously illustrations identified in red and you can see that the massing of the master plan is stepping down towards that building. We have also sought to reduce the height of that block in that area identified in red there, just to fix that at five storeys, again to provide the best possible setting for the listed building. In conclusion, we are satisfied that the development will enhance the setting of the Grade II stylistic Master Shipwrights House and Dockyard Office.

In terms of response to the townscape, I propose to examine that in this section. For the avoidance of doubt, throughout the townscape assessment and the other listed building assessments in this presentation, GLA officers have had special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their settings and any features of special architectural or historic interests they may possess.

In each of the visualisations to come, the proposal is identified by a green outline. This is the strategic view from Greenwich Park looking towards Central London and St Paul's Cathedral. The proposal is identified in green and St Paul's Cathedral is at the centre of the view. I have highlighted it there in red. GLA officers are of the opinion that whilst the proposal would substantially change the current characteristics of the river edge at Deptford, this change would not harm the viewer's ability to recognise or appreciate St Paul's Cathedral as the strategic landmark. Furthermore, having regard to the cumulative impact of other consented development in this view, GLA officers are satisfied that the impact of the scheme would not amount to canyoning around the strategic landmark.

This is an expanded panorama of the same view and also shows the Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site in the same context to the right. GLA officers are of the opinion that the proposal would feature some considerable distance from the Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site and would not undermine the formal actual arrangement that is Greenwich Palace, the Queen's House and associated landscapes. Accordingly, GLA officers conclude that the proposal would not adversely impact on the integrity, authenticity or significance of the World Heritage Site in this view and that the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage Site would be preserved.

This is a townscape view from within the World Heritage Site. The view demonstrates that the proposal will be seen in conjunction with the Grade I Royal Naval College North East building which is prominent in the foreground and the proposal would compare distance from the secondary in the background. Having considered this view, GLA officers are satisfied that the proposed development would not cause harm to the setting of listed buildings or the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage Site.

In this view, the proposal would feature, in the middle ground, the view towards Central London from Greenwich Pier. The proposal would be seen amongst various other large scale buildings in the middle ground and GLA officers conclude that the proposal would not harm this view.

This is a strategic view from Blackheath Point looking towards Central London and St Paul's Cathedral. The proposal again is identified in green and St Paul's is located in the centre here with the red circle. The development obviously features some distance to the right of St Paul's and GLA officers are of the opinion that the proposal would not harm the viewer's ability to recognise or appreciate St Paul's Cathedral as a strategic landmark.

This is the view from Pointers Close. It also includes Paynes Wharf which is Grade II listed. The visualisation demonstrates that the scheme would result in a dramatic change to the character of the Deptford river site and, in conjunction with other consented development, would contribute to a new and distinct urban riverside location. The Tower elements give a distinct sense of presence to the 16.6 hectare site in this view and, once completed, the scheme would positively contribute to the life and vibrancy of this stretch of the riverside. Accordingly, GLA officers are of the opinion that the proposal would significantly enhance this view and would not harm the setting of Paynes Wharf Grade II just to the right in this view.

This is a view from the foreshore at Deptford and it includes listed warehouses which are Grade II listed. The foreground is obviously dominated by the listed building. Whilst it is clear from the proposal that both Tower elements would feature prominently in the view, the massing strategy ensures that, as a whole, the development would present a sympathetic silhouette stepping down to below the parapet height of the listed building in this view. Accordingly, GLA officers are of the opinion that the proposal would not harm the setting of the Grade II listed warehouses.

This view looks north along New King Street towards the site from a position within the Deptford High Street conservation area. The three Tower elements would be partially visible either side of the access in New King Street, landmarking the site and framing the gateway to the Thames riverside. GLA officers are of the opinion that the proposal would enhance this view and positively contribute towards improving the legibility of the area whilst preserving the fundamental character of the Deptford High Street conservation area.

This is a view further south within the Deptford High Street conservation area. Submitted visualisation demonstrates that two of the three Tower elements would be clearly visible above the railway bridge at the centre of the view. These would landmark the riverside from this part of Deptford High Street. GLA officers are again of the opinion that the proposal would enhance this view and positively contribute towards the legibility of the area whilst preserving the fundamental character of the Deptford High Street conservation area.

Having had special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their settings and any features of special or architectural or historic interest that they may possess, GLA officers conclude that the proposed development would enhance the settings of the Olympia building and Master Shipwrights House. The height and massing development would enliven the silhouette of the scheme when viewed from the riverside and landmark the Thames from the townscape views. The proposal would not cause harm to the settings of listed buildings, strategic or local views or the outstanding universal value of the Mayor's unfinished World Heritage Site.

With respect to masses of design flexibility, having had regard to issues raised by numerous parties, including the Mayor and Lewisham Council, the applicant has submitted revisions which relax the minimum parameters for the tallest buildings within the scheme. This will allow for greater flexibility with respect to the detailed design of the proposed Tower elements meaning that these could potentially come forward in a more slender or curvaceous form. GLA officers also propose a planning condition to allow for reasonable deviation from the proposed design guidelines that reserve them at a stage where this would allow for enhanced design outcome.

I will now explore the proposed response to accommodating community projects starting with the Sayes Court Garden project. This is a close-up of the master plan as originally submitted in the vicinity of Sayes Court. The applicant proposes community space, identified here by the arrow, above the archaeological remains of Sayes Court Manor. This visualisation shows how the scheme could express the community space, named in the application documents as the John Evelyn Centre, as a distinct element within a larger mixed use block. The centre would also be used to allow for the archaeology of Sayes Court Manor to be revealed.

However, whilst the centre responds well to the floor space requirements of the Sayes Court project, concern was raised that it did not benefit from a tangible link with the critical mass of green open space. In response to GLA led negotiations, the applicant submitted revised plans which removed a school block at master plan plot 17, moving that into plot 16 creating a community hub and resulting in a significant improved interface and with open space and a greater provision of open space also.

Further to this, the applicant has also offered the community group terms for use of approximately 0.6 hectares of open space adjacent to the proposed John Evelyn Centre. However, the Sayes Court Garden Group has maintained that this provision of open space is insufficient for it to deliver a viable programme. Accordingly, the community group proposes a revision to the master plan parameters at plot 16 to allow for a more open block layout that would deliver a greater provision of open space. The applicant has not proposed this amendment however. Further negotiations between the applicant and the council and the community group are proposed to take place as part of section 106 work with a view to identifying flexible open space options for the community group. These may include a landscape extension of the programme into the adjacent Sayes Court Park subject to further detailed discussions with Lewisham Council in particular.

With respect to the Build the Lenox project, as discussed earlier, the project's preferred location for the shipbuilding programme is at the Olympia building. However, as acknowledged by English Heritage, there are a number of potential constraints to this scenario associated with potential impacts on archaeology and the structure of the listed building itself. This approach would also require excavation of a basin or channel of approximately 120 metres in order to the launch the ship and would also require deconstruction of part of the jetty park.

The applicant's proposal for the Lenox project is that it should take place on the wharf at master plan plot 21. The archaeology at this plot is less constraining meaning that shipbuilding could take place on a cradle or within an excavated dock. The key advantage, however, is the proximity to the river for launch. However, given that master plan plot 21 is proposed to become a working wharf, the applicants offer for use of this plot is only temporary. Whilst the duration of occupation would be sufficient to meet the needs of the Lenox shipbuilding process, the community group has made it clear that the longer term legacy objectives of the project would not be delivered unless the ship has a permanent home to return to. This constraint is acknowledged and whilst GLA officers seek to use the section 106 agreement to secure the Lenox shipbuilding process at the wharf site, an independent feasibility study is also proposed to be secured. This study would look at the strengths and weaknesses of both the Olympia and wharf site for the Lenox project and will also consider the issue of finding a permanent home for the Lenox once it is built.

In conclusion, on the community projects, whilst both the community groups and the applicant have generally responded positively to the need to compromise, GLA officers accept that neither of the community groups are currently satisfied that the core requirements of their project would be accommodated by the master plan. GLA officers are, nevertheless, hopeful that through further detailed negotiations around the terms of the section 106 agreement, it

may be possible to reach a mutually agreeable accommodation scenario for these projects. You will, of course, be hearing directly from the Sayes Court Garden Group and the Lenox community groups in due course.

I will now look at transport and starting with the Thames Path connection which is a key benefit of the proposed development. Here you can see the existing routes which obviously have a significant deviation inland due to the inaccessible nature of the Convoys Wharf site at the moment. However, as a result of the proposal, a new section of high quality Thames Path would be provided. GLA officers propose to use the section 106 agreement to secure the delivery of the Thames Path extension for pedestrians and cyclists from the first phase.

In other proposed transport interventions, the applicant proposes a series of public transport interventions. These include a new pier and financial contribution to support river bus services which will stop at the site. Rerouting of a bus service through the site and a financial contribution towards enhancing other bus services' capacity on Evelyn Street and, as part of a package of planning obligations, the applicant also proposes enhancements to New King Street where, subject to securing an area of land owned by Lewisham Council, would be widened to allow for two-way bus movements and an enhanced pedestrian route to Deptford High Street. It would also allow for a cycle route connection to Cycle Superhighway 4 which will be coming in along Evelyn Street.

The applicant also proposes enhancements to the important New King Street, Evelyn Street, and Deptford High Street junction south of the site identified here. This, in conjunction with other public realm enhancements, will provide significantly improved pedestrian connections between the site, Deptford High Street and Deptford Rail Station.

Within its representations on the case, the Lewisham Council has expressed its view that an all red phase should be introduced for traffic lights at the junction with a view to prioritising pedestrian movement. With respect to this proposal, the Mayor has advised that Transport for London (TfL) has cautioned that an all red phase may have implications on traffic flow along Evelyn Street and/or may result in a longer waiting time for pedestrians crossing this junction.

Notwithstanding this, TfL is committed to working with Lewisham Council and the applicant in order to reach an optimised design solution that would enhance this junction particularly for pedestrians. An all red phase option is proposed to be considered as part of this process along with various others.

Quickly looking at proposed car parking; there are 1,840 car parking spaces proposed, 300 of which are non-residential. The scheme, therefore, provides an average of 0.4 car parking spaces to each dwelling. This is in accordance with London Plan standards. Furthermore, disabled parking, electric vehicle charging points, a car club and implementation of a car park management plan are proposed to be secured by way of a planning condition and a planning obligation as appropriate.

The applicant submitted a transport assessment that sets out expected transport impacts of the scheme. This assessment and its findings are considered in detail within the representation here

in the report. In summary, GLA officers have concluded that the data and modelling outputs within the transport assessment are sufficiently robust to demonstrate that, in conjunction with the various mitigation measures proposed, the development would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway or public transport network. Notwithstanding this, in accordance with TfL best practice, it has proposed to secure further detailed modelling by way of planning obligation. This modelling will be used to inform the detailed design of highway mitigation measures in conjunction with the Cycle Superhighway or proposals on Evelyn Street.

In conclusion, on transport, GLA officers are satisfied that the transport assessment is sufficiently robust. Appropriate transport interventions would be secured to service the scheme and to mitigate the impacted development in transport terms. The proposed development would not result in unacceptable impacts on the highway or public transport network. The proposed level of car parking is appropriate.

I will now consider matters associated with housing and community infrastructure. First of all, I look at residential quality. The submitted design and access statement includes studies of all the key residential type policies within the scheme. Having reviewed these, GLA officers note that they would allow for the key aims of the Mayor's London Housing Supplementary Housing Guidance (SPG) to be met. Incorporation of wharf operation mitigation measures and compliance with London Plan minimum space standards is proposed to be secured by way of a planning condition. Based on this and the outlined design principles within the scheme, GLA officers are satisfied that the residential design of the detailed phases will come forward in broad accordance for local and regional residential design guidance.

With respect to the provision of affordable housing, the scheme would deliver 525 affordable homes or 15% provision of affordable housing. GLA officers have had the viability of the scheme independently reviewed and this has verified that the proposed 15% provision is the maximum that the scheme can afford under current market conditions. Notwithstanding this, given the expectation that sales' values within the scheme will improve over time, GLA officers propose to secure a review mechanism in order to secure a proportion of any uplift for the delivery of additional affordable housing units within the Borough of Lewisham.

Whilst it is noted that the proposed affordable tenure split does not accord with strategic targets within the London Plan or the Lewisham core strategy, GLA officers are satisfied that the proposed prioritisation of intermediate tenure is an appropriate response to context in this instance given that 57% of dwellings with the Evelyn Ward are social rented. Furthermore, following GLA led negotiations, the applicant has agreed to increase the proportion of family housing within the affordable rent component maxed to 40%.

In terms of community infrastructure, the scheme proposes to make a positive contribution to social infrastructure in Deptford through the provision of a two form entry primary school and local health centre. The scheme would also provide a local extension to the Thames Bath and more than 35,000 square metres of new open space and a number of financial contributions are also proposed as part of a package of planning obligations.

In conclusion, the proposal would deliver a significant quantity of high quality homes. The proposed provision of affordable housing has been demonstrated to be the maximum the scheme can currently afford and a review mechanism will ensure delivery of additional affordable homes in the future where viability improves. Furthermore, through the applicant's commitments to community infrastructure, GLA officers are satisfied that the outlined application would positively contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities in Deptford.

That concludes the key issues' section of the presentation. I am just moving on to other issues and, for the avoidance of doubt, I should point out that there are numerous other issues on the case associated with safeguarding wharf matters, maximising use of the river for freight, a mix of uses including employment, retail and visitor infrastructure, sustainable communities including social inclusion, inclusive design, energy, environmental issues and neighbourhood immunity.

For reasons of time, I have chosen not to cover these issues in detail as part of this presentation. However, all the relevant planning issues are fully addressed within the hearing report and addendum. With respect to planning obligations, we propose a number of heads of terms as part of the section 106 agreement. A comprehensive list is provided within the addendum to the hearing report. However, key section 106 items include the affordable housing review mechanism, wharf infrastructure and activation measures, two form entry primary school and delivery of a health facility all (several inaudible words), restoration of the Olympia building, public transport enhancement of the new river bus service and enhanced by services. £3.1 million for public rail enhancements. £1.5 million for local employment and training. £0.4 million for education and with a top up to £0.8 million where it is viable to do so in the future. £0.5 million for local open space. £0.25 million for community projects, and a further £0.25 million for the community trust. £0.2 million for Lenox's Project feasibility study.

Finally our recommendation to you, Mayor, which is that you agree with the offered advice and the representation here in the reports, and to grant planning permission for the development subject to planning conditions and conclusion of a section 106 legal agreement. Thank you, Mayor that concludes my presentation.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Thank you very much, Graham for a very thorough, not to say compendious, presentation. I think we have already covered all the front, so to speak. That takes us on to the speakers on this matter from the borough. To begin with, who is going to speak? Sir Steve himself, the Mayor. Welcome. You have five minutes. Then after Steve has spoken I am then going to hand on to the objectors who will have 18 minutes in all, through great clemency we can give an extra 3 minutes there, presumably divided between you. First of all, Steve you have got five minutes. Steve?

**Sir Steve Bullock (Mayor of Lewisham):** I am Steve Bullock the Mayor of Lewisham. I am accompanied by John Miller, our head of planning. The importance of this site must not be underestimated. It is the largest development site in Lewisham, occupying a site of great historical significance, as we have heard. If we get it wrong now we will not have the opportunity again in our lifetimes. I am speaking today on behalf of the whole of Lewisham

Council as well as our community. We want to see the site developed but our concerns are not minor issues which can be resolved or fixed at a later stage. I will begin with the scale massing in relationship of the proposals to the historic building and spaces. The Olympia Warehouse is the only visible reminder of a history on the site today and we feel that the scale and position of the proposed buildings around it will tend to dominate it, and in fact detract from its setting. In particular we feel they limited the views of the building from the river and of the river from the building. We argue that the heights of the new building should be reduced. Their sighting changed to get it a generous and respectful setting, safeguarding the views to and from the river.

Turning to the Sayes Court Garden and Build the Lenox Project. You have heard about the relevant history of the site and we believe there is a unique opportunity to provide a real and viable link to that history through these projects. The current proposals do not however provide either the space needed to deliver them, or a commitment to ensure that they create an enduring legacy. We believe that relatively minor changes are needed to the development parameters to allow for the meaningful incorporation of the Sayes Court Garden Project. We welcome the undertaking to jointly commission an independent feasibility study of the use of the warehouse and the wharf as locations to build the Lenox. However, we are disappointed that the possibility of a permanent home is not included in that.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** the Lenox?

**Sir Steve Bullock (Mayor of Lewisham):** The risk remains that these community projects will be shut out and the energy and enthusiasm they have generated will be lost.

Referring to the transport issues, we have serious doubts about TfL current assessment of the scheme and the absence of detailed traffic modelling and we urge that finding a solution which includes a pedestrian phase at this junction be prioritised. We have looked carefully at the community benefits and sustainability, we believe that for the new scheme to become genuinely part of Deptford, supporting social cohesion will be critical and we look to the financial contributions through the section 106 agreement to make that possible. We believe the current development is able to afford what are in any case quite modest increases in the financial contributions of some £5 million being proposed by the council to match the commitments made by the previous owners. There is a great need in this area for affordable housing and the financial review mechanism is essential to secure additional units as the viability improves.

To conclude, we have the change to develop a genuinely sustainable community at Convoys Wharf. A few simple changes now that will in no way undermine or detract from the overall vision for the site, or go a long way to ensure that this becomes a reality, not something future generations will see as a missed opportunity. For that reason we urge you to take just a little more time to ensure that these issues can be addressed and resolved satisfactorily before giving your approval to the scheme. Thank you.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Thank you very much. That is very clear and helpful. Thank you, Steve. Also, I think you were well under time there by the way. Fantastic effort.

Thank you. Shall we go on to -- the first speaker I have got on my list is Ray Woolford of Lewisham People Before Profit.

**Male Speaker:** (several inaudible words)

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Oh, forgive me. OK. Is it Malcolm Cadman?

**Malcolm Cadman (Pepys Community Forum):** Yes.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** From Pepys Community Forum. Welcome. Malcolm, you have three minutes, apparently.

**Malcolm Cadman (Pepys Community Forum):** Thank you.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Is that OK?

**Malcolm Cadman (Pepys Community Forum):** I am from (overspeaking) I am the chair and manager. I actually live nearby, so I am a local resident, so I will be effected by this. You are welcome to come and visit me sometime. I am very concerned about getting the very best benefits for the people of Deptford. Particularly in housing, social integration, business and transport amongst many others. Such as new homes, new employment opportunities and new community assets and facilities. On employment Convoys Wharf has always been a major employment site, particularly marine site. The application is now doing a new mixed use application and we do not think it is going to really offer new employment opportunities for people at our level. The GLA report has forecast 2,150 operational new jobs and about 1,200 new construction jobs, but we find this very difficult to see. In the long term we think may be somewhere - 600 to 800 jobs - might be in the long term. However, most of those might go to new people who actually travel into the area and not local people.

We operate a local project for employment and training advice. It is not their fault, but our clients mainly want to access basic low and semi-skilled jobs and we do not see the new Convoy is really creating this opportunity. For example, the new hotel may create around 40 jobs, and so where else will all these new jobs be coming from. In the GLA report in which quotes the (inaudible) of Lewisham, **SSA2(?)** they are asking normally for about 20% of new business spaces being created. That is flexible ones for new affordable businesses, not kind of hotels and stuff like that. This scheme has only given 4%, which is very, very low. There is not really going to be much chance for local entrepreneurs in Lewisham to come and thrive and float on this site.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Sorry, 4% what?

**Malcolm Cadman (Pepys Community Forum):** There is just 4% in the application. It is 920 square metres plus 370 square metres. It is actually in your report. It is only 1,000 square metres will be for new flexible --

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Sorry, forgive me. Yes.

**Malcolm Cadman (Pepys Community Forum):** -- businesses. Not big businesses no. It is the sort of small guys in essence. It might be the Richard Branson and so on, OK? Mainly this is aimed at unaffordable housing, 85% luxury apartments and a very small total of 15% affordable. It is really aimed at foreign investors, not local Deptford people. China, Hong Kong, Russia, part of the world with fiscal instability who will most likely not even bother to reside here. Remember I live nearby. The real Londoners that you are meant to be supporting will then be put in a position of having to rent back this property from the new owners at a higher costs in the **sales**(?) rather than their own mortgage for the first time. We know there is real problem there. This very low number of 15% affordable in itself is not going to be affordable to anyone with an income less than £40,000. That is a really high fence to actually climb over for people in our area. The (inaudible) has been said already is about 57% social housing, so there is a real demand for social housing in this area, and there is not any social housing to come out of the development. You need to look at that very carefully, Mr Mayor.

Overall it is going to give a very negative effect on our housing waiting list, which is about 15,000 plus, which is principally for social housing. That is families with two, three, four children and so on. This scheme is mainly for the financially better off. There is going to be a new population coming into our area.

Moving to a different point, we think the design of the three towers are too tall. They are twice the towers already around the other parts of the area, which are atypical of the area. We think the architectural features are very, very poor; very boring, single rectangular sort of features. The guidance by **Caber**(?) and so on has always been that high buildings should have real high quality, if they get approved at all. You must seriously look at the heights of those buildings, if they even get built.

Generally, in yesterday's *Sunday Observer* there is about 220 new high rise towers being proposed in London and there is a new campaign, by influential artists and politicians and academics to try to save London's skyline from this domination of high rise. Again, you must look at this, because it seems that the tower blocks here are going to look like a kind of kit tower block that can be built anywhere, not really responding to the site. The scheme itself is going to have 76% of the land from employment use to be housing use. That is going to be a luxury housing use. That is out of a total of 419,000 square metres. The actual density of 3,500 gives 211 units per hectare - this is actually in your report - which is well above the range of your London plan. It is already very dense in Deptford, you are making Deptford super dense Deptford. Lots of 'Ds' in there and so on. That you must avoid. There is a clear intention it seems, at worst, to bury all the maritime history of this site under a high density and high rise luxury apartment scheme, and then throw away the keys to any future for our children and their grandchildren and so on to really enjoy this site in the way it could be. It seems the key driver is really just to make high profits for luxury development and not really respond to the site.

We actually funded four social integration projects. One was about education, one about health, one about economic development and one about traffic movement. We used the Civic Trust and we used Alan Baxter Associates. We concluded then there was not really any detail coming forward from the developer as of now how we are really going to benefit as local people.

The social integration is really not here. They are not really addressing that, because it is very difficult to do. The **evening**(?) waters are sort of very useful. We have got a population of about 40% under 16. There is going to be a big demand on secondary school places. The child yield, and that is how many young children get born in the area, could be about 2.4 from our statistics and that means a high number of people coming forward in the future demanding primary schools and secondary schools.

A larger point, taken in relation to eight other applications in Deptford, which were just around this site, again where I live, there is probably going to be about 15,000 to 20,000 --

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Mr Cadman, I do not wish to interrupt you, but you are taking time from other people.

**Malcolm Cadman (Pepys Community Forum):** Oh, sorry. I thought you were going to cut in and tell me when to stop.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** You have to keep to your own time. The total time --

**Malcolm Cadman (Pepys Community Forum):** OK, I will stop there.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** -- the lot of you have is 18 minutes. I regret to say you are --

**Malcolm Cadman (Pepys Community Forum):** I thought I was going to get a one minute warning, but it has not happened. OK. Yes, OK. We sort of decided earlier on to get a sort of one minute warning. I will stop there and let other people come in. Thank you.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Thank you very much. Thank you. Who is next? Is that Mr Ray Woolford?

**David Fleming (Tenants Action Group):** David Fleming.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** David Fleming.

**David Fleming (Tenants Action Group):** Tenants Action Group for Deptford. I have been involved in this project for 13 years. Richard Rogers was the first architect we had on board and there was a lot of consultation with Richard Rogers. They actually came to the meetings that we had in Deptford. With this architect there has been no consultation whatsoever from the day 1. There has been a lot of changes. When you go onto the site of ten blocks, and they are built in a square - which is a medieval design - it is to gain density, right? What people do not realise is the privacy of these blocks is nil because inside the podiums, inside the blocks you can see across and you can see other people's flats. When you are outside of it, we do not know whether the bedrooms are inside or outside. Outside of it, it is just across the road, which is about 20 ft. There is no privacy whatsoever.

Also with the GLA guidelines of 211 property per hectare this falls long over that. There is more than 211 properties. Are the GLA going to put this in force, the 211? I have worked it out that there is something like 160 properties over the guidelines, so it means what we are trying to do is decrease the density. Deptford at the moment has the highest density in London. With the amount of projects that are being done there now, no one seems to have taken it on board about density. You are putting three and a half thousand properties there. At the moment I have meetings with the local community and they are saying there is nothing there to attract them to this. There is no open space. There is no public area where they can go and enjoy anything. Every block is in isolation of the other.

The next point I want to raise is the new jetty is being put alongside a play area of children which has just been refurbished. It has got swings, roundabouts, the lot, for young children. There is a netball court. There is a football pitch. That has cost the best part of £3 million.

In the long term, what is going to happen is the jetty is there and you are going to have a lot of lorries coming in and out of there. They are going to be diesel lorries so the fumes of diesel are there. I have got a document here which I am going to give to Graham [Clements] over there. This is the American Cancer research. They have 100% proven that diesel lorry fumes can cause cancer. There is no barrier from the jetty and (inaudible) estate which has cost £3 million to refurbish.

The next item I want to bring up is that on the drawings it shows a foot bridge going from Convoys in to the protected wharf area which we do not want. It is a place where people can sit and enjoy.

However, what I am mainly asking for is that we have had no consultation and I am asking you to defer this until the local community get answers. I went to a meeting with the architects at Convoys with the model and I asked a load of questions. Every time I got told, "I do not know, I do not know." I wrote a letter last Monday which I sent to Graham [Clements] and it itemises all the questions. We want answers and we are not getting them.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Thank you so much Mr Fleming. I think we must move on to the next speaker. Thank you very much.

**Ray Woolford (Lewisham People Before Profit):** Good afternoon, Mayor. My name is Ray Woolford. I am representing Lewisham People Before Profit today.

Over past week Prince Charles, Lord Turner, People Before Profit and Shelter have all agreed with the following statement, "We are seeing a land grab and a rush for profit leaving our city blighted by appalling planning choices."

Convoys Wharf should be the model for the future by reflecting London's heritage and give the listed warehouse to the Lenox Project, by learning from the failings of the past, and by resolving the present manmade housing crisis that even *The Daily Telegraph* states today is pricing Londoners out of getting housing by speculators, offshore investors and buy to let.

Affordable should include small shops and workspace, the engine of local economies. All affordable homes should have a new lease by what you can ensure when you grant their consents that they are protected long term as affordable social homes, and only available to be sold to people on low incomes, not ending up in years ahead in buy to let hands.

Failure to act today will have alarming repercussions for all Londoners, with new laws forcing social and council landlords to charge 80% of market rents. The very people that make London work will be priced out forever.

We have other concerns. The Convoys risk assessment highlights air pollution and water contamination. We call on you today to ensure your officers get air monitoring in place next week to monitor air quality before, and during the 13 years of building. Londoners' health must be put before offshore profit.

We call on you to insist that all the residents benefit from the (inaudible) green energy. It cannot be fair that Lewisham residents waste will be used to offer low cost energy for the superrich, whilst thousands of local residents are living in fuel property.

We call on you to insist that jobs go to address the 55% youth unemployment in Deptford, and that you put a stop to cheap labour moving onsite and living in sheds as happened in the Olympic Park, in all to be called Jobs for Local Residents.

We have a homes crisis. You have the power to end the bubble. Is it so wrong for the workers of London to expect the politicians they elect to have the vision to offer self-built, co-operative, and council housing as a proper long term and sustainable solution to the present housing crisis in London. Thank you.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Thank you very much. We now have Helena Russell.

**Helena Russell (local resident):** As a local resident I believe that the research in to the potential impact of this development on the local transport network has been woefully inadequate. Meanwhile, the work that has been carried out uses outdated information and lacks robustness.

Three fundamental aspects of this application risk creating the perfect storm for our local transport network.

The master plan foresees the construction of 3,500 residential units, potentially 9,000 new residents. Even by London standards this is high density. Car parking provision is well above what is proposed for other major developments in the area. The average across four nearby sites is 0.32 spaces per residential unit, compared with 0.44, which is seemingly acceptable for this site.

The public transport accessibility level for the site ranges from very poor to poor. Even with the proposed mitigation this only rises to a moderate level on some parts of the site with the remainder still rating poor. The relatively isolated location of the site makes it very difficult to

improve this level of access, and the proposals on offer simply do not have the capacity to address this need.

It is obvious that residents will resort to driving, hence a robust analysis of the impact on the local highways should be given the highest priority. Congestion on Evelyn Street will undoubtedly increase above existing levels, and the extra traffic will undermine the reliability of the very bus services intended to encourage public transport use.

Many other factors have not been taken in to consideration. For example, the lack of any firm commitment to the use of the river for construction materials; the changes to Greenwich Line train services that start next year; and the cycle super highway proposed by the Mayor for Evelyn Street.

I remain disappointed and concerned that the GLA is recommending approval of this application, in particular at this density, without up to date robust traffic analysis.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Thank you.

**Julian Kingston (Director, the Lenox Project CIC):** Good afternoon, sir, ladies and gentlemen. I am Julian Kingston, Director of the Lenox Project.

The Olympia Building is the most visible part of the dockyard heritage remaining on the site today. Archaeological excavations have shown, however, that a huge range of below ground structures also remain in much greater volume than previously believed. These include the great basin in front of the Olympia Building, potentially the one remaining dynamic element in an otherwise static landscape. The historical and visual significance of this protected building is clearly recognised. Its distinctive shape has even been adopted by the developer for use as the site logo.

Master Planner Terry Farrell pledged to place the Olympia Building at the heart of the development when he made his promise to build from the ground up. However, the future uses proposed for the building would not offer any meaningful link to its history, nor would they engage or educate the local community, attract tourism, or offer the legacy for the site that we believe can be drawn from the Lenox.

The benefits of our project to build a 17th century replica ship have been accepted by all parties, including the GLA which strongly supports the key aims and associated public benefits of the Lenox Project, and the applicant, which recognises its importance as a reference to Deptford's history. Our vision for the Olympia Building would link directly and tangibly to its historic past, link the ship building shed to its original use and the opening of the great basin would reconnect the building with the river to enable its past splendour to be recreated. The legacy is threefold. A legacy for heritage assets of the site; a legacy for craftsmanship, education and training; and a legacy for historic ship building.

The location of our project is key. It would offer a logical use for the Olympia Building and create a vibrant tourist attraction at the heart of the site, drawing in visitors for the shops, cafes

and restaurants that the redevelopment proposes. Above all it would be a living history, an exhilarating and sensational adventure for Deptford's youth, and a strong draw for the tourists flocking to the Greenwich and Deptford maritime heritage zone.

Our community projects are the one solid foundation on which the heritage of Deptford can be acknowledged and built from the ground up. Without our persistence no attention would have been paid to the heritage of the site, and they cannot be allowed to fail for a lack of will by those in power.

Our support for Sayes Court Garden acknowledges the passion that John Evelyn had for shipbuilding. A passion so strong that he left his land to the admiralty, on condition that there should always be a ship on the stocks. We believe this tradition deserves to be resurrected with the Lenox keel laid in the Olympia Building. Thank you.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Thank you.

**Nic Durston (the National Trust):** Good afternoon, my name is Nic Durston at the National Trust. I am going to speak first and then Bob [Bagley] will follow.

the National Trust's interest, as introduced by Graham [Clements], is very much about the history and the significance of Sayes Court, not just from John Evelyn's 17th century garden, but through to the history of that garden and the foundation of the National Trust in terms of how the trust's founders, Octavia Hill and Robert Hunter some ten years before the official founding of the National Trust were looking at ways in which Sayes Court could be protected for the benefit of the public. We have commissioned independent historic research to underline the importance and significance of Sayes Court, and also how undoubtedly its protection was something that the National Trust's founders were looking at, and which undoubtedly led to the subsequent creation of the National Trust in 1895.

We are therefore working closely with the Sayes Court Community Interest Company to realise that significance and that importance in their proposals. We fully support the proposals they have set out and their current position in terms of looking for more flexibility in terms of the master plan to allow their ambitions for the centre of urban horticulture to become realised. Bob will explain more about those plans.

**Bob Bagley (Director, Sayes Court Garden CIC):** My name is Bob Bagley. I am one of the directors of the Sayes Court Garden Community Interest Company.

Working with the National Trust, the Eden Project, and Harvard University, we have demonstrated a real need for a dedicated centre of urban horticulture in London, to help us prepare and adapt for the new challenges facing our cities in the 21st century.

Sayes Court position at the new Convoys Wharf, together with its international significance, make it the perfect location to establish such a centre as a beacon for the future; a visitor attraction in its own right; creating a programme of education, training and enterprise. The benefits of this potential have been well recognised in the GLA's report.

From research conducted by the National Trust we found that a minimum of one hectare of open space is required to deliver this project. Unfortunately the applicant has only been able to offer half of that. Without this land the project will be unable to deliver any of the programmes and the accompanying benefits, will thus be unable to sustain itself financially and will be unable to proceed.

Working with Lewisham Council planners we have put forward a solution where an alteration to the minimum parameters of block B16 would allow the necessary open space to be released. This flexible approach, which the applicant has recently taken on the towers to allow for greater design flexibility, would allow an appropriate design to be negotiated at the reserve **matter**(?) stage to meet the ends of all parties. Any floor or parking space lost can be accommodated within the existing parameters elsewhere on the site. The applicant would retain the security of being able to build out to their current maximum parameters, if no feasible business plan were forthcoming.

Crucially this would not affect other aspects of the application, such as the environmental impact assessment and could therefore be applied without delay to the determination of outlying permission.

The centre could then be accommodated within, for example, an L-shaped block. This gives the project a strong link to the cultural hub of the Olympia Building, and maximises the aggregation of community activity between the centre, primary school and hotel within one building. This reinforces the strong design principles of the master plan, giving good definition to surrounding **boots**(?) and spaces. Through recent discussions with the GLA officers it was confirmed that such an approach, by moving away from our earlier proposal for a standalone building, and accompanied with appropriate design guidelines, would be capable of resolving all concerns raised in the report.

350 years ago, whilst tending his garden at Sayes Court Garden, John Evelyn first suggested planting trees to clean London's air. That idea is today a cornerstone of world-renown London policy. We have the opportunity to create a new paradigm of urban horticulture in the place where the ground-breaking ideas of the future will be born.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Thank you very much.

**Bob Bagley (Director, Sayes Court Garden CIC):** Thank you.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** The last speaker and objection is Dame Joan Ruddock.

**Rt Hon Dame Joan Ruddock (MP for Lewisham Deptford):** Thank you. I am Joan Ruddock, MP for Lewisham Deptford, and I am here to support the Sayes Court Garden and build the Lenox. Years of research and expertise have gone into designing these projects. Those who lead them and those who advise them have looked at all the options. Today's presentations set out what is still required to make them a reality. No developer would have come forward with plans to sufficiently honour the unique heritage of Henry VII's naval

shipyard. Without Sayes Court Garden and the Lenox, Mr Mayor, you would be looking to approve a development that would obscure most of the great heritage of this site forever. What we are offering is not dusty, static museums but living enterprises that honour the past while embracing the future. Mr Johnson, this is an extraordinary opportunity to create a unique destination, new to London but steeped in our magnificent history. We appeal to you to support us in realising this legacy.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Thank you very much. Thank you. Right. Thank you so much. OK. We had a good wallop there because I think we went slightly over time. Never mind, it was all worth hearing and great stuff.

We are going to come now to the application. The planning agent, Mark Gibney. Is he here? Mark, from BPTW Partnership, you have five minutes.

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** Thank you. The site has a very long history. You have heard a lot about that so I am not going to go into that in detail. Hutchison Whampoa purchased the site in 2009 and have been pursuing an application on and off since then. We have been working very closely with the GLA officers and the London Borough of Lewisham and we feel we have made significant progress over time. We did take a very big step back a couple of years ago and appointed Terry Farrell and his team to review the master plan and take very seriously the comments that had been made by the local community.

We acknowledge that some of the matters have been resolved but we feel that the scheme that you have before you balances the needs of the development itself and the community aspirations in a reasonable way. This development is the largest type in the borough. The development is going to go on for at least ten years, probably more, and there is massive opportunity for regeneration.

In relation to the two groups, just dealing firstly with the Sayes Court group, we have made significant changes by moving a school from its own parcel, which you heard earlier from Mr Clements, and made a significant change to the master plan as a result. We see that the linkage between the new school and the foundations of the remains of the original buildings are exciting. You saw proposals to create a basement type arrangement, and we think there are some massive linkages between the school and the community group as a project to --

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Is this the basement of the Sayes Park - the workhouse there?

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** Yes, to bring forward joint education related benefits, and we see the linked building - and I think that is something that your officers were very keen on - as an opportunity not to be missed and preferable to a standalone building, which in itself would be quite hungry for site area and take up more land.

In terms of changing the master plan, it is not as easy as it has been suggested to move accommodation around. Nonetheless, we feel we have the right balance between the needs of the group and the needs of the master plan as a whole. Similarly, in terms of the Lenox project,

we have had significant discussions with Mr Kingston kindly facilitated by Joan Ruddock. We feel that the proposal to put the Lenox on the wharf is a major advantage. It is going to probably be half as much in terms of infrastructure to put on the wharf than it will do the Olympia building which, given charity funding, etc, we think is significant. The wharf is ready now. It could be done pretty quickly and they can get on with the project, and we think that will be a great asset to the scheme.

You heard some comments about densities and perimeter blocks that you may well wish to ask some questions on. In terms of the quality of the scheme, as set out in the report, Sir Terry and his team have come forward with a very high quality master plan. It complies with all of the Mayor's standards in terms of size, overlooking distances, amenity spaces, etc, and accessible housing. So I think in that regard this is a high quality scheme. In terms of jobs, there are 1,200 construction jobs to be created, many of which will be locally sourced using the section 106 agreement. We are in discussions with the council and the GLA in that regard. Similarly, there will be 2,150 jobs. Mayor, they are just based on average statistics that you used from floor space. There was a comment about the amount of floor space. That is set out on page 12 of your report. Therefore, you can have a look at that if you want to but there is a significant amount of commercial space and opportunity for local employment as a result.

The scheme is delivering quite significantly for the community. The building for the Sayes Court group is in excess of £2 million and the use of the wharf will also be a significant profit reduction for the developer as a result, but it is something that the developer is happy to do. In terms of other community facilities, there is a new **elementary**(?) school. That is greater than the level of demand that the scheme generates, so there is a wider community benefit.

In summary, we think that the scheme will deliver the right balance between the commercial viability, the high quality of development and the needs of the local community. Thank you, Mayor.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Thank you. OK. Thank you very much. Perhaps I could just kick off by saying what I am going to be doing now; I am going to ask you a series of questions generally. I am going to clump them together into various categories and I will be firing the questions around randomly as the idea pops into my head. I will not go to one particular person after another. I am going to do housing, jobs, transport and then we will look at the two community schemes, Sayes Park, the Centre for Urban Horticulture and then at the Lenox project. OK?

First of all, I would like to ask if I can just put the question to the developers, to the applicants, I would like to ask the question that was raised earlier on quite vehemently about who is going to be the beneficiary of this development? Who are the people who are going to be living here? The suggestion that you read an awful lot is that these, as I think somebody said, will be coming from unstable regimes around the world, like Hong Kong - it was not particularly unstable last time I was there, but anyway - Russia and China. That was the assertion and, indeed, this kind of assertion definitely resonates with Londoners. There is a strong feeling that homes being built in our city, which will cause considerable disruption for local communities and in the course of building it will have adverse traffic impact, and all the rest, that they should be built for the

advantage of Londoners. Can I be clear about who these homes are aimed at and how they will be marketed?

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** Mayor, I will try to answer all of those points, and we have quite a lot of our team here as well if I fail at the first.

First of all, this is a commercial development in the way that any other scheme that comes before you is a commercial development, and will be marketed in the normal way. However, I would say that Hutchison Whampoa has signed up to the Mayor's concordat for marketing and the House Builders Federation guidelines as well, which is that the accommodation is marketed for local people in the same way that it is marketed elsewhere.

In terms of the Affordable Housing provision, I will steer away from the viability issues, which you may want to ask questions on later if you are not satisfied. We have been working with a local housing association, London and Quadrant. They are not 100% signed up but we have been talking to them, and the range of accommodation is a range that meets their requirements. They are quite happy with that. I am sure if they do not want it there will be many others queuing up behind them. I know that because I advise lots of them locally.

One of the key issues raised was affordability.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** How many affordable units are there?

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** 525, which is 15%.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** OK. What is the balance between rent and (overspeaking)

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** It is 70% intermediate and 30% rent. With regard to the rent, I think Mr Clements touched on it in his presentation. There is a quite high level of rent locally anyway, and the amount of accommodation is a maximised balance between the viability and other considerations. For instance, if we were to increase the rented accommodation the amount of affordable as a whole would need to reduce having regard to viability. One of the key issues that has been raised is affordability and, through discussions with your officers, we have agreed that we would maintain compliance with the council's affordability criteria, so that should meet the local demands in the way that all the other schemes locally would meet.

Mayor, I think that was all of your points.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Yes. If I could go over to Steve [Bullock] now just on the affordability quotient. Unless I wasn't paying enough attention I do not think, Steve, you dwelt in your objection to the affordable quotient very much. Are you broadly happy with the amount we are getting out of them in terms of affordable?

**Sir Steve Bullock (Mayor of Lewisham):** The **charge(?)** we have is one that you will be familiar with is that if the rental is at 80% we would get more units, but that would not help us in terms of the housing need in the borough. We have accepted that we will have a smaller number of rental units but at rents that will help us.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** At genuinely affordable rents?

**Sir Steve Bullock (Mayor of Lewisham):** That does not mean that we are happy with the total affordable within the development. We are all aware of how rapidly the London property market is rising, and that is why we think it is essential that there are (overspeaking)

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** There is a review mechanism?

**Sir Steve Bullock (Mayor of Lewisham):** Yes.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** It seems to me that is crucial because, you are absolutely right, this thing is starting to take off now. If this is going to be built out over ten years or more, it would be absolutely crazy not to come back and have another bite of this.

**Sir Steve Bullock (Mayor of Lewisham):** Absolutely.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** On the other hand, I suppose the more stuff we build, in terms of Sayes Park and all the other things we want to do, they will argue that starts to eat into their margins I suppose.

Steve, while I have got you, just on design and massing and height because there is quite a lot of objection on those grounds I think. Several objectors raised the issue of tall buildings in London. I notice again that I do not think you specifically objected on those grounds, unless I misheard you.

**Sir Steve Bullock (Mayor of Lewisham):** We were not raising the issue overall of the height. We had some specific concerns about the height of the blocks immediately adjacent to the Olympia warehouse building, simply because from the river even with that gap the building is much wider than that gap and we feel that, as it stands, it dwarfs the building to some extent.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** I can see exactly what you mean. On the other hand, I suppose the Olympia building - unless I totally misunderstand - has not been much inspected or viewed by the public - has it - in the course of the last 15 years or so?

**Sir Steve Bullock (Mayor of Lewisham):** Most of that site has been inaccessible to the public for --

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Even before then was it something that people were able to walk around and to go down? It is not a building that Londoners have been used to.

**Sir Steve Bullock (Mayor of Lewisham):** Despite my advancing years I was not around at the time you could actually access it. I am told it is about 150 years since you could access that site.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Right.

**Sir Steve Bullock (Mayor of Lewisham):** It is visible, however, as things stand from the river and it is something of a landmark.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** I suppose what I am trying to say is in the sense that we are opening up the Olympia - which I agree is an extraordinary building - to public view this would be the first time it has happened, and what you are really saying is it is not being done in the best possible way and there could be more --

**Sir Steve Bullock (Mayor of Lewisham):** Yes.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** OK. That is very helpful.

Can I go to jobs now and I think the suggestion was that the kind of jobs created - the 1,500 jobs are going to be created on the site - would not be the right sort of jobs. Again, it was that they might not necessarily go to local people. I do not know who would like to answer that. I think possibly, Mark, it may fall to you to try to get that one back over the net. What is your view? I think it was said by a gentleman over here that they would not be the kind of thing that would get the local population in Deptford interested.

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** Yes, thank you. We have done quite a lot of work with DTZ advising us. One thing for sure, this is not a major office location. We are not going to bring in some swanky office user. This is all about creating jobs (overspeaking) locally.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** What sort of jobs are they going to be?

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** They will be creative industries jobs. There is a significant amount of reduced rent to bring in starter businesses, to start ups. The scheme will also produce quite a lot of shops and restaurants, so service industry jobs, and the hotel so again service industry jobs.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** If you did something like the Lenox that would be something that brought in a lot of local people, would it not?

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** That is absolutely right. We have an emerging strategy for the Olympia building, which is to use the building much more diversely than just for the Lenox. For instance, it is built on the Spitalfields Covent Garden site model, where we can have lots of ad hoc events, destination activities, arts and cultural facilities, temporary destination activities, and there will be some shops.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** There is nothing wrong with shops, by the way. Let's not knock shops.

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** That adds to the mix and diversity of making a big space work. You saw that space.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Yes.

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** It is very large, and there is lots of potential there to use it for a very wide range of different uses rather than a single use, which the Lenox is.

**Female Speaker:** No, it is not.

**Male Speaker:** No, it is not.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** OK. We will come to that. I do not want to anticipate that. We are going to come to that in a second.

I want to go back to something that you were saying, Steve, which I am afraid I did not quite catch, about the whole social cohesion side of things and not being enough on that. You spoke of a £5 million contribution from the council that you hoped would be matched. I am sorry; I did not catch your drift. What do you want out of that?

**Sir Steve Bullock (Mayor of Lewisham):** We are very happy with the list that is in the addendum report. What we were arguing, however, was that prior to the current ownership of the site a larger amount had been suggested. We would like to return to that because of the impact that this will have. You visited to the site and you know how Deptford works. It is one of the more deprived parts of our city and the risk is that we have an enclave in it and we were seeking a greater contribution, through the section 106, in order to carry out a variety of programmes that would alleviate that.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** That was what I was interested in. I passionately agree with that objective. To my mind that is clearly a potential risk with any such scheme. How can you integrate this scheme with the wider community? What sorts of measures are you talking about?

**Sir Steve Bullock (Mayor of Lewisham):** At the risk of getting into a level of detail, I am going to ask John [Miller] my head of planning to say a little bit about that because he has been working on the detail of that.

**John Miller (Head of Planning, Lewisham Council):** Yes, thank you. There are a number of areas where we were saying that a greater sum was required, and this is something that has been negotiated for quite a long time. One of the significant things is a community trust. We have secured funding from a number of other large schemes in the area and a pro rata contribution would be £2 million from this scheme towards that community trust.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** That would be for, what, activities local for young people in the community or that sort of thing?

**John Miller (Head of Planning, Lewisham Council):** That is right. Effectively endowing to local projects, etc. The offer from the scheme as a result of your officer negotiation is £250,000, which is a long way down from the pro rata sum that we would have expected from this site.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** OK. I think I understand.

**John Miller (Head of Planning, Lewisham Council):** Similarly, there are additional monies for local labour to try to ensure that local people do have access to the jobs that we have been talking about through suitably focused training programmes, etc.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Skills brokerage or whatever, yes.

**John Miller (Head of Planning, Lewisham Council):** Yes. That is right. There is a dispute between us about secondary school payments, where your officers are recommending a certain sum and then the rest according to viability. Our view is that we currently have a primary school crisis and that will turn into a secondary school crisis, and so that money should be assured. Those are the kind of key points that we have been dealing with, but they are itemised in the council's latest committee report of Wednesday of last week.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Right, so you are down on the cohesion funds that you want for supporting various local initiatives and you want more support for the secondary schools?

**John Miller (Head of Planning, Lewisham Council):** That is right, yes. There is an open space payment as well that is relevant to that, but as I say it is specifically listed in our report.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Going back to what Steve [Bullock] was saying. Have negotiations faltered on this? Have you squeezed this lemon dry?

**John Miller (Head of Planning, Lewisham Council):** Your officers have been working very hard on this. Not surprisingly there has been a negotiation between parties at different extremes and they have taken a central view. Our view is that these are really important things in terms of social cohesion and more should be **found**(?).

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** I completely understand that. I completely understand that. Obviously the only thing I suppose I -- this has been quite a long time in gestation now, hasn't it? We are talking 13 years this site has been --

**John Miller (Head of Planning, Lewisham Council):** It has and since your officers have been involved meetings and discussions have progressed very swiftly indeed, which is very

welcome. We think there is a little bit more to go and we think that could be done very quickly indeed if that happened.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Right. What about now?

**John Miller (Head of Planning, Lewisham Council):** Yes, now is fine. If you would like to agree to those payments that would be excellent.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** I do not think I am allowed to do that. I am being told by my officials I cannot do that, regrettably.

I think that is probably what I need to know about jobs and cohesion. Can I ask now about transport? Obviously I was listening to the noise from around the gallery and obviously anxieties on several fronts, mainly about the low (inaudible) access level, the low access to public transport and the inevitable disruption for the community during the construction of this site, the building out of the scheme will go on for a very long time, movement of vehicles. The legitimate question was raised: how much can we move by river? Do we have enough there? Doubts about the car parking ratio 0.44, is that too high? Do we have too many cars going into this area? What should we be doing to get more public transport? Sorry, I am asking a lot of questions. What do we need to get more public transport to this scheme?

**Mr Williams (TfL):** Thank you, Mayor. I shall try to answer those in order. Firstly, I will deal with the issue about public transport access and then move on to the traffic and highway impacts, which we recognise are key issues for the assessment of this site. In terms of the public transport offer, the offer at the moment clearly is not that great. There has been a lot of debate with the applicant and the local authority on how we can improve that. There are three ways we have done that. One is by negotiating improvements to the bus services in the area. In a conurbation of 5.8 million has been negotiated, which will get you an extension of one route and a new route through the sites. I think that is a significant improvement, so that there will be higher quality bus services going through the site and improving the public transport accessibility.

The other issue we have looked at to try to address that issue is to look at how we improve connections between the development site and the train lines that go through Deptford station. That is an improved station with a good service into central London. The pedestrian and walking environment between the station and the site is not as good as it should be, but I think the borough's major scheme and improvements to New King Street will improve that route to the main line station.

The other improvement in connectivity is through the provision of the new pier and the river bus services that will go stop at that pier when this development is developed. I think, in terms of the public transport offer, we have done as much as we can do to improve that. We do feel that that is sufficient to accommodate the scale of growth that we are talking about.

The other issue is the impact of traffic on the local highway network. On our network there is a strategic road **map**(?) will on Evelyn Street. We recognise that that is an issue. It is understood

that some residents will be concerned about that, given the scale of development we are talking about.

The applicant has done a very thorough transport assessment of the scale of development, and one that you would expect them to do. That is in accordance with our guidelines and we are confident that it is a good and sound assessment of the impacts. We have used that assessment to negotiate a package of improvements to the highway network. Those are listed in the report, including I think it is over £4 million for local highway improvements.

It is recognise that one of the key junctions of concern that Mayor Bullock raised, was the junction of Evelyn Street, New King Street and Deptford High Street, where a lot of that increase in traffic will be felt. It is recognise that is a concern, but I think part of the difficulty we have there is that you have the impact of the development traffic there. You have the borough's major scheme going through there, and you have an east-west cycle superhighway going through there. What we have agreed is: (1) a contribution to do a scheme at that junction to significantly improve the quality of that junction; but (2) we want to work with them on the modelling of that. Given that we are talking about a ten year fit-out phase for this, and given we have several other projects being developed over the next few years, we need to look at the impact of all of those projects and design a scheme that can accommodate all of those needs. We are not there now on the modelling, but we have agreement to work on that and, indeed, I think there is a meeting next week to start crunching through those details.

The final one was on parking and the parking levels are 0.44, which is what you would expect for a development of this accessibility and they are in accordance with your London Plan.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** What about the moving stuff by river, moving the consequences of the construction?

**Mr Williams (TfL):** We think this is an excellent site to do that. We saw when we went for the site visit how this is an ideal site for transport, **constructive(?)** support.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** There are walks everywhere.

**Mr Williams (TfL):** Yes, exactly. It is an ideal site to transport construction materials, spoil out and also materials in through the river, so we will --

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Is that conditioned in?

**Mr Williams (TfL):** We are conditioned in to have a construction management plan, and we would certainly be pressing the developer to maximise the amount of heavy goods that are moved in and out of the site through the river. We think there is a very good chance to do that, to try to reduce the impact on local streets.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Right. What about the air quality point, is there monitoring of the air quality?

**Mr Williams (TfL):** There will be.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** That is in the conditions, is it?

**John Miller (Head of Planning, Lewisham Council):** That is right. That is section 106, planning obligations.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Right. So the petiole problem we are basically going to solve with buses?

**Mr Williams (TfL):** Buses and improvements to access to Deptford station and also the river services.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Would it help if TfL was in charge of the over ground rail services?

**Mr Williams (TfL):** Of course it would. We will continue talking to that.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Something that the excellent local MP might want to lobby on.

**Rt Hon Dame Joan Ruddock (MP for Lewisham Deptford):** I have.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Thank you very much. OK. Thanks on housing, jobs and transport. We go now to the two very interesting local projects, Sayes Park and the whole horticulture paradise. I want to get into my head why what I understand is an offer of what you say is part of -- sorry, it seems to be quite a big space that is on offer. Quite a big area, about a hectare all in if you add the triangular bit and the other bit, no?

**Roo Angell (Sayes Court Garden, CIC):** It is half a hectare.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** It is half a hectare, forgive me, and that is just not big enough for what you need, is that right?

**Roo Angell (Sayes Court Garden, CIC):** Unfortunately that would not be enough to conduct the full range of programmes that we have been talking about, but crucially because every activity would use all of the space you would, therefore, need all of it just to produce one apprentice(?) and so forth with all of the other courses as well.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Right. OK. Perhaps I could ask the developers, is that right? Is there no more space available? Is half a hectare the most we can come up with?

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** We looked very hard at this and how it affects the scheme as a whole and the scheme viability. We have also had lots of discussions with the group and their business plan is an emerging business plan. I have not seen any

evidence to suggest that it cannot work with 0.6, which is what is on offer. That may not be the case, so do not take my word for it.

The issue for us is there has to be a balance between what has been offered and what is reasonable. Half a hectare is a significant space. We have moved a school to accommodate this, so we have taken it very seriously, and when we had discussions it was not just about the space it was about building that would work. We believe that our scheme is going to deliver a building. We are going to provide them with the shell and core of a building to the cost of over £2 million, which means they are up and running, and we are going to contribute to feasibility studies and business planning to get them going, which we think is significant. We think there is a **tentacle**(?) scheme there.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** You will help to supply a building for the horticulture centre, did I get that right?

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** Yes.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** It is part of the agreement that the development will help supply that work?

**Bob Bagley (Sayes Court Garden CIC):** Our understanding of the offer is that Hutchison Whampoa have offered 1,500 square metres, so part of a building of P16. I would like to possibly defer over to John Miller, head of Lewisham, in terms of the viability argument in terms of Hutchison Whampoa. I think what we have tried to display is that the quantum of hotel displaced by us allowing the park to flow into the inside of the quadrant is a perfectly restorable offer and, because of the maximum parameters that are on the site, to answer the question, there is more than enough capacity in the rest of the 40 acres to accommodate the quantum given, and for the developer to plead poverty I think Lewisham Council have very clearly stated to your officers that that just is not the case.

**Roo Angell (Sayes Court Garden, CIC):** To just quickly come back to another point that Mark Gibney questioned, there is a report that has come up with this figure of 1 hectare is what is needed and your officers do have a copy of that.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** I was briefed to think that there was a hectare.

**Roo Angell (Sayes Court Garden, CIC):** Yes.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** That is an exaggeration in your view?

**Bob Bagley (Sayes Court Garden CIC):** No. The 1 hectare is a specific number. That is what we have declared. We have worked with this with Mike Buffin, Head of Gardens at the National Trust, who admitted that 1 hectare would be quite tight and it would have to be quite a robust operation to be able to deliver the horticultural training on a site of that nature. Any reduction of essentially half down to 0.6 would completely render the project not viable.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** I am getting totally lost. How much land is on offer?

**Bob Bagley (Sayes Court Garden CIC):** On offer to us is 0.6 hectares. We need 1.11.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** What about if you amalgamated with the park next door?

**Bob Bagley (Sayes Court Garden CIC):** Yes, I will defer to Lewisham on that one.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Lewisham, come on Lewisham, your park is needed for horticulture.

**John Miller (Head of Planning, Lewisham Council):** This has been a slightly late arrival as a suggestion, I have to say.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** It sounds like a good one to me.

**John Miller (Head of Planning, Lewisham Council):** At the moment it is a public park. The area is ringed by public parks and the scheme is of such a density that we rely quite heavily on those public parks. What we are talking about here is around half of that park potentially becoming part of this project. In order to manage that project, it is probably going to need to be separated from the park to be in horticultural use. It will have a visual amenity but what you are actually talking about is reducing the amount of usable public park for local people. If we have a little bit more time to explore how this might work, there may be a compromise here somewhere but I think we are quite nervous about the idea that half of the existing public park will be required to make this (overspeaking) project work.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Right. Here comes a suggestion to how you can lose your park painlessly.

**Roo Angell (Sayes Court Garden, CIC):** Thank you, Chair. Just on that as well, we would be very keen to work with the park and that is also part of our document put forward but, yes, it is just to understand the nature of what we are proposing here. In a hectare it is a very educational resource, which is also open to the public to enjoy but, as John Miller has said, it would be taking away non-programme public space where there is a need for more.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** I tell you what, something that nobody has mentioned so far, unless I -- but I thought I understood when I was going round the site, was that there was this plan to have a museum or a site where you could expect the foundations of the workhouse, is that right?

**Male Speaker:** Yes.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** I have to tell you that I - and this is just my view, OK, worth nothing - could not see the merit of that. For the life of me, I could not understand why it was of historical interest to look at the forces of bricks that made up the foundations of a

workhouse that had replaced the house in which John Evelyn had once lived. You have to forgive me, I consider myself a bit of a glutton for history and --

**Male Speaker:** Also, if your officers have read (several inaudible words) report rather than listen to the sound bites from the archaeologists, the site is the site of John Evelyn Sayes Court. Therefore, that means that that site is the site of Sayes Court prior to John Evelyn where Erasmus lived when he was teaching Henry VII, for instance.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Yes, I accept that.

**Male Speaker:** It is an embarrassment of riches why it is of historical interest.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Of course, no one is for one moment denying that but I have to say that I have inspected a huge number of archaeological sites in my time, and love nothing more than looking at ruins, but this particular set of archaeological remains did not seem to me to be evocative of anything very much. Indeed, all they really evoked was a workhouse that had been put on the site of John Evelyn's house, which as I understand it had been destroyed by drunken Russian troops, possibly going back to one of those unstable regimes that came to London. I know that there are archaeological experts here who may want to -- yes?

**Male Speaker (the National Trust):** I am from the National Trust, Mayor, and I think the important point is that a museum of archaeology was never proposed. What lies at the core of this is a programme to deliver training and education around green space, which is one of the fundamental legacies that Evelyn gave Deptford, gave London. The actual proposal that may have been on the table at the time you saw, we have moved on from there. There is no standalone building.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Say no more. What I was going to say was that chunk of territory I thought was of negligible archaeological interest and should be consecrated to the green stuff that you want to do. Sorry, would you like to say something because I remember you gave me a tour of the area?

**Male Speaker:** We have never said that the site of Sayes Court was not the site of Sayes Court; it is just that it is the workhouse occupying it. The archaeology could accommodate other uses, that is our problem.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** OK. That is very helpful. OK. Basically, somehow or other we need to get to a hectare is what you guys are saying. Have I understood that correctly, Dame Joan? A hectare is what you need?

**Rt Hon Dame Joan Ruddock (MP for Lewisham Deptford):** A hectare, absolutely, 0.6 is not enough.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** OK, right, let us park all that so to speak and get on to the last item, which is the Lenox and that plan. I have to say that I am very much drawn to this idea. If there was some way of making this work I would absolutely love to see it done.

I noticed in the plan for the Olympia building, the future of the Olympia building, there was a pool in front of it, a reflector pool. Is that right? If it is possible to do a reflector pool is it not possible to have a means of making the old shipbuilding centre, the Olympia, communicate again with the river? What is the answer to that?

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** The answer, Mayor, is that it would cost millions of pounds to dig it out, whereas a reflective pool is something that can be used as a hard space.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** That is the answer I wanted, OK.

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** We have a master plan that would --

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** When you say "millions", give me a figure.

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** 20 million.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Right.

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** That is the figure that I have been given and based on cost analysis. There is a master plan principle here which is that the Olympia building spills out on to that space, and it is a public space. That space is part of the new use for the Olympia building. The new use being a multi-destination space for community, cultural and leisure activities with a series of commercial uses ringing all the way round it. To create a body of water in the middle that is deep like that would have a major impact on the way that people move across the site. It would also have an impact on how the public transport with the river bus interchanges. It would also result in a reduction in the **Jetty(?)** Park. That is one thing that we have not talked about today but it is significant. If you stood out there and had a look, this could be a unique and absolutely unbelievable facility. One thing that --

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** As I understood it, you had only clipped the left-hand end of the Jetty Park.

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** When you are there it is still a fair amount. The other thing that has not been mentioned is that we have said that the site can be a home port for the Lenox. It could be moored against the Jetty Park. We see that as being something that is out there, as attractive and could work and could be made to work.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Could I ask then the Lenox partisans, is it integral to your vision that it should be both made and slipwayed into the river from Olympia? Is that --

**Julian Kingston (The Lenox Project CIC):** Absolutely so, yes.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** It is absolutely critical. Could you explain why that is so critical?

**Julian Kingston (The Lenox Project CIC):** From my point of view it is not just about the boat itself. What this project is about is reconnecting, as I said earlier, Deptford with its heritage and creating a viable training and education programme around ship building.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** The vital skill of building 17th century ships?

**Julian Kingston (The Lenox Project CIC):** Yes. The Olympia shed --

**Female Speaker:** They are transferable.

**Julian Kingston (The Lenox Project CIC):** Oh, no, they are transferrable. If you look at the traditional skills involved then they are easily transferrable into the repair of stately homes and other historical buildings. If you look at the modern technological skills they are easily transferable into modern industry, so it is quite a broad project in itself. My argument is that the Olympia shed was purpose built as a boat building shed, but we do not need all of it. We would hope to be able to have a museum facility within it as well as constructing the ship.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Could you not do it on this other site that has been offered to you?

**Julian Kingston (The Lenox Project CIC):** I am a little confused about the other site because, as I understand the application, the applicant is going to build a jetty in order to transfer demolition and construction materials by river and yet, as I also understand it, the jetty is not going to be built until the end of the second phase, so that means that it is not going to tranship any goods until after the goods have been moved.

In present circumstances, to use the existing jetty would not work because it is in a poor condition, it has not been surveyed and the roll-on, roll-off element of it sank a while ago and has been taken away. That rather knocks out that option, so I have a fear that we would be in the way of any storage operations were we to be on the protected wharf. The problem with the protected wharf is that there really is no ongoing home port. A ship of that nature, while capable of going to sea, would get steadily taken apart by passing traffic if it was moored against the existing jetty. It needs a calm home port. The original Great Basin was the home port for royal yachts, for warships, for all manner of craft and I fail to understand how it is going to be an obstruction to the project. I think if you get most water spaces where there is activity then you draw people in, you do not frighten them off. There is enough room in front of that shed to have a thoroughfare either side if they reduce their building parameters to a minimum rather than a maximum. Also, to display the original archaeology of the Great Basin itself, either by its use or by containing it within the new walls of the basin. I agree it is expensive but equally so would be digging a dry dock which would obstruct all other use of the protective wharf.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Which dry dock? Where would you dig a dry dock?

**Julian Kingston (The Lenox Project CIC):** The proposal from the developer was that a dry dock should be dug on the protected wharf instead of the transshipment jetty.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** How are you going to fund this whole project?

**Julian Kingston (The Lenox Project CIC):** The business plan is on the stocks at the moment. We intend to do it by various means. We intend to apply to Lottery. We intend to apply to **2Cs(?)**. We intend to go to the hedge funds if we can or anybody else who thinks it is a brilliant idea, and most people do.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Yes.

**Julian Kingston (The Lenox Project CIC):** You could equally level the same question at the developer. How is he going to fund his project?

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** I suspect he has a pretty ready answer to that one. Mark, do you want to come back on that? Just explain for us all why the dry dock thing works now and I think the suggestion was that it would not be ready straightaway.

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** Thanks, Mayor. I will duck the funding question, if I may. In terms of the jetty, just to clarify, the jetty is something that will come along later subject to the ultimate wharf operator. As part of the discussions and part of the application we submitted detailed plans to show how the site can be serviced by the river in terms of construction materials. The current jetty will be restored. There is a planning condition requiring surveys and works done to it early in the process to facilitate that. The **row/row(?)** is gone effectively. It sunk a long time ago and it is not intended that that would stay. It is just the large concrete structure that you saw when you were there.

In terms of the operational issues, we have provided a plan to officers that shows how the Lenox could be accommodated on the site with construction materials. It is a large site. It is 2.3 hectares so it is a very significant piece of land, so it is easily doable. It gets tighter towards the end of the project for obvious reasons, because you start running out of space, but it is still achievable to do it.

In terms of the issue of digging the dock out, if you dug a dock out on the wharf it would be immediately behind the river wall. There are issues associated with that because the river wall is listed. If you dig a basin in front of the Olympia building, the channel that you would have to dig to get there is twice as long, so operationally it has to be half the amount of work and money to put the Lenox on the wharf. I was surprised by how much --

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** On the protective wharf. How much do you think that would cost?

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** Sorry?

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** How much do you think that would cost to put it on the protective wharf?

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** I think it is £9 million to build a dry dock on the wharf site and double that to build it on the Olympia building.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Right.

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** In terms of the issue about can it be done --

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Could I ask a dumb question: why could there not be a compromise whereby the project took place within the Olympia, which I have seen and it is colossal and I cannot imagine it would be filled out very rapidly. Why could the project not take place in one bit of it and then the boat be gently pushed out and plopped in? Why do you need to dig these colossal trenches?

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** You would have to dig a big channel to get it from the Olympia building to the river, which is simply not feasible. The other issue is that there is £12 million-worth of refurbishment works to the listed building that would need to be done early-ish in the development programme before it can be used for other purposes. There are other factors as well, which are that there are issues about it is not actually known whether a boat can fit within the structure because of the beams, and there are --

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Within the Olympia building?

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** Yes, and there are issues --

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Hang on.

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** Mayor, there are also issues about the archaeology that I am definitely not an expert in but the sensitivity archaeology is in the basin area.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Surely, we cannot have been quite so incompetent in the 17th century as to build whatever it was --

**Duncan Hawkins (Archaeologist, CGMS):** The Olympia building dates from the 1840s not the 17th century, and at the time it was constructed the vessels that were built underneath it were relatively small, but the building is not as originally designed. The roofline has changed. You may recall this.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** I remember.

**Duncan Hawkins (Archaeologist, CGMS):** We went around and we discussed that point. The roof is lower than as originally designed, so there is a question as to whether the full height of the warship could be accommodated in the building.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** You would not have the masts on but you --

**Duncan Hawkins (Archaeologist, CGMS):** I would simply add that English Heritage have raised some concerns over potential damage to the building and damage to the archaeology using the Olympia for the Lenox project.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Right. Yes, that is very interesting. I must say, unless you build a really colossal ship I would have thought you could fit a pretty sizeable wooden vessel. Joan?

**Rt Hon Dame Joan Ruddock (MP for Lewisham Deptford):** Yes, thank you. I think, Mr Mayor, there is a class of visions here. It is as simple as that. Our vision is in the Olympia probably only a third of that space would be required to build a ship. It would not have its masts put on in the building. It would be built in the building. In there, there would be then something unique going on in a place which would then, we believe, attract a huge amount of visitors, not least those who would come and use the restaurants, the bars, the facilities, all of which could be accommodated. It would be entirely complementary.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** What about this point that in order to get it into the water you have to build a trench costing £18 million?

**Rt Hon Dame Joan Ruddock (MP for Lewisham Deptford):** The way to deal with that question is a proper feasibility study. We are very happy that there should be a proper feasibility study. We are not asking for something that is impossible but we have the view that it is possible. It would obviously have to be done in conjunction with English Heritage. No one wants to destroy archaeology but the site of a ship there would surely be an amazing attraction and hugely attractive to those who were living there.

We think this is entirely in the interests of the developer, that this is entirely complementary, sympathetic and would boost their properties.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** You do not need to sell it to me. I love the idea, I really do.

**Rt Hon Dame Joan Ruddock (MP for Lewisham Deptford):** Let's do it.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** The only thing I worry -- many demands are being properly and legitimately made of this development and whether it is £9 million or whether it is £18 million either figure we are talking about a serious hit on the Affordable Housing, on other objectives that we want to attain. That is the problem. They have agreed to a £20,000 feasibility study. Is that the position? You are going to look at it?

**Mark Gibney (Planning Agent, BPTW Partnership):** Yes, Mayor.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Right, and any idea about how the Lenox would be maintained, if and when it was to be built? In my experience of these projects, it is, “We have built this fantastic thing”. Do you remember the Gloriana we built for the Queen for the Jubilee? It was an absolutely brilliant thing but the issue is: how do you maintain them? Where is the revenue cost coming from?

**Julian Kingston (The Lenox Project CIC):** Ships are high maintenance, there is no doubt about that but what we are hoping to achieve is to have an ongoing programme of skilled maintenance on the site. We are not looking at just this ship alone. We are looking at creating something that is the centre of a much wider project. I have been examining all of the other projects in Europe, particularly the Hermione and the **Gothenburg**(?).

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Sorry to interrupt, but is your vision that you could build the Lenox in the Olympia without having these pathways to the river? Do you need these?

**Julian Kingston (The Lenox Project CIC):** No, because our vision is to see the ship at sea occasionally.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** How do you get it from the Olympia? How do you get it from the building?

**Julian Kingston (The Lenox Project CIC):** The bit I do not understand is the fact that there is an assumption that this has to be done all at once. There is nothing wrong with starting the programme, presumably, the restoration of the Olympia shed, followed by the gradual construction of the Lenox, followed by money raising in order to reopen the basin. We are talking about reopening a structure, not building a new one, and then eventually raising the money to make the breach, as it was originally in the seawall, and access the river.

Our problem - going back to the protective wharf - is getting visitors to it to get a big revenue stream going. What we are hoping with the Olympia shed is that it is easier to get visitors to the shed and our main revenue stream is the visitor numbers and their involvement in the project. It is the same at the historic dockyard in Portsmouth. It is the same at historic dockyards in Europe. You have to have visitors.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** If the Olympia, suppose at the end of the feasibility study there was no way of doing it within the Olympia shed, and you had to build this for the archaeological reasons that, for example, you could not do it. You would have to dig this colossal trench. It would cost too much. Suppose that is what the feasibility study suggested and you had to go with building it on the site of the protective wharf, how would you raise the £9 million to do the trench and all the rest of it?

**Julian Kingston (The Lenox Project CIC):** If it were to be built on the protected wharf my greater concern would be its home port afterwards because the mooring on the outside of the jetty in the river is simply not suitable. Again, it is the question of getting visitors to it easily

and safely. It is also not the centre of the site. What we were hoping with this is that the developer would get on board with it and we would have something that really gave this place and incredible identity and gave it a balance with the site out of Greenwich adjacent to it. We are the bit that makes sense of Greenwich. If you were an alien and you landed here tomorrow and you looked at Greenwich you would wonder what the devil it was all about. If you knew the history of Deptford you would know why Greenwich existed.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Yes, yes. OK. I have heard an awful lot. I think, unless anybody has any last point that they want to get across, we are going to conclude things. Yes, last one.

**Roo Angell (Sayes Court Garden, CIC):** Thank you. Just to reiterate, it is about the flexibility of what we have proposed in moving the parameters and in terms of working up a future business plan. We would really love to negotiate with the applicant on that. We are very happy to negotiate to do whatever we can to make this happen because we think it is really worth doing.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** You are flexible, OK. I have got you. Thank you. Thank you very much. What I am going to do now is I am going to vanish and wrap a cold towel around my head and try to come to a decision, which I may announce today or I may defer it. I may defer the announcement for a few days, depending on how I get on in trying to absorb the overwhelming mass of stuff I have just had. Thank you very much. Thank you.

(A short adjournment)

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Thank you everybody very much for your patience. Indeed, thank you everybody for staying for what has been pretty much a marathon session but very, very interesting and educational I think for everybody. On the face of it, this is one of those schemes that should be unquestionably for the benefit for London and for the community in Lewisham. It is obviously a scheme that has been a very long time in gestation - 13 years - nothing much has been happening on that site. We have a huge housing shortage in London. There is a real crying need to get development done. This has the prospect of 3,500 homes and 1,500 jobs. I listened very carefully to the representations that were made to me about the height impacts, about the architecture and I listened obviously with particular attention to the views of the council and Sir Steve, who I very much respect. Clearly, I did not hear passionate objections on against the height, certainly not against the principle of development. That is supported. Indeed, the quotient of Affordable Housing was thought by the council to be broadly acceptable in view of the other constraints that the site faces.

I heard what had to be said about the transport mitigations and I was content with the responses I heard there on the access to public transport. I am minded, therefore, to give consent subject, however, to agreement of the 106, which must contain two provisions. I have been very impressed tonight by the arguments that have been made by the MP, Dame Joan, by others who have made a strong case in favour of two schemes that seem to me to have a great deal of merit and to be both intrinsically very attractive. I am talking of course about the idea of the Sayes Court Gardens horticultural venture and the Lenox project. The two provisions that

must be in the 106 are that my officials should get together with Lewisham and with the developers, to look at this space in Sayes Court Gardens and indeed around the development in general that has been identified, to come up with a secure and deliverable project; a viable and deliverable project. That is the first provision. I have mentioned Sayes Court Gardens. I have mentioned the existing park. They are worried that I will get this wrong and you will be confused by which Sayes Court Gardens, but the existing park. Therefore, to look at the space in the existing park and the wider development to ensure that there is a viable and deliverable project.

The second condition. I am delighted that the developers - whom I warmly congratulate on their scheme, by the way - have agreed to fund a feasibility study into the Lenox project. One of the provisions that we will include in the 106 is that the feasibility study should be concluded as soon as possible to produce clear options, and that there should be an agreement on the part of the developer to contribute to whichever of these options is the most feasible. With those two provisions in my 106 I therefore give consent to this proposal. Thank you.