

Planning and Housing Committee

29 November 2011

Transcript of Item 6: Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area - Briefing from GLA Officers

Jenny Jones (Chair): We will now move on to Item 6: the Earls Court and West Kensington opportunity area.

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): I came here not being quite sure what it is you wanted me to say but also, given the context of where we are in terms of a live planning application called an opportunity area planning framework that is out for consultation, I am not sure how much I ought to say because I do not want to prejudice people's reactions to the consultations that are still going on.

I can give you a brief run through of where we are in terms of process if that would help.

Jenny Jones (Chair): Yes.

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): If I can take the opportunity area first of all and then come on to the planning application. The opportunity area figured in the 2011 London Plan. It did not figure in previous versions of the plan so it is a new opportunity area. It is in the London Plan now because when we were going through the process of looking at the old London Plan we saw an opportunity arising in Earls Court. An opportunity that has been pushed both by the local authorities and by major land owners, and change is going to happen there; change is coming.

We did what we always do with opportunity areas. We looked at all the data available. We looked at all the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment data to inform what we thought would be provided in terms of housing. We looked at the employment land data - masses of it - and came up with initial thoughts around there being the capacity for 2,000 new homes and employment uses that would generate about 7,000 jobs.

At the Examination in Public (EIP), which took place between June 2011 and December 2011, things changed somewhat, partly as a result of lobbying from major land owners, partly as a result of what the boroughs had to say and partly because we were moving into the process of looking in a bit more detail what the opportunities were, what the capacities were and what one could do with the area. At the outcome of that process we were looking at the density matrix in the London Plan and looking at the work on urban design that was coming forward from various sources - looking at infrastructure studies in the initial stages.

We came to the conclusion that one could actually get 4,000 homes in the area, rather than the 2,000. That was agreed to by both the boroughs and the panel holding the EIP into the London Plan went along with that and supported the notion of 4,000 homes and 7,000 jobs.

We started work in earnest on the preparation of the planning framework in the autumn of 2010 as the EIP into the London Plan was going on and we produced a first draft for consultation in the spring of this year. The consultation responses - I am not going to go into them - are on the web. You can look them up. We took all the consultation into account. The second draft is now out for consultation and it is this document. If Members want a copy let me know.

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): If I can then move swiftly on to the planning application we began having pre-application meetings with Capco, which has recently acquired the Earls Court exhibition centre over two or three years ago and it was very, very preliminary and initial discussions first of all. Capco owns Covent Garden so when they came to us they had no preconceived ideas about whether they wanted to keep the exhibition centre going as a going concern or redevelop. Obviously as part of those initial discussions they wanted to know what we thought in strategic terms about both those two options. Indeed there were various intermediary options where you would perhaps redevelop some of it and keep some of it. This was also being done in the context of what Capco - which had also bought Olympia - was doing with Olympia and what was happening at ExCeL.

Capco's first serious proposals began to come through and we started talking to them about the height, bulk, about the exhibition complex and what should happen to it. At the same time as we were talking to Capco about its original proposal we started talking to the two borough councils and to Transport for London (TfL) which is the major land owner. At this point I ought to say that TfL has established a very, very rigid chinese wall between its land owning section and the section of TfL that contributes comments on Opportunity Area Planning Frameworks (OAPF) and planning applications. It was Hammersmith and Fulham Council that asked for the two housing estates to be brought into consideration. Initially that was not necessarily for the complete redevelopment that is now being proposed. There were options for partial redevelopment or, indeed, no redevelopment at all.

As all this was going on, and with two parallel processes going on at the same time, Terry Farrell had been employed by Capco to produce a master plan. His work is not quite the sort of thing you expect a consultant to do for someone who is paying a fee to deliver what a land owner wants. Terry Farrell does not work like that. He is, apart from anything else, a member of the Mayor's Design Advisory Panel. What he was doing was genuinely giving what he thought was the right approach to the planning of the area and not necessarily delivering what Capco wanted or what Hammersmith and Fulham wanted or what TfL wanted.

We then had the process of bringing all those things together. With Capco rushing forward with its planning application we, from our side, said, "Please hold on a minute. We have still got work to do on the OAPF" but Capco clearly, for its own reasons, needed to bring a planning application forward because it has got funding issues, and it has got to go to the banks and the financial institutions to continue its involvement.

The situation is that three separate applications were made: one for the Seagrave Road site which is entirely within Hammersmith and Fulham; one for the main site in Hammersmith and Fulham, and one for the main site in Kensington and Chelsea. The Seagrave Road application was referred to us on 14 September 2011, and was reported to the Mayor at stage one on 17 October 2011. Some of you will undoubtedly have seen the stage one report. I do not think it is on the web yet. If you want to see a copy I can gladly supply it.

The two main applications were referred on 27 October 2011 and we are reporting those to the Mayor. The current date is scheduled for 7 December 2011. I really cannot say any more about those two applications at this stage.

I suppose there are two glaring headline issues. One is to redevelop the housing estates or not. All I can say in that regard is that we are largely in the hands of Hammersmith and Fulham Council. It is Hammersmith business. It is its decision to redevelop or not is up to Hammersmith and Fulham and its residents - whether it consults with them, whether there is a vote of local residents. That is not for us to be involved with. It would be wrong for us to be involved with that. However, if Hammersmith and Fulham as the majority land owner there decides that it wants to go down the redevelopment route then we can come in and say how we think it should be done, and what it should be replaced by and talk about mix of uses, mix of household sizes, mix of tenures and all those sorts of things. The basic decision to redevelop or not is not for us.

In terms of the second headline issue which is the loss of the exhibition centre here - this is me passing the buck a second time I suppose - it is a commercial decision. There is nothing we can do to stop Capco or anybody else from closing down the business and/or demolishing the buildings. We have obviously been provided with a lot of information by Capco about the business which is open to challenge and I would be interested to hear what other people have to say about it. In fact I have got a page of detailed bullet points I could go through with you if you wanted to but it is probably not appropriate.

I suppose the headline for us is that Capco has invested very heavily in Olympia and has managed to increase its utilisation levels very considerably. In the past, because the back of house facilities at Olympia were very poor you had to spend a lot of time clearing an exhibition out before you could get another exhibition in, so there were no exhibitions on for half the time or even more; that is turned around now, turned on its head. There will be much more scope for exhibitions at Olympia.

Secondly, ExCeL has expanded enormously. It was built in 2001 I think. It added a further 65,000 square metres then, and has recently added another 35,000 square metres of floor space. It is an enormous facility and it has eaten into Earls Court's market share quite considerably, and has, in fact, reduced Earls Court's market share to about 40%. Not all of ExCeL's business was taken from Earls Court of course; a lot of it was new business.

As all this is going on, Earls Court has lost most of its concert type functions to the O2: big pop concerts. O2 is much more efficient. It is considered to be a much better venue so it is all gone down to the O2. Earls Court is competing not just with a much improved Olympia and a greatly expanded ExCeL; it is also competing with the O2.

Capco felt that the business at Earls Court was falling away, that this was an inexorable decline and its decision was that it would keep the facility there for the Olympics, because it is an Olympic venue, and thereafter they would redevelop; that is a commercial decision. We have no influence on that. The OAPF is reacting to that decision. If Capco itself or if a new owner comes along and says we want to keep it open we have absolutely no problem with that. The existing service and the existing buildings fit perfectly well in a strategic sense with London.

What Kensington and Chelsea Council is very keen on though is, if the Earls Court exhibition centre does close, it wants something back - not just a huge housing estate. It wants some sort of cultural tourist leisure facilities back there. It will not be anything like what we have at the moment but it will be a considerable amount of floor space dedicated to non-residential and non-office uses.

Jenny Jones (Chair): That was very, very valuable.

Nicky Gavron (Deputy Chair): For clarification, you said that Capco has got the end of lease, and you said it was a few years ago that it took the end of lease on Earls Court. Is that correct?

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): I do not think I said that. I think it acquired it a few years ago, yes.

Nicky Gavron (Deputy Chair): A few years ago acquired it. I do not know the answer to this. Does it have the freehold of Olympia?

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): No.

Nicky Gavron (Deputy Chair): Does it have a long lease on Olympia?

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): It has a very long lease I think.

Nicky Gavron (Deputy Chair): Very long lease. So having got a very long lease on Olympia it then, a few years ago, bought a short --

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): Sorry, I am getting confused. It has a very long lease on Earls Court because much of the freehold is owned by Transport for London and Network Rail. You probably know this better than me but, the newer bit of Earls Court it may even own the freehold of that. I do not know.

At Olympia I am not sure. I suspect it probably owns the freehold but I do not know.

Karim Halwagi (Chief Executive, Association of Event Organisers): I cannot clarify those specific details on the ownership issues

Jenny Jones (Chair): It is very good to have you here. Would you like to say something?

Karim Halwagi (Chief Executive, Association of Event Organisers): I come here representing the event organising industry and through all the conversations and comments I have heard the level of consultation seems to have been quite minimal with us as organisers who bring the business to the venues.

I take on board all the comments about Olympia which is a fantastic venue and has been enhanced, and the same about ExCeL but that is, in no way, an acceptable solution for the removal of Earls Court. We have fought for years, because of demand, for the increase in venue stock across the country, not just in London. The introduction of ExCeL and its further development has been welcomed and utilised by our membership, but you cannot say that Earls Court, on that level, is not required any more and you cannot say that Olympia is an acceptable solution. It is a venue and a brilliant venue in its own right but it does not simply replace 60,000 square metres of Earls Court exhibition space.

What you have with Earls Court is you have a centre of business. What we do with events is see this it as a hub to bring together face to face marketing and bring business to an area. There is direct expenditure by the organisers, by the exhibitors, by the visitors and by the contractors. Then the level of indirect expenditure within the local community and London-wide is enormous. Earls Court alone contributes, in expenditure, over £250 million per year in London. For this to be simply, “No, we’re going to change it and put residential housing there with a little bit of cultural space, which remains very vague in its definition”, I just do not see this as a compelling argument.

Jenny Jones (Chair): What about Giles’ point about the reduction in business?

Nicky Gavron (Deputy Chair): 40% he said.

Karim Halwagi (Chief Executive, Association of Event Organisers): 40% in the reduction of business. Since the announcement of the potential redevelopment organisers have a duty to start looking elsewhere, so the idea of the business being reduced, it could be argued, has been skewed because of that announcement. The confidence in the future of it affects people’s business planning, so they have to make assumptions. Since nothing has been decided we are campaigning for the venue to stay. We just had Ideal Home Christmas, a launch show, that had 78,000 visitors in four days. Ideal Home Spring has 280,000 visitors in four days. These are just two shows. If you look at Earls Court and say there is no room for the business I can not see that and neither can our membership.

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): Can I come back very briefly? I might have given you the wrong figure. Utilisation levels at Earls Court since 2001 have dropped from 60% to 40% which means 60% of the time it was in use and something was happening there and now it has dropped to 40%. Licence fees or venue hire fees have dropped by 30%. Sorry, I was getting my figures a bit muddled there.

Jenny Jones (Chair): Thank you very much.

Andrew Boff (AM): To what do you attribute Earls Court's decline in popularity over the years?

Karim Halwagi (Chief Executive, Association of Event Organisers): Earls Court has been used as a multi-use venue for a long, long time and, as has been highlighted, venues like the O2 which are geared towards music may have a benefit on that level. What I am talking about with the exhibition organisers - and this is the body that I represent - there are economic issues that we have all suffered over the past few years that may have induced a shrinkage in the level of business. I think these proposals for Earls Court have had an effect on business having to move away.

The point about venue tenancy is you cannot expect venue tenancy to run at 100%: these are community spaces. They are never full 100% of the time, but there are strategic times of the year - and this is based on business cycles - that these venues are over run, over subscribed to, and to remove Earls Court would have a serious effect on that business. We would either lose it in this country - it may move abroad. The idea of transposing events to ExCeL simply does not work.

Andrew Boff (AM): How do you view the explanation from the owners that 75% to 85% of the Earls Court business will transition to Olympia?

Karim Halwagi (Chief Executive, Association of Event Organisers): It cannot. It is a different sized venue. Simply the idea of having 60,000 square metres going to a 40,000 --

Andrew Boff (AM): 75% to 80% of the building - not perhaps the very largest.

Karim Halwagi (Chief Executive, Association of Event Organisers): I do not see how it can happen.

Andrew Boff (AM): You have said at Olympia about the recent expansion. That of course has given it much better ability to support large events.

Karim Halwagi (Chief Executive, Association of Event Organisers): Yes, larger events than it currently does, but do not say it can support events that Earls Court hosts; also the number of visitors. We are talking about floor space. Also it is the capacity of these venues to accept visitors. I had a conversation about the Ideal Home Show with 80,000 visitors. You put that into Olympia and it cannot accept that number of visitors so you drive the level of business down which then has an effect on the exhibitors wanting to go to the show. There are impacts along the way. It is not simply about square metres.

Andrew Boff (AM): How much business do you think there actually is for Earls Court when ExCeL outperforms it in terms of --

Karim Halwagi (Chief Executive, Association of Event Organisers): You say outperforms it. ExCeL is a modern venue and therefore it can be viewed as being a better venue in certain areas but the point about it - and it is very clear and has been proven - is there are events that

will work in ExCeL but ExCeL is a destination. Earls Court is in central London. For consumer led events Earls Court is a much better venue and it offers much more accessibility to the day to day consumer. Trade shows at ExCeL, absolutely. Destination and people will travel. It has also been proven that people from the west of London will not travel east and vice versa so simply to remove Earls Court ...

Andrew Boff (AM): It is not as though there is going to be no exhibition space because there is Olympia.

Karim Halwagi (Chief Executive, Association of Event Organisers): It is not enough.

Mike Tuffrey (AM): Chair, I have also got some questions for Giles on the revised supplementary planning document. Whilst this is a distinct issue my question on this issue is from a plan point of view, because we are a planning committee. Does the London Plan not have some sort of consideration of the total capacity for exhibition space in all its facets? I can remember a few years ago there was a great campaign, getting the business community involved, to expand because London was losing out because we did not have internationally competitive exhibition space. I simply do not have it in my head; is this not a section of the London Plan?

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): The London Plan does support the exhibition business. One of the problems is that its main competitors, places like Hanover and Paris, have exhibition facilities that are hugely and very heavily subsidised by the authorities. That does not happen in London where the venues are entirely commercial and do not have public support, so London's ability to compete is somewhat constrained.

Mike Tuffrey (AM): I was picking up on your point that somehow if Capco wanted to demolish it that is its business. This is a fascinating discussion in economic terms but we are not an economic committee - we are a planning committee and I am interested in does the London Plan not have a view as to the total capacity we should have, what size of venues and so forth, to maintain London's viability as an economic entity?

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): Total capacity is something that is going to shift over time so it would be wrong to have specific targets. Before ExCeL we had about 100,000 square metres split between 60,000 at Earls Court and 40,000 at Olympia. ExCeL is doubling that so even with the loss of the 60,000 at Earls Court you still have a considerable increase in available floor space. It is much more efficient floor space. One has to say about Earls Court that Earls Court 2, which was built in 1991, is relatively efficient. It is Earls Court 1 that is inefficient, built back in the 1930s and very difficult to make work.

Can I add a comment while I am speaking about the notion that ExCeL is way out far in the distant east? Crossrail will put it just about on everybody's doorstep when it is built. It has a Crossrail station alongside it so that will change enormously its accessibility by public transport.

Murad Qureshi (AM): I take your point, Giles. Let me compare like with like. What is the present occupancy level at ExCeL? Most of these centres lie empty most of the year, that is my view. Tell me otherwise. You have said Earls Court has dropped to 40%. What is ExCeL's?

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): ExCeL's latest level has increased because it has had this massive big expansion.

Murad Qureshi (AM): What are the levels?

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): I do not know.

Murad Qureshi (AM): Do you know how much it charges? Has that dropped or moved? You quoted the figures for hire at Earls Court and you are aware that the prices there have dropped, clearly. Is that the same at --

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): I do not think I mentioned price, no. I do not know what the charges are.

Murad Qureshi (AM): I thought you did. Would you accept that there is a difference exhibition market in central London which has grown without actually very little intervention by local authorities or London-wide entities like the GLA, and it has been there for some time, although its interests have not necessarily been represented in the best of ways at relevant political levels? Do you accept that?

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): One has to accept that. It is the way it is. That is the existing situation. I do not think in planning we ever take the view that it always has to be like that; it can change. It is up to the exhibition business to bring about those changes and to operate as efficiently as possible.

Nicky Gavron (Deputy Chair): Giles, my understanding of the London Plan - of course it is tricky because there you are in charge of it - is that it gives the spatial framework for all the other Mayoral strategies. Therefore, I want to strongly support what Mike Tuffrey said about it obviously reflects economic dimension, and one then needs to go to the Economic Development Strategy to get the fine detail, and that is where we should look for that. We would obviously expect it to have a view on the role of exhibition centres for the economy of London.

Andrew Boff (AM): That is a very good point, Nicky, because, as I understand it, the events market, over the past ten years, has actually shrunk by 20% , so you probably do need to review that.

Nicky Gavron (Deputy Chair): I do think we should review it. I was one of the people - because I was chairing the London Planning Advisory Committee - that argued for ExCeL and, at the time - and I was also on London First - there was a fierce argument between people who were pushing for ExCeL and the people involved in events and exhibition in the west. What was said then was, "Look, whatever you do in the east, we need more in the west. We need more

than Earls Court 1 and 2. We need more than Olympia. We cannot compete internationally”
The person who spearheaded that was Harvey Goldsmith.

I know what Giles has said about subsidy to Hannover and Paris but could you talk about international competition and the role of this in the economy of London?

Karim Halwagi (Chief Executive, Association of Event Organisers): What is clear from what we have seen globally is that most major economic centres build a lot of their local economy around convention centres because what they bring in is a hub of business. The German model is very clear and, yes, it is subsidised but it manages to bring in events of such a scale and business to such massive degrees that it simply has a hugely positive effect on the local economies. You look at areas in America. Every major American city does the same thing and has a convention centre at its core. In England - I am very proud to say - our industry is incredibly resilient despite the lack of support that we get. Not only do we sustain an industry in the UK but the UK organisers are one of the greatest exporters of exhibitions around the world. The Germans are incredibly good and it is very Germany-centric. The Americans stick to North America. The British organisers take their shows across the globe.

For that reason we need to look at our home business as well. We need to really protect what we have developed since the 19th century when Earls Court was built. We have to protect that and develop it. The whole development of ExCeL was supported. The Association of Event Organisers (AEO) was a stakeholder in ExCeL in its very early days because of the need for greater levels of venue stock. I am sure that when it was built and when it was developed it was not with the knowledge that Earls Court could disappear; it was built because there was a need for it. As has been pointed out, no venue is ever full to capacity 100% of the time. Those levels will vary based on a myriad of different factors. To say, “It has dropped a bit, therefore we are just going to bulldoze it” is a very narrow minded view.

The consultation to the organising industry, organising community, has not been there. There are a lot of people who have made a lot of assumptions about it without asking those people who organise and bring the business to London. That is a very key issue. The competitive nature of removing Earls Court means that there are going to be events that will relocate to other countries. Business commuters will say, “We’re not going to go to London anymore”. Despite any sort of transport link there are inherent geographic problems in the locations of Earls Court and ExCeL. It is not rocket science; it is a very simple thing. There are people who do not want to travel that direction for whatever their reasons. We cannot disseminate every single little reason. They are simply facts that we have researched. It does not happen. ExCeL is an incredible venue for certain events. Earls Court is an incredible venue for other ones.

Jenny Jones (Chair): Thank you very much, Karim. As my colleagues are pointing out we are not the economic committee, we are the planning committee --

Nicky Gavron (Deputy Chair): They are interrelated.

Jenny Jones (Chair): Of course they are.

James Cleverly (AM): Everything is interrelated but this is the wrong Committee for this discussion.

Mike Tuffrey (AM): Could I move off the exhibition and on to the draft SPD?

Mike Tuffrey (AM): To understand how it works - and you have the advantage in that you have the document and I have not seen it. I am not sure any other Members have seen it or read it and digested it. The first question is does the SPD only concern itself with the line around the map or does it look at the impact of that development, that large scale stream of planning applications and so forth, on the neighbouring communities? I am thinking particularly of the gridlock already on the roads around this whole area and Earls Court in particular, the gridlock on the public transport system in terms of overcrowding of the Piccadilly and District at peak hours and things like air quality and so forth? Does it see that wider view and does it look at what is happening already with, for example, the expansion of Westfield and other housing developments and the pressures in the surrounding areas, or does it narrowly concern itself only with that site? How do you manage that tension?

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): Transport for London is studying the cumulative impact of Earls Court alongside what is happening and what is going to be happening to the south down to Imperial Wharf and what is going to be happening to the north at White City and eventually further north at Old Oak Common and Kensal Rise. All of that has a massive transport impact across a wide area. One cannot judge what happens in any one of those areas without knowing what the cumulative impact is. That is being looked at.

One of the problems is that we are doing this in the context of a planning application and there is an application in from Earls Court that we have to deal with. We do not have applications yet for White City or for Old Oak Common. They come along later. We have to respond and be able to respond to Earls Court. What Transport for London is doing at the moment is looking at how the immediate short to medium term plans can be mitigated. Can they be mitigated? Our thinking is they can, but there is detailed design work on, say, the junction with the A4 that has to be completed before we can say that the scale of development is acceptable.

Mike Tuffrey (AM): My question is: are those other issues that TfL are looking at, but presumably have not reached a conclusion; how do you get that into the supplementary planning document? If you do not then clearly you are considering these three applications in the light of the supplementary planning document that has not considered everything that is going on in the neighbourhood and the impact of that development on the neighbourhood, particularly air quality, gridlock and so forth.

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): This is the first version. It is the first consultation. In a sense we are consulting TfL along with everybody else. The results of that study will feed in to the next iteration of this. If there are insuperable problems and it cannot simply be made to work then we would have to change track. The whole point --

Mike Tuffrey (AM): If it is under revision it is very much work in progress --

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): Yes, it is.

Mike Tuffrey (AM): -- you are not then going to consider the applications that have come in in outline against the current draft which is --

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): We have to.

Mike Tuffrey (AM): Exactly. You have acknowledged the current draft is not adequate because it has not taken account of all these others things --

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): I would very much like to be able to go to Capco and say, "We are deferring our decision on this" but we cannot. We have to fit in with the two boroughs' timescales. If they decide they are going to determine the application we have to respond within 14 days. It is that quick.

Mike Tuffrey (AM): Does it have to conform with the London Plan on something like density? My understanding is that the London Plan sets out optimised density figures now whereas what is being considered for this site is is hugely more dense and built up than the London Plan. Does it not need to conform with the London Plan?

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): It has to conform generally. General conformity I think is the phrase. The policy on density in the London Plan is a much misunderstood policy. I regard it - and I think all practitioners regard it - as a policy that is there to be weighed in the balance alongside all kinds of other factors. Planning is not a tick box approach. You do not assess a planning application by ticking boxes. Is it within the matrix? Tick it. Therefore it is OK. It is just the wrong way of doing it. The density matrix gives us some material to work on but we also look at the urban design studies done by practitioners like Terry Farrell and if they can come along and show you can develop an area at something that might be slightly above or even significantly above the density matrix then the question is, why wouldn't you? Why would you arbitrarily cap the number of new residential units you can build?

Jenny Jones (Chair): You are opening up so many boxes!

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): I was taking that as a theoretical question.

Nicky Gavron (Deputy Chair): Can I just ask, in the beginning your assessment was 2,000 units, it's now 4,000 units can I ask how many extra social rented homes there are going to be?

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): No, I don't.

Nicky Gavron (Deputy Chair): I think it is really pertinent.

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): I know.

Jenny Jones (Chair): That is something you have to keep an eye on

Nicky Gavron (Deputy Chair): I don't think there are going to be many, if any, from what I have read.

Andrew Boff (AM): 1,300 additional ones according to the plan ---

Jenny Jones (Chair): Karim, do you want to say anything in closure, just to sum up?

Karim Halwagi (Chief Executive, Association of Event Organisers): This cultural usage space that you refer to, the idea of there being leisure space, it's a very vague definition and I wonder that is in specific terms.

Giles Dolphin (Assistant Director Planning, GLA): We are not specifying specific space or users; the space is there.

Jenny Jones (Chair): I think this is a question for Capco. I am sorry we cannot answer your question. We have started a dialogue. Can I thank everybody for today's discussion.