

MINUTES

Meeting: London Assembly (Plenary)
Date: Thursday 5 September 2019
Time: 10.00 am
Place: Chamber, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA

Copies of the minutes may be found at: <http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/whole-assembly>

Present:

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair)	Susan Hall AM
Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman)	David Kurten AM
Gareth Bacon AM	Joanne McCartney AM
Shaun Bailey AM	Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM
Sian Berry AM	Keith Prince AM
Andrew Boff AM	Caroline Russell AM
Tom Copley AM	Dr Onkar Sahota AM
Unmesh Desai AM	Navin Shah AM
Len Duvall AM	Fiona Twycross AM
Florence Eshalomi AM	Peter Whittle AM
Nicky Gavron AM	

1 Apologies for Absence and Chair's Announcements (Item 1)

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Léonie Cooper AM, Tony Devenish AM, Andrew Dismore AM and Steve O'Connell AM.
- 1.2 The Chair provided an update on recent Assembly activity including:
- the submission of a response to the proposed Heathrow Airport expansion consultation;
 - a survey by the Transport Committee asking Londoners what they dislike the most about using public transport; and
 - a letter to the Prime Minister asking for his support on the Assembly's Domestic Abuse Register campaign and reminding him of the promises made in the Chamber on the proposed Heathrow expansion.

2 Declarations of Interests (Item 2)

- 2.1 The Assembly received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.
- 2.2 The Chair noted that all Assembly Members had been granted dispensations by the Monitoring Officer which meant that, whilst they had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in Agenda Item 8, which related to elected Member remuneration, they were properly able to take a decision on those matters.

2.3 Resolved:

That the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table at Item 3, be noted as disclosable pecuniary interests.

3 Minutes (Item 3)

3.1 Resolved:

That the minutes of the London Assembly (Plenary) meeting held on 4 July 2019, and the London Assembly (Mayor's Question Time) meeting held on 18 July 2019 be signed by the Chair as correct records.

4 Question and Answer Session - London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) (Item 4)

Part A:

- 4.1 The Assembly put questions to Sir Peter Hendy CBE, Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC), and Lyn Garner, Chief Executive Officer, LLDC, on the work and policies of LLDC.
- 4.2 The record of the questions put by Assembly Members and the answers given is attached as **Appendix 1**, and written answers are attached as **Appendix 2**. The Deputy Chairman assumed the Chair from 10.37am to 12.05pm, so that the Chair was able to put a question to the invited guests.
- 4.3 During the course of the question and answer session, the invited guests undertook:
- To liaise with the Mayor's Cycling Advisor in relation to checking the LLDC's design guidance against the Mayor's Zero Vision aspirations;
 - To consider trialling changes like side-road zebras and other ways of prioritising walking in the Park;
 - To attend a meeting (to be arranged by the Chair of the Assembly) with lead advocates on the return of the LLDC's planning powers to the relevant London boroughs;
 - To provide details of the monitoring outputs on the proportion of developments that are meeting carbon zero requirements;
 - To provide details of how many applications the LLDC has received for funding from the carbon offset fund;
 - To look into whether the LLDC places any restrictions on the private sale of leasehold homes, particularly in relation to high service charges and onerous ground rents;
 - To confirm whether or not private developers – such as Taylor Wimpey at Chobham Manor – charge ground rents to leaseholders on publicly owned land, and to explain what the situation is in relation to any such ground rents;
 - To invite Nicky Gavron AM on a site visit to view the play and recreation facilities provided for children and young people in the residential developments in the Queen Elizabeth Park; to provide details of how many square meters are provided per child for play and recreation facilities within the Park; to provide details as to whether the LLDC obtains developer contributions for providing such facilities; and to provide details of how many children and young people living in and around the Park are using the recreational facilities within it;
 - To provide a breakdown of the percentage of family-sized homes (three or more bedrooms) to be developed/delivered within the Olympic Park, and to provide details

of whether the LLDC's delivery of housing is meeting its housing delivery target and the government's housing delivery test.

Part B:

4.4 The Chair formally moved the motion in the agenda, namely:

"That the Assembly notes the answers to the questions asked."

4.5 **Resolved:**

That the answers to the questions asked be noted.

5 Petitions Update (Item 5)

5.1 The Assembly received the report of the Executive Director of the Secretariat.

5.2 **Resolved:**

That the responses received to petitions presented at recent Assembly Plenary meetings be noted.

6 Motions (Item 6)

6.1 David Kurten AM moved, and Keith Prince AM seconded, the following motion:

"This Assembly notes that the Mayor plans a phased reduction of the maximum age of a licenced taxi from 15 years to 12 years. He also plans to change the criteria for annual registration by mandating the maximum age, meaning that, from November 2019, a taxi will longer be registered unless it has one whole year left before its maximum age, rather than one day as at present.

This will, at a stroke, remove approximately 3,000 taxis from service in the year beginning November 2019, as well as another 1,500 in the year beginning November 2020, and a further 1,500 in the year beginning November 2021.

The Assembly notes that the Mayor currently allows only one model to be licenced new: the LEVC ZEC TX, but production levels of the LEVC ZEC TX are nowhere near high enough to replace the 6,000 taxis which will be removed from service over the next 3 years.

The effect of this will cause real hardship and disruption to many London taxi drivers who simply will not be able to purchase or hire a new taxi due to lack of supply. Thus

at least 6,000 taxi drivers will be unable to work which will cause financial, emotional and mental hardship to them and their families.

The Assembly therefore calls upon the Mayor to reconsider his plans and to maintain the maximum taxi licence age at 15 years.

We also call upon the Mayor to restore the Mercedes Vito as an approved vehicle for first-time taxi registrations until such time as there is greater supply and competition in the market for new taxis, and more electric charging points are available in Central London which can be accessed easily by taxi drivers."

6.2 During the course of the debate, the Chair proposed, and it was agreed, to extend the meeting in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 2.9, in order to complete the business on the agenda for the meeting.

6.3 Following debate, and upon being put to the vote, the motion was agreed (6 votes cast in favour, 3 votes cast against).

6.4 Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM moved, and Florence Eshalomi AM seconded, the following motion:

"This Assembly notes the recent decision by the Department for Transport to issue to Govia a short-term extension of the South Eastern passenger franchise until November, with an option of a further extension to 1 April 2020.

This Assembly reiterates its long standing support for the devolution of train franchises and for more suburban rail services to be run on the successful model of London Overground.

This Assembly believes that the lack of interest in the bidding process for the South Eastern passenger franchise provides a vital opportunity for the merits of train devolution to be fully reconsidered by the Department for Transport.

This Assembly urges the chair of the London Assembly to write a joint letter with the Mayor of London showing unanimous support for greater devolution of train franchises in London, starting with many of the metro train lines that currently exist in the South Eastern passenger franchise."

6.5 Following debate, and upon being put to the vote, the motion was agreed unanimously.

6.6 Shaun Bailey AM moved, and Susan Hall AM seconded, the following motion:

"This Assembly notes that between July 2016 and January 2018 there were 348 reported incidents of sexual assault on the London Underground, of which 100 were on the Central line – nearly double that of the next most reported line, the Victoria line at 55. The Assembly also notes almost one in four sexual assaults on the Tube network happen on the Central line. Unlike most other lines its trains do not have CCTV cameras.

TfL plans to fit Central Line trains with cameras by 2023. This is unacceptable.

This Assembly urges the Mayor to direct TFL to bring forward their plans to fit CCTV cameras on the Central line.”

- 6.7 Sian Berry AM moved, and Caroline Russell AM seconded, the following amendment to the motion:

To add the following to the end of the motion: “and to do more to promote awareness of the limited retention periods for public transport CCTV images.”

- 6.8 Onkar Sahota AM moved, and Florence Eshalomi AM seconded, the following amendment to the motion:

That the last paragraph be amended to read: “This Assembly welcomes the increase in reporting of unwanted sexual behaviour to the police leading to the arrests of over 1000 people since the Report it to Stop it campaign was launched. The Assembly urges the Mayor to continue to do everything he can to tackle the issue, including directing TFL to bring forward their plans to fit CCTV cameras on the Central line.”

- 6.9 In accordance with Standing Order 3.6, Shaun Bailey AM, as mover of the motion, accepted both amendments to the motion.

- 6.10 Upon being put to the vote, the altered motion, namely:

“This Assembly notes that between July 2016 and January 2018 there were 348 reported incidents of sexual assault on the London Underground, of which 100 were on the Central line – nearly double that of the next most reported line, the Victoria line at 55.

The Assembly also notes almost one in four sexual assaults on the Tube network happen on the Central line. Unlike most other lines its trains do not have CCTV cameras.

TfL plans to fit Central Line trains with cameras by 2023. This is unacceptable.

This Assembly welcomes the increase in reporting of unwanted sexual behaviour to the police leading to the arrests of over 1000 people since the Report it to Stop it campaign was launched. The Assembly urges the Mayor to continue to do everything he can to tackle the issue, including directing TFL to bring forward their plans to fit CCTV cameras on the Central line and to do more to promote awareness of the limited retention periods for public transport CCTV images.”

was unanimously agreed.

- 6.11 Fiona Twycross AM moved, and Tom Copley AM seconded, the following altered motion:

“In light of both the Mayor’s evidence and the numerous official Government documents detailing the negative impact of leaving the European Union (EU)

without a deal, this Assembly believes that a no-deal Brexit would have a disastrous impact on London. We welcome moves by Parliament to prevent a no-deal Brexit.

This Assembly is concerned about the intent of the Government to leave the EU without a deal regardless of the evidence presented and that the principles of our democratic process are being threatened by the apparent lengths the Government will go to to enable a no-deal Brexit. A no-deal Brexit would harm London's most vulnerable residents, harm businesses and harm London's economy and the reputation of the city.

In light of these concerns, we support the Mayor's call for a no-deal Brexit to be taken off the table. This Assembly calls on the Mayor to write to the new Prime Minister, enclosing his evidence on the impact to London and by extension the UK, to continue his efforts and to urge the Government and Members of Parliament him not to take the UK out of the EU without a deal."

6.12 Following debate, and in accordance with Standing Order 6.6E(1), a named vote was taken on the above motion.

6.13 The votes in relation to the altered motion in the name of Fiona Twycross AM were cast as follows:

For the motion: Sian Berry AM, Tom Copley AM, Unmesh Desai AM, Len Duvall AM, Florence Eshalomi AM, Nicky Gavron AM, Joanne McCartney AM, Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, Caroline Russell AM, Dr Onkar Sahota AM, Navin Shah AM, Fiona Twycross AM, Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair) and

Against the motion: Susan Hall AM, David Kurten AM, Peter Whittle AM, Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman).

6.14 With 13 votes being cast in favour and four votes cast against, the motion was agreed.

6.15 In accordance with Standing Order 2.2D, which stated that "if the Chair considers it would assist the conduct of business he or she may take items of business in an order different from that set out on the agenda for the meeting" the next item of business (Pay Award 2019-20 for GLA Statutory Officers) was heard before debate of the remaining motions resumed.

[Note: Continuation at Minute 8, Motions]

7 Pay Award 2019-20 for GLA Statutory Officers (Item 8)

7.1 The Assembly received the report of the Assistant Director of Finance and Governance.

7.2 **Resolved:**

- (a) That, noting it as a joint decision with the Mayor, a pay award of 2% to the Chief Officer and the Executive Director of Resources be agreed, and that the Monitoring Officer allowance awarded to the Executive Director of Communities and Intelligence be increased by 2%.**
- (b) That, it be noted, in accordance with the Senior Salaries Review Body recommendation, that the local government pay settlement of 2% be applied to the pay of the Mayor and Assembly Members.**

[Note: See also Minute 2, Declarations of Interest.]

8 Motions (Item 6)

8.1 Unmesh Desai AM moved, and Florence Eshalomi AM seconded, the following motion:

“The Assembly notes that the Government have announced an ambition to recruit 20,000 police officers throughout England and Wales. Though we await to see details on specifics such as funding arrangements, equipment and training, we support the desire to get more police on our streets. The Assembly notes that we have long argued that London requires more police funding and resources from Westminster and we welcome the Government’s overdue acknowledgement that police cuts have gone too far.

The Assembly further notes that the Mayor has written to the Home Secretary calling for the Metropolitan Police Service to receive 5,000 of the total police officers. The Assembly backs the Mayor’s demand for these extra officers which London desperately needs.

We call on the Mayor to continue to make requests for the additional 5,000 officers for London and further suggest that he requests assurances that the Government will fully fund the total cost of hiring new officers, including costs for police equipment, training, salary costs and pension costs.”

8.2 Following debate, and upon being put to the vote, the motion was agreed unanimously.

8.3 Tom Copley AM moved, and Jennette Arnold OBE AM seconded, the following motion, with the Deputy Chairman assuming the Chair from 1.37pm to the end of the item:

“The Assembly is concerned that more than half of London’s ‘blue-light’ workers already live outside the capital, while many nurses and teachers say that they plan to move away from London due to the lack of affordable housing. As the Mayor’s 2018

London Housing Strategy says, “public services that support our city are also increasingly suffering as a result of the housing crisis.”

The Assembly therefore recognises the vital importance of retaining existing key worker accommodation, especially in Inner London, and calls on the Mayor to work with Peabody Housing Association to find alternative solutions in order to prevent the private sale of former Crown Estate Key Worker Homes on the Victoria Park Estate, and to support the retention of key worker housing across the city.”

- 8.4 Following debate, and upon being put to the vote, the motion was agreed unanimously.

9 Mayoral Commitments (Item 7)

- 9.1 The Assembly received the report of the Executive Director of the Secretariat.

9.2 **Resolved:**

That the commitments made by the Mayor of London during the London Assembly (Mayor’s Question Time) meetings between May 2016 and July 2019 be noted.

10 Future Meetings of the London Assembly (Item 9)

- 10.1 The Chair proposed that a minor amendment be made to the proposals set out in the agenda – namely that guests be invited to the upcoming meetings of the London Assembly rather than summonsed. It was explained that this would provide the greatest flexibility in the scheduling of these meetings, in case of requirement to change them – for example, within a pre-election period – to which Members agreed.

10.2 **Resolved:**

- (a) That the 28 November 2019 Plenary meeting be principally used to hold a question and answer session on fire and resilience matters in London and that Dr Fiona Twycross AM, the Deputy Mayor, Fire and Resilience and Dany Cotton QFSM, Commissioner of the London Fire Brigade, be invited to attend from 10am to answer questions.**
- (b) That the 6 February 2020 Plenary meeting be principally used to hold a question and answer session on the work and policies of Transport for London (TfL) and that the Mayor, Sadiq Khan, in his capacity as Chair of TfL, and Mike Brown MVO, Commissioner, TfL, be invited to attend from 10am to answer questions.**

11 Date of Next Meeting (Item 10)

- 11.1 The next scheduled meeting of the London Assembly was the Mayor's Question Time meeting which would take place at 10.00am on Thursday 12 September 2019 in the Chamber, City Hall.

12 Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent (Item 11)

- 12.1 The Chair noted that one item of business had been circulated under cover of a supplementary agenda.
- 12.2 Item 12(a) had been accepted by the Chair as urgent business, under section 100B(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, and Standing Order 1.10A(1), in order that a timely mechanism for agreeing Health Committee outputs is in place ahead of any formal pre-election period.

Proposed Delegation to the Chair of the Health Committee (Item 11a)

- 12.3 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.
- 12.4 **Resolved:**

That authority be delegated to the Chair of the Health Committee, in consultation with the Deputy Chair of the Health Committee, to agree any outputs of that Committee, in accordance with the agreed work programme, for the period up until the May 2020 GLA elections.

13 Close of Meeting

- 13.1 The meeting closed at 1.53pm.

Chair

Date

Contact Officer: Fiona Bywaters, Committee Services Manager; Telephone: 0207 983 4425;
Email: fiona.bywaters@london.gov.uk

London Assembly Plenary Meeting: Thursday 5 September 2019**Transcript of Item 4 – Question and Answer Session – London Legacy Development Corporation**

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): We will now go to section 4 of the agenda, and that is the question and answer session on the London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC). We have with us today Sir Peter Hendy CBE, Chair of the LLDC, and Ms Lyn Garner, Chief Executive of the LLDC. Our questions to you both will be on the work and policies of the LLDC. Welcome to the meeting.

To give a brief explanation, there are three lead-off questions and Assembly Members may ask supplementary questions after each question has been answered. Before asking the first question, however, I am happy to take a short opening statement of up to two minutes, Sir Peter, from either you or Ms Garner.

Sir Peter Hendy CBE (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): Thank you. Good morning, everybody, from us both. I will be very brief and just say that since we were here last year, we have made huge progress with East Bank. The Mayor broke the ground for this huge cultural and educational project in July. One of the things I particularly wanted to say is we of course would welcome the Assembly and the Assembly Members to go and look at the site. But, far more important than that, if you can find the time, [we would welcome the Assembly and the Assembly Members] finding out what the partners in East Bank are going to do for the local community, for East London and London. My offer is that we arrange that for any or all of you. That is the Victoria and Albert (V&A) Museum, Sadler's Wells, London College of Fashion, University College London (UCL) and the BBC.

Lyn will talk about the progress we have made on the Stadium and on housing. Progress is sometimes difficult, but we feel we have made it. The whole thing is about working for the local community, making sure they benefit from this significant investment. The last thing I would say is that however difficult we find it, however successful we are, it is still by any standards the most successful world city urban regeneration project, and the most successful Olympic legacy project. Lyn has been doing a great job as chief executive and she has a couple of things to say there as well.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Thank you, Chair. I am going to focus on progress with the Stadium, if I may, because it was a big focus of the Plenary last year. We can pick up other points during the meeting. We have made real progress with the Stadium, a much-improved relationship with West Ham, a key partner. We have settled all outstanding legal cases during the year and increased the seating capacity at the Stadium through an increase in usage fee and collaboration with the club. We have signed a revised agreement with UK Athletics, which will give us greater certainty over when they use the Stadium and allow us to commercialise different weekends.

In January we brought LS185, the Stadium operator, in-house under the control of LLDC, after buying the company from VINCI. In gaining control, it will put us in a much better place to lift the lid on costs and expenditure and drive improvement.

I do want to say about how successful the Stadium itself has been in recent times. After I was here in September last year, in October 2018 the Stadium team was recommended for a prestigious award and won Best Venue and Best Teamwork Award at the Live UK Business Awards, after hosting six very successful

concerts. This year they have hosted another series of great events, changing the Stadium from football to concerts, to baseball, to athletics and back to football on programme and on budget, which is really very impressive and very focused. Major League Baseball (MLB) came to the Stadium. We had two of the best clubs in the world playing baseball here in London. We had a crowd of over 100,000 people in the city and the games went terribly well. I want to quote the feedback from MLB back in the United States (US):

"It was a huge success. The Commissioner and team owners are genuinely thrilled. It surpassed their expectations."

I think we have a fantastic team at the Stadium, notwithstanding the difficulties in the budget that we are working through over the next few years. On 29 September [2019] we will host the first Women's Super League (WSL) Football game, which we are incredibly proud of. We have worked with the club to bring this forward, and it will be West Ham United playing Tottenham Women in the Stadium there at the end of the month.

We are running an economics study to check what impact MLB has had on the wider London economy. As you know, the 2017 World Athletics had a tremendous impact on the UK economy, with over £100 million going into the economy from that event, and we know that National Football League (NFL) games at Wembley generate around £14 million for the economy locally. Around 30% of the tickets were sold abroad, 20% in the US and 10% from elsewhere; the vast majority of the remainder being people who came from London.

I am going to leave it there, because I know I am probably over my two minutes, Chair. We will pick up housing, business and investment later through questions, I am sure.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): Thank you very much. OK, so let us go to the first lead-off question.

2019/17039 - London Legacy Development Corporation's progress on Healthy Streets **Caroline Russell AM**

What progress are you making in the London Legacy Development Corporation to deliver Healthy Streets and reach your target for 85 per cent of all journeys to be made by sustainable travel by 2031?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): The target for 85% of all journeys to be made sustainable by 2031 is a target that is contained within the Legacy Communities Scheme, so it is our own target. We are fully committed to supporting and encouraging sustainable travel, and that would be in line with the Mayor's Healthy Streets approach. Each neighbourhood is required to submit travel plans setting out measures to help achieve that 85% target. They have been approved for the early phases of Chobham Manor, phases 1 and 2, and they will be monitored over the development phases as those phases come forward. Phase 1 is complete and we have nearly completed phase 2 at Chobham.

With outline planning permission also in place for Stratford Waterfront residential, design teams have been appointed for Pudding Mill Lane, and those plans are also being embedded within master plans for those areas, particularly in Pudding Mill, which is a new area of development for us.

Of course, the overarching target for our wider mayoral development corporation (MDC) area is in line with the Healthy Streets target, which I understand is 80%, so there is a bit of a mismatch between the two. Nevertheless, in 2018/19, when we carried out the visitor survey, we found that we were at 83% of visitors travelling sustainably, 28% having walked or cycled and 55% arriving by public transport. We are not quite at that 85% own target and we are not complacent. You will know, I think, Caroline, from when you came to the

Park and had a look around yourself that we are working hard on some transport improvements. We are working on transport improvements on the Bromley-by-Bow junction on the A12, with £21 million to be invested in partnership with Transport for London (TfL) and the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.

We are also working to improve Montfichet Road and Westfield Avenue. These roads were planned at the time of the shopping centre being put in place, well before the [Olympic] Games, and our intention is to reduce those roads by a complete lane of traffic and to introduce easier cycling across both Montfichet Road and Westfield Avenue. There is significant funding in place, but there are some gaps to that funding. We are working to bring that forward, but the design work has started on those schemes. The aim is that by the time we open East Bank and have considerably more people arriving in the Park, we can make sure that the vast majority of that is coming through the transport routes and through cycling routes; so we are aiming for those sorts of dates.

We have some really good news that recently happened to the south of the Park, because we have opened two new cycling routes and pedestrian routes, one of which is a 1km section of the Greenway, which connects the Greenway from Newham straight into the Park. Actually, it really makes a difference to that part of the Park, for anybody who is familiar with that. It has been closed for quite a long period of time while we have been working on it. You cross over the Stratford High Street and directly into the Park, and it just enhances the availability of the Park really considerably.

We have appointed a local cycling consultant – I think that was your suggestion when you came to see us – and they are helping us with audits locally, Park infrastructure and improving the routes. We have opened-up a new plan to look at the Carpenters Estate entrance to Stratford Station. For a long while we have had planning permission to put a new station entrance at the Carpenters Estate end of Stratford Station, so if you come via the Jubilee line and you look immediately to your left, there is a little car park there and that is where the new station entrance is going to be for Carpenters Estate. Funding is in place and we expect to open it in September 2020, so we are going to be on site very soon with that, which we are really pleased about. It will help stimulate the regeneration of the Carpenters Estate in the fullness of time, depending on what the London Borough of Newham would wish to bring forward there in partnership with its residents.

Caroline Russell AM: Thank you very much. That is a massively comprehensive list of things and it is certainly very good news that you are working with a cycling specialist.

I would like to pick up on the £25 million investment that was announced in April to make the Olympic Park better for walking and cycling. The Infrastructure Project Plan has 52 projects classed as local transport schemes, and of those there are four that are currently underway, seven have funding or permission and 41 of them do not have funding or permission yet. When are you going to be delivering those remaining 41 schemes so that people start to get that benefit? Do you have a sense of the timescale?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes. Without a doubt, those schemes will need to be prioritised, because it sounds to me – not having the detail in front of me – an awful lot, doesn't it? In terms of the funding requirement for those schemes and prioritising them, that will be no doubt what officers are doing, and these ones that are coming forward now and that have funding will be the highest priorities.

Of course, we still have quite a lot of development to come on the Park. For example, we have the later phases of International Quarter London. So far, they have built about half of their office accommodation, with a further half to come, and they have residential development to come through planning. There will be various sites around the Park that are yet to come forward; so Pudding Mill Lane and Rick Roberts Way. There is a not

very well-used car park in the middle of the Park near Here East that will come forward for development, then there are the sites around the periphery of the Park. For example, this year we will complete 10,000 new homes. We will complete that milestone at the end of 2019. In total, we are building 33,000 [new homes] and there is still a lot of office accommodation to come. No doubt there are still a lot of section 106s still to come into the pot over that period of time, but I think the critical thing will be to make sure those priorities are listed.

Caroline Russell AM: What is important, if you have got all that new development, is all those new people either living or working in the Park. You want to make sure that you are building-in that walking and cycling, rather than leaving people car-dependent.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I think that is absolutely right. The Healthy Streets initiatives will run all through the residential developments, as we know.

The other thing I probably should mention is that we have started working on looking at the possibilities for improvement of Stratford Station itself. Stratford Station, at some times of the day, is under quite a lot of pressure, if you have used the station.

Caroline Russell AM: I think, actually, other Assembly Members may be asking you about Stratford Station.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Good. OK, lovely.

Caroline Russell AM: Therefore, I will move you on. One of the concerns has been that on the Olympic Park it has been a very motor-centric design, with big sweeping roads and cycle tracks that were disappearing at junctions just when they are needed. I am just wondering about your design guidance. Have you thought about just checking your design guidance against the Mayor's Vision Zero aspirations so that you are definitely building in ways to make sure that people walking and cycling are kept safe on the streets in the Park?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I can pick that up with the Mayor's Cycling Advisor, who came over to see us in the last 12 months. We think we are in line with the Mayor's best practice guidance. It is quite a difficult environment at the moment. There are at least three or four sites being built out, which really frustrates cyclists, actually, because they are having to be diverted around the Park. We do --

Caroline Russell AM: There is good practice, diverting cyclists around works, and we can insist on your developers actually following that good practice.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): We do, but I think nevertheless it is frustrating, isn't it, if you are used to going a certain way and so on, so we are having to put those diversions in place. The Quietway 6 is due to come forward, of course, which is coming through the Park from Hackney Wick over to Chobham Manor and through Honour Lea Avenue, so that cuts right across the Park, which I think will be a real development. There is a new highway opening, a new north-south highway, as part of the East Wick and Sweetwater development that is opening in October. That also has a cycle route up and over the bridge into Hackney Wick and so on.

Caroline Russell AM: Thank you. I finally want to say I have heard that you are running a scooter trial in the Olympic Park, making use of your status as private land.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): We are. Yes.

Caroline Russell AM: This could be a space for trialling changes like side-road zebras and other ways of prioritising walking. I am almost out of time, but would you consider using your land for trialling things like side-road zebras?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Absolutely, absolutely. Let us speak afterwards on that.

Caroline Russell AM: I will write to you afterwards. Thank you very much.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): Assembly Member Pidgeon.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: I am increasingly concerned as to whether Stratford Station can safely meet growing passenger demand. Stratford Station is dangerously overcrowded, with well over 40 million passengers using the station a year, from only 12 million a decade ago. I understand plans to address overcrowding are looking solely at Stratford regional station, yet Stratford International could help relieve the situation. What are you doing to look at expanding the use of Stratford International Station to deal with this increase in demand?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): We have established a team, a very senior leadership team, with TfL colleagues, Network Rail colleagues and the London Borough of Newham. We are starting to bring a plan together for the whole of the Stratford transport piece. Clearly, you cannot simply look at Stratford Station alone. Stratford International is part of the solution, as are buses, as are cycling routes and so on, and furthermore the stations that are outlying around Stratford. It is important that we look at the whole of that piece. I think that group is well aware that we need to be looking wider than just the station.

We have this leadership group in place. It has met at least once. It is looking to commission a strategic outline business case for the Government to have a look at the future of Stratford Station to ensure that we are building for growth because, as you know, it is under pressure at certain times of the day. We are seeing more growth coming to Stratford. It has been tremendously successful. It is three times more successful than was originally predicted some years ago, just before the games. Obviously, there are key routes there to the rest of London, like Canary Wharf and so on, from the Jubilee line, so we need to look at the thing in the round.

The example of the Carpenters Estate entrance is a short-term fix for some of the issues that are arising at the moment. We have a list of short-term fixes that we are looking at with the station, but we are very mindful we need to look at it completely in the round.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: OK. I think reputationally the overcrowding is going to affect some people deciding whether they want to move their business to some of the new buildings. I hear that from people whose offices are moving there and they are looking for other jobs because they say, "I cannot cope with that level of crowding". I do not believe the continued growth and regeneration of the area can be met, as I say, if you neglect Stratford International. Given that there are 82 trains a day from London to St Pancras there, just six minutes, I suspect a significant factor for the underutilisation of that high-speed line is the premium charges. I am wondering, has LLDC explored the costs and benefits of reviewing this charge, working with the Mayor and Department for Transport (DfT)?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Not yet, on that particular issue. Where I would really agree with you is, I feel - as somebody reasonably new to this area in terms of my

own job and coming from west London – that that line is not particularly made known to people by Network Rail or TfL as an alternative route. On the pricing, it has already been said to us that if you are in one of the outlying TfL stations and your home is closest to a station that is just beyond Stratford, you are in a different charging zone; so you go out of zone 2 and into zone 3 and pay an extra charge. There may be people getting off at Stratford and exacerbating the situation because of the way the charging works. I think the charging has to come into the entire study piece, actually.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: But it is clearly a premium charge there. I think it is interesting what you are saying, because my next question was going to be: do you think enough is being done by TfL to promote the route? Should this route – along with, I also think, Thameslink – be put on the TfL map? That is effectively another Tube line through London. You will find a lot of people in the south who are going out east could easily get the Thameslink and change at St Pancras and get out, six minutes to Stratford. Is that something you are going to look at as part of this work?

Sir Peter Hendy CBE (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): You will recall, Caroline, there is a bit of history there. The LLDC can certainly make representations about the increase in use of Stratford International Station, but primarily it is tied up with the way that the national railway system is franchised and also the fare structure, which you know all about. I am sure, if the Mayor wanted to do something, the department would be only too happy to agree to it, as long as he paid for it. We had all that fuss in the Olympics when we had to make special arrangements for Oysters to be available to Stratford International. I think you are right in the sense that actually Stratford International is part of the answer to transport at Stratford, but it is a slightly different programme from Stratford regional station, which has to be solved in itself in the short and medium term because many of the people who go to Stratford regional do not want to go to the other end of the Park. It is another solution, not an alternative.

We were quite pleased because we wrote, as you would do, to the new Secretary of State, and rather unexpectedly we got a very helpful letter back yesterday applauding our efforts to look at Stratford [regional] Station in the round, because it is actually the business of the LLDC, TfL, Network Rail, the train-operating companies and the department. I think we are going to have to do a lot of work in the medium term to produce a station which is fit for the next 20, 25, 30 years. One of the biggest issues with Stratford is you should not do anything in the short term which will have to be undone in the longer term. It is all a bit of mess because it has got various subways and it has all been added to over a period of time.

The group that Lyn has established, which I – with my other hat on for Network Rail – sit on, is trying to work out what the end solution is and then how you get there in terms of the intermediate solutions. In the meantime, I do not think it is dangerous, but it is certainly very crowded. TfL, as the station operator, is having to manage the station on a dynamic basis, which means it has put in a one-way system, which relieves some of the congestion. We know that something needs to be done there.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Thank you very much. I look forward to an update in due course.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): No other follow-ups for that question, so let us go on to the next question.

2019/17038 - Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park – long term vision

[Navin Shah AM](#)

What is the long-term vision for the Park and how are you progressing with your plans?

Sir Peter Hendy CBE (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): It is no different, I think, from what everybody signed up to as part of the Olympic legacy. It is inclusive growth; it is community; it is opportunity. As I said at the beginning, I think we can already demonstrate that those principles are being adopted in what is being done there so far, and on what currently the LLDC is engaged in; so actually bringing a world-class educational and cultural centre to the place is not only of benefit to the Park and the people who work there and immediately live there, but we see it as a huge benefit to the wider community; both in the immediate area in east London and London. I think it is a really very good example of how we are seeking to develop the place for the long-term benefit of the city.

Lyn can talk to you about the housing. What we have done with the Stadium is designed to make it a sustainable part of the Park for the future, rather than a continuing liability. We take that through to principles which involve the employment of local people, providing training opportunities and so forth. I think one of the huge benefits of this development corporation is the comprehensive nature of the undertakings which we expect builders, developers, occupants, residents and educational establishments to provide. If you go to any particular employer or any particular part of the Park, we can identify local people who have benefitted from the principles which we have adopted to use.

If you go to Loughborough, for example, they have a large postgraduate education centre at Here East. They have a scheme to find further educational training for unemployed graduates in the area. Those things are very exceptional. They are things that a lot of local authorities would surely like to do but actually do not have the resources to do. I think we can both explain what the principles are, but we can also demonstrate that we are acting on them.

Navin Shah AM: I have only got a couple of minutes. In fact, Lyn, when you come in on this particular aspect, I have specific information I am after, because if I refer to LLDC's Board papers going back to May, it is stated that there is a delivery strategy for the vision which is due to follow, setting out detailed objectives and under each of the visions, three sections, three aspirations and a clear approach to measuring success, impact and outcomes that will follow. Can you tell us, when will the delivery strategy be actually published?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I think we did have a debate at Board around new focused vision. The reason for that was to think about the future of the development corporation in the next five to six years, because clearly a development corporation does not last forever; it is a time-limited organisation. We decided we needed to make sure that the principles we were putting in place around inclusive growth, community and opportunity were relevant with that in mind and really focus on those opportunities. We would be in a position to publish that towards the end of this year or early 2020. We are in conversation with the boroughs about them being joined up in some of that vision through our Board meetings, because it is pointless a development corporation putting together a long-term vision when its life is coming to an end during the period of that long-term vision. At the moment we are working hard to join up with the boroughs to make sure that whatever we publish is right for the area and that they can pick up those pieces as we move forward. That is why it has gone to Board in May but you have not seen it published yet, because we are working it through with the boroughs and getting aligned on those principles, which are really important.

In terms of how we are progressing with the plans, we are well underway with the East Bank plans, which will come to fruition in 2022 to 2023. There is still a lot of housing to come, another 23,000 homes. All the venues, as you know, are open and operating, but getting them on to a firmer financial footing, the Stadium in particular, is really important. We are progressing well, as I outlined in the introduction, but there is still quite a

lot to do there. I think at the same time we need to make sure that we are working with academic partners and these significant partners coming to the Park in the arts and culture piece --

Navin Shah AM: I have a question coming up after on East Bank.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): OK, fine. I was just going to say that --

Navin Shah AM: If you can stop there because I am out of my time, I am afraid.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): -- working with those partners will help secure the inward investment for the longer term. Having the UCL campus there in east London is going to be tremendous for inward investment in growth moving forward, we think.

Navin Shah AM: Thank you.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman): Assembly Member Arnold.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): Yes, thank you. Can I start my question to Sir Peter? It is going back to a Plenary Assembly meeting that we had on 2 November 2017. The issue was raised there about the timeline which you are working to in order to return the planning powers that you either see as being on loan or borrowed from the Olympic boroughs of Hackney, Waltham Forest, Newham and Tower Hamlets. I have met with local councillors representing wards in all of these boroughs and spoken to some senior representatives and a group of residents, and they really do not understand why these powers cannot be transferred back to the boroughs by 2022, by the latest.

Sir Peter Hendy CBE (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): I think we have discussed this both times we have come, actually. As the Mayor committed to, he was looking for the Corporation to finish its work by the end of his second term. We have started work at the Board about discussing what we need to do to transition. Part of that is indeed discussing what we do about the planning powers and when they should transfer. Like the Park itself, these are not simple issues. Indeed, the scale of the development in the Park means that there is a lot of work, and a lot of work which would need to be transferred to bodies which have been under really significant financial pressure for a very long time through squeezing Government expenditure. We have started those discussions.

You are absolutely right, we have heard that there are people who would like the planning powers transferred. We have a group which includes the mayors and leaders. There is a group which includes the borough planning officers about looking at what would need to be done. It sounds great to say, "Oh, we will just transfer the planning powers", but actually the boroughs concerned would need the resources to use them. They would need those resources to come out of presumably their funding, rather than our funding, unless, at the end of the life of the corporation, the Mayor decides to continue to fund other people to do what we would have done. It is not quite as simple as it looks.

We are concerned not just to hand things over, but to hand them over properly to ensure the long-term future of what we were just discussing in the previous question; the intention of the original scheme. I am not saying that we are not going to do it. We are discussing how quickly we can do it, what the issues are surrounding it, but it is not that simple. I think it is tempting to look at the Park as a series of assets which can simply be divided and handed over. The truth of it is it is a very complicated scenario and the costs of running the

corporation include a significant continuing revenue cost, which actually the people who are taking the power also need to shoulder, but we are in that discussion.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): Before you come in, Lyn, can I just say to you, Sir Peter, you do appreciate it is reasonable for residents to be asking the question, “When?” given the length of the time that the powers have been removed from them?

Sir Peter Hendy CBE (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes, absolutely, but there is also the question of the legal process which needs to be carried out in order to do this. We have been investigating this. Needless to say, it does not look very simple, it does not look as if it is going to be very quick, but we are on to all of this. It is not like we are sitting there thinking, “We are reluctant to do it”. The long-term future of the Park and the powers that we are discharging ought to rest with the residents of the four boroughs. The question is how you get there, how quickly it can be done and how effectively it can be done.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): Lastly, would you be willing to have a meeting with some lead advocates of the return of the powers which I could lead and arrange on their behalf?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes, absolutely.

Sir Peter Hendy CBE (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes, yes. Since we are in discussion with the mayors and leaders and since we have an officer-level group, including the planning officers for the four boroughs, I think we have enough material to be able to talk to people about it.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): Thank you.

Unmesh Desai AM: Good morning. If I could ask you, Ms Garner, a straightforward question. Is convergence still central to your long-term plans? Let me tell you why I ask you this question. As I said, it seems a straightforward, simple question. The last annual update of your performance measures and convergence targets that were reported were in your quarterly performance report in January to March 2016/17.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes.

Unmesh Desai AM: You yourself noted earlier this year that the four growth boroughs are not currently publishing collective performance on convergence targets. If you are not measuring performance, how can you assess whether you are actually meeting your target of closing the gap between the wealthiest and poorest communities, which is what convergence is all about? It therefore begs the question, is convergence still central to your long-term plans?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Monitoring is still central to our long-term plan, monitoring outputs and outcomes. We still measure those things as the development corporation. You are right to ask us about convergence, and we discussed this a little bit last time we were here. The convergence indicators and the convergence monitoring was always an initiative that was owned by the boroughs that surrounded the Olympic Park. In the initial stages, and that was six London boroughs that owned the convergence strategy, they brought the strategy together and they owned the strategy and they decided that they needed to monitor the outcomes of the legacy going forward on local people. They of course hold the data, because the boroughs hold all of the key performance data around their wards, at ward level, for social impact and they monitor key performance indicators around what is happening in each of the boroughs.

In 2016, my understanding is that the boroughs decided to disband the unit that was collecting and monitoring that data and decided they would no longer publish that data. In order for us to have continued doing that, we would have needed access to the boroughs' data, we would have needed more resources to set up our own team to do that. A decision was taken not to do that. The boroughs are now speaking again, they have joined up again, this time four of the six; the closest ones that surround the Park. They are now thinking about whether they need to come back to convergence and what kind of monitoring they do want in place in terms of the impact of the legacy on local people.

Just returning to what I said at the top of the answer to this question, that does not stop us measuring how many jobs and skills and people are impacted, but they tend to be numbers and percentages in their own right rather than distance travelled in terms of key performance indicators over a period of time - which was the intention of the convergence strategy back at the time of the Olympics.

Unmesh Desai AM: OK. Because I am limited for time, I will write to you about what you have just said.

Very quickly, there will be a lot of new businesses moving into this area, particularly in the Cultural Quarter, so how are you supporting existing local businesses to benefit from the big organisations that will be going in?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes, there are a number of layers, in answer to that question. Members may know that Hackney Wick and Fish Island were successful - LLDC [working] with the two boroughs, Hackney and Tower Hamlets - in achieving Creative Enterprise Zone (CEZ) status; which means that the wider artists' area and small businesses in that area that are in the creative world are getting additional funding through the CEZ. That enabled us to put that funding in place and tie up with the East Bank partners' relationships with those local artists, community groups and small and medium enterprises (SMEs). In addition, the partners are working hard locally, both with residents but also with community groups and so on to make sure that what we are not seeing here is funding, for example, being taken away from local groups in favour of the bigger organisations.

This will be critical in the funding strategy that the Foundation for Future London puts together. Now, the Foundation for Future London has a couple of new chairs. There is a joint chairpersonship and a new chief executive, and she has very recently launched an arts and culture grant pot for local organisations, not for the big partners, and she is working proactively on making sure that those groups are tied into the opportunities so that we do not have fragmentation in that area.

Unmesh Desai AM: Thank you for the detailed answer.

Joanne McCartney AM: Thank you. I wonder if you could just briefly update me as to whether you are meeting your environment targets.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Can I just turn to that page, because that section is quite detailed. I think we are meeting our targets. We have zero carbon targets, for example, for housing. What we have done there so far is we have built 26 exemplar homes at Chobham Manor, zero carbon. The critical thing of course over this next period is just running a monitoring study to see how effective they are and how residents are finding those homes and whether they work for them. We are just about to commission a study on that, and the tender returns are due back in October for that study. It will be interesting to see what comes out of the study. We will then take that learning to apply it to the overall estate and start thinking about that for the next level of planning commissions that we will be giving in Pudding Mill Lane. There are also zero carbon targets for East Wick and Sweetwater. Phase 1 is on site at the moment.

We have a carbon offset fund, which fits into this sort of category. So far we have collected around £130,000. In the sustainability pot we have £632,000 to use for projects around the Park.

Joanne McCartney AM: I think that was the same figure that you wrote to us about last year.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): That is right, yes.

Joanne McCartney AM: On the carbon offset fund, are you monitoring what proportion of developments are meeting zero carbon requirements, so that you can be satisfied that developers are not just paying into an offset fund to avoid the requirements.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes, we are monitoring it. I do not have the detail of the monitoring outputs, but I can send them to you.

Joanne McCartney AM: That might be helpful, yes. Last year you said that the fund was open to applications from the offset fund. Do you know how many funding applications you have actually funded so far?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): No, I do not, but I do know one that we are funding at the moment, which is the Bromley-by-Bow centre, where we are installing photovoltaics (PVs) and running an engagement programme around sustainability at that centre. It is a community centre. Why don't I write to you with the bids that have come in again to the pot?

Joanne McCartney AM: That would be helpful. The other issue I had was about biodiversity. Your first five-year plan has just come to an end. Are you going to be publishing a new five-year plan?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): For biodiversity? Yes, we are about to publish that, actually. We have updated the Biodiversity Action Plan. It is due to be published late this year, early next year. What we have done there is picked up a number of key learnings; some of those include planting designs on the Park, opportunities to be more innovative around planting designs. Of course, the Park habitats are maturing over time, which is really lovely to see. Some really lovely information I had on this actually from the team was that last year's survey showed that 42 species of bird were confirmed or highly likely to be breeding on the Park. That was up from 38 in the previous year and 33 in the year before that, so really positive news. That includes three schedule 1 highly protected species, so the likes of Kingfisher, Black Redstart and Cetti's Warbler, which is really lovely news, to understand how that is settling down over time.

Sir Peter Hendy CBE (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): Presumably up from zero in 2007.

Joanne McCartney AM: I visited actually a couple of times over the summer and it is looking really good, yes.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman): OK, Assembly Member Duvall.

Len Duvall OBE AM: Thank you very much. Can we go back to the Moore Stephens report? Can you just remind us of the steps that you have taken briefly since they highlighted that your organisation was taking most of the risks around the Stadium, both in capital and in terms of operating cost?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes. At the top of the meeting, I outlined in broad terms the things that we have done.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): In headline terms, this year we have first of all got off the table, by last autumn, the outstanding legal matters with the club. Going forward, we have a much better relationship with the football club. We have moved on leaps and bounds, joined up on a few things, collaborated, got the seating capacity up to 60,000 and in that negotiation increased the usage fee to bring in more income as part of that deal. We have worked with UK Athletics to essentially fix their window of usage of the Stadium. That is quite important because UK Athletics has the whole of the month of July to run athletics events. It is really important to us to focus that into one or two weekends so that we can use the other weekends for other things. It is not bringing in tremendous amounts of money, but it is bringing opportunity and flexibility.

The other things we have done are critically, I suppose - and I took a long time at the Budget and Performance Committee last time explaining that we had difficulties around the costs of operating the Stadium that were not very transparent to us - we have worked hard this year on a strategy to bring the [stadium] operator in-house. We negotiated a deal with VINCI and we bought the company so that we could have visibility around the costs. The next stage is building a five-year plan, which we have in draft, to reduce the costs on match days and to increase income over that five-year period. I can tell you in headline terms that we are hoping to reduce costs by around £7 million over that five-year period to bring the public subsidy down. I think we can go further than that and I am employing a chief commercial officer, who is joining me in November. She was previously the Chief Executive of England Netball. She has a background in sponsorship - she did the Vitality deal for England Netball, for example - and she is coming to work alongside me and the club, the venues and the Park to look at how we can better commercialise the whole of the area in terms of reducing the burden on the public purse, so more work to come there. I would suggest that they are the highlights. This year, between where we settle in 2018 and where we expect to be, we will make at least a £1 million saving in the bottom line operating costs and potentially £2 million.

Sir Peter Hendy CBE (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): Lyn makes all that sound sequentially quite simple, but in fact I would say from my involvement in it that it has been a really large amount of work to do all that. I am not sure whether anybody believed this year that we were going to get on top of it, but we still see this as work in progress, because getting a grip on the costs of running the Stadium on a daily basis and sorting out West Ham are all moves towards what Lyn says is trying to reduce the cost to the public purse of this place in the long term.

Len Duvall OBE AM: You should be congratulated on that, and I think it is very commendable about the efforts that you have done in that short space of time in terms of this phase. I am pleased to hear it is ongoing work.

The issue of programming and maximising that expenditure will require a subsidy of some description, but clearly we need to get that down to the minimum and people need to pay their way. I am told that it took 24 days to set up for the baseball. I think the baseball is a good thing, but that is 24 days - allowing that there would always be some setting-up cost - of potential spaces that we might have been able to let. We do not know because of programming. Is someone looking at things like that for the coming years?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes.

Len Duvall OBE AM: We do not want to lose baseball, but clearly that is a crucial time – off-season, outside the football season – which could be used in terms of raising revenue income. What is the plan about that, looking at that? What are the lessons learned about baseball, not just that it was a success and it truly was, not just that people were attending it, but in terms of international recognition, as you rightly raised earlier on? How do we reduce that setting-up cost?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes, they took basically a month to set up and then have the games, essentially. That takes four weekends out of the calendar, which is significant. Now, this was a trial year. We still made a surplus on the baseball, but what you are saying is, “Is there an opportunity cost there?” Could we have sold all those weekends for concerts, for example? We have established with MLB that we will be able to reduce by a few days for 2020 just by trialling things this year; things like in the bump-in, for example, having people working 20 hours a day instead of eight hours a day to build the overlay for the baseball, which will make a big difference. That costs more money but it is worth doing in the long term, so we have explored that with them. We expect the bump-in next year to be shorter, not by an entire week, but probably about half a week. It may be that we are able to talk to Baseball about coming after 2020. Our contract is just a two-year contract at the moment. If that was the case, we would want to have a conversation that took at least a week off that bump-in time in order to maximise concerts going in and so on.

We have done an exercise that maps what income baseball brings in compared to concerts and then the likelihood of being able to secure concerts for every one of those weekends, because actually, if baseball was not there, it is highly unlikely we would be able to secure a concert for every single weekend.

Sir Peter Hendy CBE (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): For all of them, yes.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Which would be eight or ten individual events. We are licensed for ten at the maximum. We have done an exercise that shows opportunity cost. We think that the best place we can get to is one MLB per year on that three-week bump-in with four, potentially six, concerts. I say four or six because, with the way that – we look after the pitch at the moment, if we were to bring what is called a PlayMaster pitch into the Stadium, which is a fast-growing grass – and it is not my expertise, but apparently it grows much quicker than ordinary grass – we would get another weekend of concerts. We are constantly monitoring how we can get the event income to the highest possible place by moving the various events around.

Sir Peter Hendy CBE (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): I think what you are hearing is that we are constantly learning about how best to do this, after an extended period of great difficulty in various ways, and that will carry on. The fact that Lyn is all over this I welcome entirely, because you have got to understand how this place works to make the most of it, actually, and its opportunities. It is quite clear that you could not do – or it would be extremely lucky to be able to get – concerts every weekend in all that available space, so we have just got to match it. One of the reasons we need a commercial officer on board is that there is a whole level of work below this which actually is not Lyn’s proper work, but somebody needs to do it, because if we are going to sort out the economics of this place in the best way, then somebody has to really be into the detail.

Of course this is a transition issue in the end because, long after the LLDC is gone, somebody has to manage this as a major public space and make the most of it at the least public expense. We sort of think what we are doing now is what we should be doing and it is for the benefit of both the immediate future and the long-term future.

Len Duvall OBE AM: Just lastly, the number one priority issue for the commercial officer, naming rights of the Stadium?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes.

Len Duvall OBE AM: You have a business-like relationship with West Ham. The question now is - we have missed this season - do we think we will have the naming rights sewn up for next season? Is that reasonable?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Potentially. I think you have hit on the really important point there. We cannot sell naming rights without being hand-in-glove with the football club. Now that we have cleared out some of the arguments and so on and we have a clear path to a partnership, I have asked Baroness [Karren] Brady [CBE, MP] to work with me personally on stadium naming rights. She has agreed to do that, in good faith. We will work together to try to bring a strategy that gets the best win-win situation, both for the club and for the Park itself. The global eyes are coming through football in the main, notwithstanding the wonderful events we are able to put on through the summer, so we must work in partnership. The contract outlines that, in any case.

Len Duvall OBE AM: Thank you very much.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman): Assembly Member Sahota.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: I am going to talk to you about the provisions of health services in the corporation. The Legacy Communities Scheme proposes that there be five neighbourhoods around Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park, but there will be two general practitioner (GP) practices and one walk-in centre. Will that be enough?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): At the moment the Local Plan talks about three health centre facilities and our Local Plan has recently been revised, so we have had a fresh look at that recently. There is one already on the Park, it is up and running, and that is close to the Chobham Manor development, and there are two to come. As you know, in order to bring forward those facilities, we need to work hand-in-glove with the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) to make sure that we are aligned on those. Our intention is to have two more at the moment for the new homes that are still to come. These are actually on the Park facilities. Just to give you a sense of that, we are expecting on the Park itself around 4,500 new homes still to be built for those two health centres to work with.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: With the projection you had for the residents, the growth has been faster than what you had anticipated already and those provisions you provided were based on your previous projections. Now the new projections are coming along, have you taken that on board and what is the impact on the health provisions of those new projections? Are the CCGs playing ball with you?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): We have, because, as it happens, we have recently refreshed the Local Development Plan for the Park and it is going into Examination in Public in a few months' time. We have had a look at those provisions. We think we have got it about right, but, as you know, things change as we move forward. The key thing will be keeping it under review and making sure those facilities are sufficient.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: My concern is that the population growth is faster than you thought, and also more is being asked of GP practices and more is coming out into the community. I fear that the CCGs may not keep in pace with what is happening on the ground there. This is what happens right across London, that population

growth takes place at a faster rate than what the initial response is to it. I just want to understand; is that happening? Do you have any concerns about the whole matter? I understand the practices already around the area are under a lot of pressure.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I think it is a really good point. I personally have not met local CCGs. It is early days in terms of those homes coming forward on the Park, but we are making sure that we connect those needs with the boroughs' requirements, because obviously there are false boundaries there at the moment, so we are thinking about the needs on the Park, but obviously the Pudding Mill Lane development is in Newham. It is right next to Stratford High Street. We need to have a look at the wider facilities and I think that is where we probably need to join up with the boroughs and make sure we are making approaches sensibly to the CCGs, looking at the whole of the area. But I do not think we are necessarily doing that in practical terms right now, so it is something that I can pick up.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: Great. Thank you very much. Thank you.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman): Assembly Member Prince.

Keith Prince AM: No, my question has been answered, Chair.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman): Assembly Member Shah.

Navin Shah AM: Thank you, Chair. It was great to hear the very upbeat comment about progress being made at East Bank in the opening remarks. However, the question is: how are you minimising the potential risks to the plans at East Bank? Again, going back to the risk register from May, there are certainly three major risks which have been identified. What are you doing to actually deal with the major risks involved there?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Look, this is an enormous construction project. The budget is £470 million. We have probably one of the best construction managers in the country working with us, the Mace organisation, extremely experienced both on the Park, all over London and all over the country. We have a really highly qualified team from Mace working alongside us. On a regular basis - it is quarterly, I think - Peter and I meet the Chief Executive of Mace and his chief operating officer for an informal conversation that actually goes into some detail of how the project is working on the ground. We have monthly implementation review meetings that I attend, so I get a monthly detailed update of how the project is going in terms of programme and budget. We have a number of lines of risk and assurance built into the process, so the first line of assurance is at that meeting, and at the implementation review, where we review risks on a monthly basis and how we are progressing against those, where I am present and I am able to feed into the Chair and so on.

Aside from that, we have an internal - what we call - second line of assurance, which is an external company called Arcadis that looks at all of the costs and risks and advises us on how the programme is going live at the time that we are talking about the implementation review; so it is very live to the project as it is moving forward. We have a third line of assurance that is a risk and assurance board that meets on a regular basis and has construction experts sitting on it - one of the Government's construction experts, Paul Morrell [OBE], chairs that board - and some external expertise that is having a look at risk and assurance sort of a little bit after the fact; so they are receiving reports after the fact and making sure that the project is running in a sensible fashion.

Sir Peter Hendy (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): We are also in dialogue, of course, with our partners, because it is not only a big construction project, it is a project which involves significant

other partners: UCL, the BBC and V&A and so forth. One of the members of our Board, who is Simon Blanchflower, who was the project director for London Bridge Station across the road, spends quite a lot of time on this as well. I do not think we are short of risk and assurance methodology.

Nevertheless, the fact is that the construction industry in the UK and in London is not in a good place at all, and we are some way through the tendering process for the construction packages. It is fair to say that it is challenging. We cannot tell you what the end result of that is, but we can tell you that we are all over this because you need us to know what is going on as the tendering practices unfold.

Navin Shah AM: What worries me the most is that when you look at the three key areas of risk identified in the register, it is about further delays and costs escalating risk to the funding itself for East Bank, construction interface and procurement risk. Let us not forget, you are doing only the shell and core. The rest will be done by the actual occupants or tenants, so to say. The question is: is it that you have underestimated the actual cost of the project? If that is the case or, in any case, should extra funding be required, will that be available, and where will it come from?

Sir Peter Hendy (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): The first call on tensions in terms of the return tender estimates is to review the scope with the partners, because it is their scope, largely, because it is their buildings, and see what we can do about it. I think it is too early to say where we are going to wind up. Actually, as the tenders come in, and there are 30-odd packages, I think --

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Twenty-seven.

Sir Peter Hendy (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): -- we are all over them to make sure that if the returns that we get are in excess of the budget, firstly we do some value-engineering and return to the scope to see what we can do. This is work in progress. It is too early to draw a conclusion, but Lyn and I are both spending significant amounts of our time on this. In all my experience of these projects - you will all be familiar with large-scale projects - once you have a budget and a timescale, all that can go wrong is either of them go wrong. The way in which you mitigate any effects of that is to be all over it as the thing unfolds, which is what we are doing.

Navin Shah AM: I would simply like to end with the comment that, given the substantial risks potentially involved, I am concerned about delay as well as cost escalation. I would like to be kept in touch, certainly from a regeneration perspective, because the Assembly's Regeneration Committee of which I am a member does a lot of work to do with the LLDC and similar regeneration projects.

Sir Peter Hendy (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): It is a very reasonable point. We have high-level meetings with the partners in the projects themselves, because they have risk timescales to meet, too. The London College of Fashion wants to move. The campus for UCL is enormous, and they want to get it full of students. The other artistic participants, of course, want to open their facilities and use them. You are not alone in your --

Navin Shah AM: Sorry, I am out of time. Thank you.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman): Assembly Member Bacon.

Gareth Bacon AM: Thank you, Mr Chairman. There has been a lot of good progress on the Stadium in the last year or so, and the baseball, by the way, I thought was absolutely phenomenal. I have said that to you

privately; I will say it now publicly. I thought it was a tremendous innovation, and I look forward to going again next year.

Moving away from the Stadium, I want to pick up some of the points that Assembly Member Shah has just been talking about, about the Cultural Quarter. I am going from memory, not from my briefing, but I think it was about a year ago we had quite a good private briefing with the partners in the room and Assembly Members, talking about the various different developments that are going on at the East Bank. From my memory, there were different arrangements for different buildings and different partners. Is that right? Could you refresh my memory on that, please?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes. We are responsible for the shell and core of University Arts London (UAL), the V&A, Sadler's Wells and the BBC in terms of building those buildings. As far as the fit-out is concerned, the BBC will do its own fit-out, as will the V&A. We are responsible for fit-out for Sadler's Wells Theatre and UAL. The way that the funding works, for example, for UAL is that they pay for two thirds of the cost, and we are picking up one third.

Gareth Bacon AM: That is of the fit-out?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): No. Across the whole project.

Gareth Bacon AM: That is over the whole project?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes, which is excellent, actually, because we have to work very, very closely with all of the partners, but in many ways even more so with the likes of UAL, which is putting its own funding in. The BBC is also funding its building to the tune of £40 million, and it is looking after its own fit-out, which is estimated to be in the region of £20 million.

Gareth Bacon AM: OK. The main part of my question is associated with what Assembly Member Shah was talking about, which is the risk. Cost overruns. Again, I am going back into my memory. I think there are different arrangements for different buildings, aren't there?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes.

Gareth Bacon AM: Could you remind me again what they are?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Just thinking about programme, it is also cost risk. There is general budget risk and there is programme, and if we are over programme, that will also generate a budget risk, potentially. If you are delayed in your programme and you already have some contractors on site, then you are having to pay for them to stay on site or come off site and come back again in different places.

The first thing to note is that UAL, London College of Fashion, wants to open the doors in autumn 2022, so there is a programme around that. The other buildings are more relaxed and we do not have target dates for opening those buildings. Notwithstanding that target date of 2022, that date is not in contract. If we needed to relax the programme, in partnership and in conjunction with UAL, for whatever reason, we can collaborate to do that, because we are not contracted to build it by that point in time, if it suited both parties. The other buildings are more relaxed about dates.

As far as budget is concerned, it very much hangs on how these packages come out at the end of the day. We are right in the middle of putting packages to the market right now. We will be tendering throughout the rest of this year, and we will not have a clear view on where we are landing until probably December/January time, when we also have a clear view of how all the packages have been procured and whether we are on budget for some, slightly over budget for others and so on and so forth.

Gareth Bacon AM: OK. You mentioned a budget earlier on of £470 million. Is that the total budget you have for the whole development?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): That is the budget for the buildings that we, LLDC, are responsible for building on Stratford Waterfront. It does not include the cost of the UCL buildings, which UCL is building itself, and it is on site at the moment.

Gareth Bacon AM: Yes, OK. How much of that £470 million is contingency?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): 10%.

Gareth Bacon AM: All right, so £47 million. OK. Is it too early to say how you are tracking against budget? You will know more when the tenders are --

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): It is slightly over at the moment, but things are coming in under and over budget all the time as we go through the process.

Gareth Bacon AM: You are confident, sitting here today, that that is going to be sufficient to --

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I am. I think we are around 3% over at the moment, ballpark, in terms of the budget. As I say, things are moving. To be honest, it is really difficult to say that I am confident, first because we are only partway through the packages. Some of these are very big packages that we are putting out at the moment, so they are worth quite a lot of money in the market. I cannot tell you how it feels procuring things like this in a market that is so uncertain, just where we find ourselves at the moment. Probably we are facing one of the most uncertain economic times that we have faced in 40 or 50 years. We are out there procuring at a difficult time. We are hopeful that we will bring this in as close to budget as we possibly can, but we do need to see how the market is going to respond to those packages and whether there are Brexit impacts, impacts on tariffs, impacts on the value of the pound, what supplies are coming from Europe and so on, how that is going to work in terms of moving goods around post-Brexit. It just feels very, very uncertain at the moment and very difficult to predict.

Gareth Bacon AM: I think those are all perfectly reasonable points. My final question on that subject, then, is: in the event that there is an overrun of whatever amount, will that cost be underwritten by the Greater London Authority (GLA)? Is that correct?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): It is not currently underwritten by the GLA.

Gareth Bacon AM: It will be picked up by?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): At the moment, the budget is the budget, and if there is an overrun, there will need to be a conversation about where that money comes from.

Gareth Bacon AM: With the Mayor, presumably.

Sir Peter Hendy (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): I would expect to have that discussion, if it is the case, with the individual partners too, because they are all with us in this. Part of the costs are the specification of the building. It is an iterative process. There is a lot of water to go under this bridge. All I would add, Gareth, is that Lyn is right about the general market uncertainty, but it is exacerbated by the parlous state of the construction industry, which you will know from other discussions about housing provision and other big capital projects is really not in a position to take any significant risk itself. We would like to see a much more fluid market in what we are putting out to tender than we are actually seeing.

Gareth Bacon AM: No. That is fine. Thank you very much.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman): Assembly Member Copley.

Tom Copley AM: Thank you very much, and good morning to you both. I have two sets of questions and quite a few of them, so if it is possible to have succinct answers, that would be fantastic.

Firstly, on agreements with developers, when the LLDC enters into agreements with developers – for example, leases on specific sites – are there any conditions placed on a developer in regard to services provided or levels of delivery? We have received evidence of very poor management of build quality of some of the build-to-rent properties around the Olympic Park, which I think reflects badly on the LLDC and makes the area less attractive to potential residents. Do you write anything into your contracts and are there any further steps you can take against misbehaving developers and property management companies?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): All of the homes that are built on the Park are supposed to be built to very high design standards, and that is part of the planning policy. It comes forward in the planning permission, and it is monitored as part of the build. In particular, where we hold contractual arrangements with developers – if you think about Chobham Manor and East Wick and Sweetwater – we have a team that actively looks at every stage of development in terms of what is built on the Park.

Tom Copley AM: I do not mean to interrupt you, sorry, but this is specifically about management, essentially where development has been handed over.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Sorry.

Tom Copley AM: Where the new owners or the owners of the freehold or the land or these buildings are not behaving properly towards their tenants, and where there are issues with repairs and things, is there any recourse that you have as the LLDC against these organisations?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Contractually, no. We have influence, but we tend to use the boroughs for that. Of course, our influence is fairly heavy-handed because we are the Park. We do have expectations. We have had a number of conversations with those landlords that I know you are referring to around the quality of standards and how residents are feeling about some of that management right now. We have had those conversations and continue to do so.

Tom Copley AM: Thank you. You mentioned working with the boroughs. In terms of enforcement, the LLDC does not have the powers; you work with the boroughs?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): No. We do not have enforcement powers. No.

Tom Copley AM: OK. Thank you. Do you place any restrictions on the private sale of leasehold homes, particularly in regard to high service charges and onerous ground rents?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I do not think we do, unless it is included in our contractual position. I suspect for Chobham and Sweetwater we do have that, but I am not sure that we have it for East Village. I can look into that and come back to you.

Tom Copley AM: If you could, that would be great. Thank you. Do you know if private developers - such as Taylor Wimpey at Chobham Manor - charge ground rents to leaseholders on publicly owned land, and do you think that is appropriate for public land?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I do not know. I would need to come back to you. I suspect it does.

Tom Copley AM: OK. Thank you. Do you think that is appropriate, on publicly owned land?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): What has happened here is essentially the public land has been sold on a long lease, which is tantamount to a freehold. We know there has been not great news around ground rents, and I think Taylor Wimpey was in the news on that some years ago. I think there probably are ground rents charged here, and I think that is quite normal in a long leasehold position, where the freeholder, ourselves, has taken a land receipt as part of that deal. Let me check and come back to you on what the actuality of the situation is.

Tom Copley AM: Thank you very much. I am going to move on now to another set of questions, and this is on land ownership and development. On the sites which are owned by the LLDC that are to come forward to residential development, such as Stratford Waterfront, Pudding Mill and Rick Roberts Way, what sort of agreement do you look to make with the developer? Is it a joint venture (JV) or sale of a long lease?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): The idea for those sites is that we will enter into a JV. We, alongside the GLA as our primary investor, will JV with the private sector partner. The first of those is due to come into the market fairly shortly early next year.

Tom Copley AM: That gives you more control and influence over the long term?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes. It gives you a seat at the table. It would be a 50-50 deadlock vehicle in terms of control, where we would have control over the governance and so on, pace of development, and complete transparency around the numbers.

Tom Copley AM: OK. Thank you. At Stratford Waterfront, I understand that you own all the land. Is that right?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes.

Tom Copley AM: At Pudding Mill and Rick Roberts Way, you own parts of the site?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): We own all of Pudding Mill, which has the capacity for at least 1,500 homes altogether, and we own part of Rick Roberts Way.

Tom Copley AM: Thank you. If we go right back to the very beginning of the development of the Olympic Park and the surrounding area, is the LLDC still liable for the costs of acquiring that land? Do you know?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes. Back in the day, there were a series of Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPOs) where the land was acquired for use for the games. I think this is what you are referring to.

Tom Copley AM: Yes.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): There was a cost to acquiring that land, and we carry a constant debt against that land. When we sell the land for development or return a profit through a JV, the idea is that receipt pays down the debt.

Tom Copley AM: That is the principal way of paying down your liabilities?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes.

Tom Copley AM: You might not have the figure, but do you know what that figure is for how much you still need to pay back for the value of the land?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I was looking at these yesterday, but they are projected figures into the future. I know that the projected surplus at the end of the project is currently estimated to be something in the region of £265 million surplus after paying debt down. That is in constant flux because of the valuation of sites, and it gets revisited every year, but the current long-term plan contains that number.

Tom Copley AM: OK. Thank you. I just want to talk specifically now through the example of the East Wick and Sweetwater development. There was an Assistant Director Decision which signed off the agreement with Places for People and Balfour Beatty, and that said that work would start in 2016, with the first phase complete by the end of 2017 and the whole thing done by 2023. Your annual report from 2014/15 said this was six years ahead of schedule. Your website says work is to begin in 2017, but work only began this year. We are looking at 2020 to 2021 for the first phase, and 2028 for overall completion. My question is, why has there been this slippage? Is there any likelihood that it will complete ahead of schedule at all?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I think there was a decision in 2016 to bring the scheme forward. I think that looked good on paper but clearly was not able to be delivered, and in fact we were not on site with phase 1 until 2018. There were some problems in 2017/18 with some of the viability around this scheme, so there were some slight adjustments made at our Board around the arrangements for receiving receipts. For example, although it was not hitting the bottom line in value, we changed the development agreement so that we had some deferred receipts instead of earlier receipts and so on, and that caused a delay in getting on site. We are now on site for phase 1, which, as you say, started in 2018, which will mean that we are still ahead of schedule if we manage to keep the programme going forward. Obviously the developer comes to us every phase and there is a viability test in terms of getting on site.

Tom Copley AM: Thank you. I believe the scheme required an additional loan from Homes England of £XX million. Is that right?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I do think that is the case, but it is actually confidential between the developer and Homes England, and I do not have the details of how the loan works.

Tom Copley AM: I was wondering what that was for and if it was delivering anything extra or just covering ongoing costs.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): It is just an equity loan, I think, to help them get on site and get moving.

Tom Copley AM: OK. Thank you. The thing I was trying to understand is why it seems such a battle for an MDC, which owns much of the land and is the planning authority, to achieve just 50% affordable housing, as it were, given that the land is already public. We are mostly talking about former industrial land that was derelict ten to fifteen years ago. Is it because the business model was to buy the land, develop the Park and the infrastructure, and then sell the development opportunities to private companies, who will be expecting to make their own profit from the activity?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes. The business model is that we will sell the land and take a receipt from the developer. In recent times, as you know, we have revisited that, as have many local authorities, and we realised that we ought to be keeping a stake in the land because ultimately we will have more control and we also have a greater surplus over the long term.

Tom Copley AM: I would agree with that change of approach. Do you think there is an opportunity for thinking about this more strategically for London's needs? If it were a London council, for example, they are seeing development on their land of 100% social rent, which can also generate that long-term income stream. Could the LLDC or the GLA directly build housing like that in the way that a London borough can?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): In theory, we can develop homes. We could do some of the things that the London boroughs have done, so establish housing companies, for example. I would say that they are in their infancy. The numbers that we are talking about are quite small at the moment, but the concept is good because, first, we change the value and get more affordable housing out over the longer term.

The difficulty for us does come back to the financial model. In any borrowing scenario – and we are borrowing from the GLA as the primary investor – we need to set a prudential borrowing target. We at the LLDC have a prudential borrowing target that we cannot go over. If we were to develop our own housing – and we are talking about big numbers here, so thousands of homes – we would need significantly more borrowing on the balance sheet than we have at the moment in order to cash flow the schemes over time. It is not that we have not considered that, but it is hundreds of millions of pounds more to do those developments.

Councils are making their own prudential borrowing decisions within the remit of what they do as a council. The GLA, of course, is making its decisions in a much broader field of what the GLA has to fund. Our discussions with the finance people here have been very much that they want to keep within the existing borrowing limit if they can. We have, however, managed to get to this JV model, which I think does half of the job that you are asking about but not all of the job. Actually, if we want to keep on programme and drive thousands of homes, we probably are, if we want to move at pace, better in bed with a private partner.

Tom Copley AM: OK. Thank you very much.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman): Assembly Member Bailey.

Shaun Bailey AM: Good morning to you both. I just want to ask two small, unrelated questions. Earlier on, you said that you had settled all of the legal disputes you had with West Ham. Was there any cost associated with that?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes. Quite a lot of cost, actually. During 2018 there were a couple of major things kicking around. One was an expert determination. We spoke about it last year. It had a number of items on the list. Three out of the four of those we were directed to do different things than the cases we were putting to the expert. For that reason, two thirds of the costs of that expert determination fell on to the LLDC, so we had to cover the costs of the other party, West Ham United.

The broad costs were associated with the seating capacity dispute. We settled at one o'clock on the day of the court hearing, managed to sign the documents there, but in any settlement, of course, one picks up one's own legal costs. West Ham United picked up its own legal costs and we picked up our own legal costs. The total cost expended during 2018 for both of those things is around £3.5 million.

Shaun Bailey AM: OK. They are all settled now. You can move forward. Are you disappointed with the outcomes and the cost of them?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): No. I am very pleased with the outcomes. We could have gone to court on the capacity dispute. We had good legal advice in terms of going to court, but the thing could have fallen against us. If we had have[gone to court], the costs would have been significantly more for Queen's Counsels (QCs) and so on. I think the right thing to do was settle. We did a deal with West Ham on a financial uplift in the usage fee, and I think it is a win-win situation moving forward. There are no formal legal problems on the table at the moment, which is a good place to be.

Shaun Bailey AM: OK. A slightly unrelated question. Have the Crossrail delays had any impact on the site?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Crossrail is due to come into Stratford. Has it had any? I suppose one could – and I would be totally speculating – say that there might be an impact from the fact that we do not have an extra transport line coming into Stratford, but I am not an expert on that. I do not know whether it would alleviate Stratford Station or add to the problems, actually, and it could do a bit of both. I am not really an expert on that. I do not think so at the moment.

Sir Peter Hendy (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): I doubt it. Crossrail takes over the Great Eastern suburban service to Liverpool Street, and that is running now, so there is a marginal loss in connectivity to central and west London.

Shaun Bailey AM: OK. Thank you.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman): Assembly Member Prince.

Keith Prince AM: Thank you. Lyn, you just mentioned about [the Olympic [London] stadium's] capacity, and I believe that currently the capacity is agreed around about 60,000.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes.

Keith Prince AM: Clearly, there have been a couple of - certainly one - significant developments recently in London which have now slightly larger capacities than that. Are there any plans to increase? At one point there was a discussion around 66,000 capacity, but I think there may be other capacity numbers that could be looked at as well.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes. For the capacity in the settlement that we entered into with West Ham United, the maximum capacity is stated in that agreement to be 62,500. There is room for the football club to apply for more capacity up to 62,500 if they wish to do so, and there is a formula to increase the usage fee accordingly to cover extra stewarding costs and so on.

It is possible to get to 66,000, we think, but the reason we did not put that number in the agreement is it would require, we think, a whole new planning application, a whole new study of movement around the area. I think, expedientially, we are looking at a much bigger project. We are not closed to going to that sort of number, but I think the club and ourselves would need to work closely on it and see where we could get to. 62,500 feels doable. We would still have to go through a planning exercise, but we think that that is far more doable in planning and licensing terms than going to 66,000. You see, if you go to somewhere like 66,000, it is more likely to have impact on facilities like toilets and so on, food and beverage outlets, and the transport studies, which start to rack up significant cost. We would need to be hand-in-glove in that if we wanted to take it that far, I think.

Keith Prince AM: They will probably have to wait until they get into Europe then, I suspect.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Potentially.

Keith Prince AM: Thank you.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman): Assembly Member Gavron.

Nicky Gavron AM: Thank you. I would really appreciate it if you could try to make the answer succinct because we are quite short of time. I wanted to focus on play and recreation facilities for children and young people, because one of the key promises of the Olympics was the legacy for children and young people. If I start by just trying to be clear about the numbers of children that are on the Queen Elizabeth Park in the residential development, the Local Plan review evidence base 2017 says there will be 10,000 households and 4,000 children. Is that correct? This is in the Olympic Park, in the Queen Elizabeth Park.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I think that is the aim. Let me just put a bit of detail around that.

Nicky Gavron AM: That is the aim?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes. In Chobham Manor, there is a target for 75% of homes to be family-sized homes. That is across public homes and private homes, and that will have informed that figure along with other targets for East Wick and Sweetwater, which sit at around 60% family homes.

Nicky Gavron AM: You could write to me, couldn't you, and confirm the figure, yes? The number of children.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I think the number is the right number, but what I was about to say is that those private homes on Chobham Manor are not being sold to families, so the dynamic is changing within what we are seeing happening in actual sales in the Park.

Nicky Gavron AM: There might be fewer. OK.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): It is more likely to be fewer than more. It is something we are keeping under review.

Nicky Gavron AM: OK. The past London Plans and the current London Plan say each child and young person should have an allowance of 10 square metres of outdoor space, mainly on site. Therefore, do you know how many square metres of outdoor space you have provided so far in what has been built?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): In Chobham Manor, those targets --

Nicky Gavron AM: This is including all of them, isn't it? You have built more than Chobham Manor. There are more residents --

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): We have built East Village, but that goes all the way back to the Games and the conversion of the athletes' village.

Nicky Gavron AM: We are counting East Village in this, aren't we?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Sorry?

Nicky Gavron AM: Are you not counting East Village in this?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I am focusing on Chobham because it is something that we have built since the Games, rather than focusing on East Village, but I can in the response. As far as I am aware, East Village will have met the targets that were in place through the relevant plans at the time of planning that development. Chobham certainly does meet those targets, and I think it is probably oversupplied, given the dynamic of what we are seeing in the market right at the moment. We are only at phase 2 of development.

Nicky Gavron AM: OK. That is helpful. I think I must do a site visit and look at this.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes, come and have a look.

Nicky Gavron AM: I would really like to do that. The reason I am asking these questions is because the Infrastructure Plan 2018 for the Park details all the different facilities: doorstep play, local play, neighbourhood play, youth facilities and so on. It says, "In total, there will be 14,000 square metres". If I work that backwards with 10 square metres, that is 14,000 children allowed their 10 square metres. That is, in a sense, almost side-lining children and young people, so I am concerned about that. I wondered what comment you had, because that is a year ago, that estimate.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): OK. Why don't I go and have a look at it, because I do not have the detail here, and then come back to you?

Nicky Gavron AM: Could you? What would be very good is if you could write to me about this.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes, I will.

Nicky Gavron AM: There is a lot of concern now about developments not complying with the play standards for children and young people. We have cuts in youth services. Children are being squeezed out of cities, road, etc. It really is important. I just want your comment on how much you are going to provide.

If a development has nearby play space or park or something, it is allowed that that can count for older children, but you have to get developer contributions. Are you doing that?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I do not know. I would need to go and have a look at the subject and come back to you in detail.

Nicky Gavron AM: OK. My final question is a bit to do with convergence, too. We do want Queen Elizabeth Park to be very inclusive. My question is, how many of these facilities around the Park, which are free and accessible, are integrated, are allowing children from nearby to be able to come and use them?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): All of the play facilities are totally open to the public. Of course, some of them are within the boundaries of the Park. There are no restrictions to anybody using those facilities. They are not private estates in the way that they have been built. Anyone can stroll through. The question of how much people are using them is a different question, I think, and we do have some statistics from visitor surveys that tell us how many local people are coming into the Park. Whether we have them on the likes of details for play equipment and children, I do not know.

Nicky Gavron AM: Again, that would be useful to know. Obviously you would have to make sure there are good access arrangements for local kids so that they could access these facilities.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes.

Nicky Gavron AM: Thank you.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman): Assembly Member Eshalomi.

Florence Eshalomi AM: Apologies, Chair. There is no more time.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman): OK. Assembly Member Whittle.

Peter Whittle AM: Thank you, Deputy Chairman. Lyn, could I ask you a few questions about the Cultural Quarter, carrying on from Assembly Member Shah and Assembly Member Bacon? You mentioned earlier the BBC, Sadler's Wells, the V&A. Is that all set in stone now? Is that the final count, as it were?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes, it is. Yes.

Peter Whittle AM: Have you not managed to attract maybe a theatre?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Sadler's Wells is a theatre.

Peter Whittle AM: I know, but it is a ballet and opera theatre.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): That is right. We do not have a theatre. The only theatre space we will have is that contained within the Sadler's Wells development, which is a 500-seat auditorium. Of course, Sadler's, you are right, is contemporary dance.

Peter Whittle AM: It is contemporary dance. The thing is, we have recently had a very good theatre here, for example, the Bridge Theatre, and there is one over at Battersea now with that new development.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes. There are, of course, some really good theatres already in Stratford. We have the Yard over at Hackney Wick, which is a fabulous place, which we support, and they are partnering with the East Bank partners. We also have the theatre in Stratford itself, the Stratford Theatre, which is doing tremendously well at the moment. We are not building a new theatre, but we are working in partnership with the local community theatres.

Peter Whittle AM: That is good to hear. When it comes to Sadler's Wells and V&A and what-have-you, I know this is maybe a little premature, but how will you ensure that these facilities and these places are used and known about by local communities? How are you going to do that? It is terribly important.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): It is a real conundrum and a hard problem, and probably one of the most important things to make sure we get right. Not only is it relevant to people from east London, but everybody in east London, and how we get really expansive interest in those facilities. What we have done - and this has been going on for a number of years before I got here - is these partners have been on board for some years, except the BBC, which only really came to the table last year, and they have already got a number of school programmes in place. During the year, if you take Sadler's Wells, for example, they have added curriculum activity to local schools, and they added a further nine schools this year from east London, primary schools mostly, into their dance cohort. They go into schools and run performing opportunities, drama opportunities and so on as part of introducing those children to what is going to come in the fullness of time.

There are a number of other things going on. The other partners, London College of Fashion and V&A, are also very much involved in the local community, not so much in the school curriculum programme, but running events in the community around art and design. This year, for example, we ran a large summer school activity that we also ran last year. 179 kids came last year and 353 this year. We are wanting to step that up year-on-year so that young people and children can see the opportunities that are coming in those buildings.

There are also a number of apprenticeship opportunities. We have something called Step, which is local people being able to have an apprenticeship opportunity through more than one organisation on the Park. You might be almost on an internship for a year and have four months with Sadler's Wells, and four months with a technology company in Here East, and four months with a V&A design person and so on. The reason we are doing that is to try to get young people to think about the opportunities for careers, and we are focusing on local schools and local young people there so we can get them to think that actually this is for them. The real challenge will be stepping up that work in the next few years before the buildings open their doors.

Sir Peter Hendy (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): One of the reasons that I said at the start that we would be very pleased if the Assembly would see the East Bank partners is not only so they can describe what they are going to do when their buildings open, but so they can describe what they are

doing now as a preliminary to it. We are really very pleased, actually. It is not centrally determined, but on a number of occasions we have been really surprised to learn that their reach into the local community has been wider than we imagined it would be, because they are independent organisations and they are just getting on with it. They are on the Park already, they are dealing with local people already, and we think that is quite a good position to be in well before these buildings are built. We would like you to hear directly from them, and the presentations of those educational and cultural bodies are very impressive. Each of them can talk about what they are doing with local people now.

Peter Whittle AM: There is a new arts centre going up in Woolwich, in the development there, Royal Arsenal. You could maybe make some links there. It is a big thing.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes.

Peter Whittle AM: Just one more question. It might be fanciful at this stage, but particularly, maybe in the Cultural Quarter, is there the capacity – or maybe not anymore – for what you would call a community centre, for the public to use in the way that local authorities used to provide when they had the money? I do not mean to go off topic too much. We live in a terrible time of violent crime, etc. We need things like youth clubs. We need public facilities. I would have thought there is a wonderful opportunity for you to --

Sir Peter Hendy (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): I think what is going on there is what you are describing by another name. The intention of all of our partners is to work in the community and have a community in their buildings. There is also a big public space in front of the buildings, because it is on the waterfront and they are adjacent to each other, and the intention is that that is available for the local community and for the wider population of east London and London as a whole to regard as their own. There is not space for yet another building, but the whole thing is a space in which people can immerse themselves and the community can get engaged.

Our challenge is to make sure that that place is accessible by the whole community and it is not felt by the local community as having been brought in by a spaceship. I do not think it is a question of providing another building, which we could not do, but your question is right about making sure that the community is fully engaged in what is going on and feels part of it.

Peter Whittle AM: That is reassuring. The only caveat I would make to that is it is a shame there is not space for another building. Having a big space like that in front of the buildings is lovely in the summer, but what about the winter months? What about old people who cannot necessarily sit out? Does this actually mean that they are going to be having to pay for coffee or something to sit somewhere? Is that how it will work out?

Sir Peter Hendy (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): No. There are public spaces in each of the buildings.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes. All the buildings are free to enter, publicly accessible, so people can go in and wander around and so on. That has been part of our lease terms, essentially, to make sure they are free to enter. There are a number of community facilities on the Park. In each of the housing developments there will be dedicated community facilities. We have the Community Track, which sits next to Bobby Moore Academy just behind the Stadium. It is an enormous community track that the athletes used before the Games in terms of warm-up and so on. It is well used by community groups every evening when the school is not using it. It is one of these dual-use places, and it has a facility for changing and so on.

We also have a significant space in the Copper Box Arena. The Copper Box Arena can take up to 6,000 people in terms of an event, between 6,000 and 8,000 actually, depending on the event. It is used regularly most evenings for sports clubs, whether it be netball, baseball, basketball, for local clubs to come in and use that facility. There are targets around Greenwich Leisure to make sure that that accommodation is available for the local community, although at the weekends we tend to use it for event space so that we can drive revenue. During the week, it is very well used by the community, largely local sports groups using that space.

We do have community facilities on the Park, generally --, the Community Track and the Copper Box Arena, but we do not have any specific community buildings in the East Bank development.

Peter Whittle AM: OK. Perhaps a little bit of a missed opportunity there, I think. It is reassuring to hear what you say, but the thing is that these things increasingly require money from people. Things should be public. You should be able to gather publicly without having to pay for something.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman): All right. Thank you, Assembly Member Whittle. Assembly Member Boff.

Andrew Boff AM: How much is the public subsidy for the Stadium?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): In 2018, the latest year for which we have just published accounts, the operating losses of the Stadium were just over £18 million, and the total losses, I believe, were £28 million.

Andrew Boff AM: Total losses? What is the difference between the losses for the Stadium and the total losses?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): When we think about operating losses, there have been many conversations here before now about how well we operate events, what usage fees we pull in from the various tenants and so on, so we have an operating loss in terms of an operating business. Then, when we add on other life cycle costs, business rates, insurances and so on, the larger number reflects the costs of running the venue on a day-to-day basis.

Andrew Boff AM: OK. Thank you. That £28 million is the number that you are hoping to reduce by £7 million. Is that correct?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I am hoping to reduce the operating loss.

Andrew Boff AM: The operating loss, £18 million? You are hoping to reduce that by £7 million?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes. The smaller number by £7 million, yes.

Andrew Boff AM: OK. How much does it cost to move the seats to and from football mode?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): In 2018, it cost just over £4 million. In 2019, it will cost just over £6 million. That is because we have had to move more seats to facilitate MLB.

Andrew Boff AM: That figure of £4 million, is that per move or for the whole year?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): In total.

Andrew Boff AM: In total it is £4 million, and so --

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Per annum, yes.

Andrew Boff AM: Per annum. Then, in 2019, it is going to be £6 million because you will be moving them more?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes. The difference is that, for baseball, we will be moving one of the stands, the west stand, completely back. When we started with the Stadium, I think we were talking about in terms of £11 million. The negotiation with various parties and new innovations around the seats got us down to £4 million, including with athletics. We now do not move the stands as much as for athletics. We just take some seats off the front, rather than moving the whole thing back. Then, with baseball, we do have to move one of the stands completely back to get the overlay in, so we are back up to £6 million.

Andrew Boff AM: Back up to £6 million, for the entire year?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes.

Andrew Boff AM: About how much per move?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): It depends what we are transitioning to and from. What we would generally do is, as soon as football is finished, we go in and transition all the seats for the entire season.

Andrew Boff AM: That is the cost I am looking for. The maximum move of seats. How much does that cost in one go?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): We take everything out at the beginning and put it back at the end, so it would be half of the figure.

Andrew Boff AM: The seats are going to get moved substantially twice a year. Is that correct?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Out and in.

Andrew Boff AM: Out and in?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes.

Andrew Boff AM: Twice a year?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes.

Andrew Boff AM: That is it?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes.

Andrew Boff AM: OK. Thank you very much for that. I will switch to housing, if I can. How many properties are there in the housing pipeline? How many homes are in the housing pipeline? Total number.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Altogether, the targets for 2030 are 33,000 homes within the MDC area. Of those, 10,200 will have been completed by the end of this year, 2019, and therefore just over 20,000 still to be delivered.

Andrew Boff AM: Almost 23,000. Of those, what percentage are family-sized homes?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Our policy is to have quite high percentages of family-sized homes. If I talk to you about what has planning permission and what is on site, that is the easiest way to do that.

Andrew Boff AM: Your policy is 51%, isn't it, or more than two bedrooms? Is that correct?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): For the developments on the Park that are on our land, that have planning permission, family-sized homes in one development, Chobham Manor, which has a total of 870 homes, are 75%. A family-sized home is --

Andrew Boff AM: That was after a lot of lobbying that that got to that position, may I say, by this Assembly. Yes, anyway.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): 75% across all tenures, and a family-sized home, it is important to say, is defined as three bedrooms or more, not two. In East Wick and Sweetwater, which in total is seven phases of 1,500 homes, the total expectation is between 50% and 60% family-sized homes, i.e. three beds or more. In Stratford Waterfront, which has planning permission - this is the residential development taking place next to the East Bank buildings - that is 600 homes. For this one, the statistic I have is that 51% are two-bed or more in that particular development, which is more of a town centre site. They are the homes for which we have had ultimate control because they are on our land and have planning permission.

Where we have outline planning permission, because we have not yet brought reserve matters forward, so detailed planning to the Planning Committee, we will not have tied down the actual physicality of the bedrooms, but our policy is to have more than 50% over three beds across the entire Park.

Andrew Boff AM: That sounds good, may I say, 'ish'. Perhaps you could write to me with a breakdown of those.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes.

Andrew Boff AM: You rather spectacularly failed the housing delivery test that the Government published in February. Isn't it time to start considering allocating more land to housing?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Can I ask you what you are referring to, please, Andrew?

Andrew Boff AM: The housing delivery test that you actually published a report about a little while ago. You published a report in August which responded to the Government's test.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Are you thinking about, for example, numbers of completions per annum of homes and so on?

Andrew Boff AM: That is correct. The Government now regularly tests all planning --

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): To see how they are getting on, yes.

Andrew Boff AM: To see how they are getting on. You fail if you do not get 95% of what they assess you should be delivering, and you only got about, from memory, 53% of what you should be delivering. Therefore, quite rightly, this Assembly is asking you questions about that, and one of the suggestions is that you need to increase the amount of land you have allocated to housing. I wanted to know whether or not you have considered that.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): If I deal with the first point first, we have an annual target for delivery of homes. That target is 14,071. If we were to go back to 2014 and measure from 2014 to 2019 whether we have achieved that target, we have achieved it, and we have achieved it to the tune of 116%.

What happens, obviously, with building homes, is they do not all get built in one year. It is cyclical. You build fewer some years and more in other years. If we look at the whole table, we can see that we have performed quite well. We were hearing earlier about how East Wick and Sweetwater has come on site a couple of years before it was targeted to do so. In those numbers I am counting the conversion of East Village, which was 50% private and 50% affordable, so I do need to make that clear. We are not behind target in terms of getting on site with our developments. We are slightly ahead of target.

In terms of whether we might allocate more land for housing, in total we have built 10,200 homes against that target of 33,000. I think we are on target with those numbers.

Andrew Boff AM: The Government does not think you are on target.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I am not sure what years it is measuring and what targets it is looking at, but I would be happy to write to you along those lines.

Andrew Boff AM: Yes. You have published a report in response to what the Government has said, and it is a report that largely says, "The Government is wrong and we are doing wonderfully". I just wanted to know whether or not you had considered allocating more land to development in order to meet those deliveries. May I say, the housing delivery test is not very difficult to pass, bearing in mind a lot of local authorities got well over 100% in terms of their marks. It is not as though it is an onerous test. It is a very easy test to pass, and yet the LLDC is down in the very lowest regions of housing delivery organisations. I just do not understand why.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): The Government and the GLA set annual targets. They set them for local planning authorities and local housing authorities. Our plan for building housing is in line with its original targets to build those homes. You could say we are using the Olympic Village to bring us across those targets if we look over a period of time. We do not consider that we

are out of sync, but I think I would need to – I feel at a bit of a disadvantage – see the original question from the Homes and Communities Agency or Homes England and give you the response.

Andrew Boff AM: Forgive me. I am talking about a report you published last month. You published, not somebody else. Still, please write to me and respond. Thank you very much.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman): Assembly Member Prince.

Keith Prince AM: Thank you. Just going back to the MLB, you said that you washed your face with that one. It made a slight profit, I believe you said.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes.

Keith Prince AM: Does that take into account the extra cost which, from what you have said, is around £2 million? Does it take that into account?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): The seat moves?

Keith Prince AM: Yes.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes.

Keith Prince AM: The profit --

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): It still makes a surplus after the seat moves, yes.

Keith Prince AM: OK. Thank you.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): Thank you. Thank you, Deputy Chairman. Just to note your responses to all requests from Members will be headed to the Assembly's Directorate and then will be redirected to the appropriate Members so that our audit and our files are complete.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): I am going to call upon Assembly Member Bailey to put the third and final question.

Shaun Bailey AM: Do I have to say the question?

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): Yes, just so quickly. Do you want me to say it for you?

Shaun Bailey AM: Please do.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): What do you see as the key challenges for the LLDC over the coming years?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I think we are doing well. I think LLDC is doing well in securing the Olympic and Paralympic legacy. Nevertheless, there is a need I think to maintain the pace of growth in what we are facing in some quite uncertain times. That will be a key challenge going forward.

We are pushing forward with East Bank and the housing sites we have mentioned earlier about difficulties in the construction world and that uncertainty. I have no doubt there will be viability questions going forward as well. We have all seen the flatlining of the housing market in recent times. We would hope for an uplift in that in the future. Nevertheless, we have made estimates of house price inflation in our long-term budgets that we may need to revisit over time, depending on how the market performs.

Fundamentally, the legacy and our vision is about changing the lives of east Londoners. We talked earlier about the importance of making sure that for things like East Bank and housing, local people are really feeling the advantage of that. That is another key challenge and a really difficult one to make sure that all sorts of local people get proper engagement into arts, culture and education facilities that are coming on the Park, and that they feel it is something for them. That includes skills, training and job opportunities as they come forward.

The Stadium remains a key challenge. We have spoken extensively about the size of the deficit that we are dealing with. There is a lot of work to do to bring that down in terms of taxpayers' subsidy.

Lastly, I talk about the transition planning that we have also touched on. We need to secure this legacy: a really high-quality park and venues. We want to maintain a single estate that all of the boroughs can get behind as our borough partners, return the planning powers and make sure that we keep inward investment at the top of the agenda. That means that over the next couple of years we have to work really closely with the boroughs in bringing forward a strategy we can all buy into. We hope to have a strategy for transition signed off early in 2020. We are due to take a paper to our Board in January, where we are hoping to get the boroughs to sign up to the date of the transition of the development corporation. We have made good progress there, but there is still lots to do.

Sir Peter Hendy (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): I would just add that I think an additional challenge is to do all of that in a time-limited organisation. Lyn and her senior team and the rest of the team at the LLDC are very, very motivated, and it will be a challenge to keep them motivated in jobs which clearly have a finite timescale. I am very mindful of it, personally, because I think a lot of the progress that we have been able to describe to you in the last two years is because Lyn and her senior team are fully engaged, and I would like to keep them fully engaged even though the organisation does not have a long-term future.

Shaun Bailey AM: When you talk about the challenges going forward and you talk particularly about the handover, you seem to have a team that is looking at that.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes.

Shaun Bailey AM: I think one of the biggest challenges was mentioned earlier about convergence. Do you have a work team looking at that? In your own comments, you have just said one of the biggest challenges is making sure that local people reap the benefit of what is going on. Is that a separate workstream?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes. We have a lot of work in terms of monitoring. We can tell you the numbers of people engaging and the impact we are having in that regard: the proportion of local people who work in our venues, the proportion of local people who visit the Park. We have that kind of a database.

What we do not have is: what impact is this regenerative project having on, say, a set of key performance indicators out in the boroughs that are measured in terms of people's life chances? We do not own those

indicators, and they were owned by the boroughs. What is really positive now, though, is that the four boroughs that are our neighbours have started coming together to think about whether they do want to reinstate some impact statistics around that area. It is difficult, but it was never really owned by us. It was owned by the boroughs. The impetus for measuring that has fallen off somewhat in recent years. But I agree. It is important, I think, that we are able to say what the impact has been beyond a list of numbers, actually. If we cannot show movement in those key statistics – whether they are educational outputs, job outputs and so on and changes in people's lives – it is very hard to really focus on the difference that has been made. In our organisation, we are always a supporter of convergence, but it was never really owned by us as a piece of work.

Shaun Bailey AM: I see what you are saying, but it needs to be more than just the statistics, doesn't it? If a thing is working or not, you need to know now so you can make the change. As Sir Peter [Hendy] said, you are time-limited, so you will run out of time to deliver what for many local people is the most important part of this, a life change. I am just trying to tease that out. Are there a set of people within a borough, within your own team, that you are encouraging to look at what has worked and what you can change in view of the fact that you are going to end sometime soon?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): We have started a piece of work outside of the boroughs, although they are aware of it, to look at social impact locally. We have the advantage of having very close relationships with UCL. We are looking at the minute at establishing a discrete set of indicators in and around the Olympic Park area that might show us about subtle changes in people's circumstances and so on, but it is a very early piece of work in social impact and it will be academically held. It will be a good quality piece of work but it is taking a while to develop that, and it is early days, to be honest with you.

Shaun Bailey AM: OK. Thank you.

Sir Peter Hendy (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): You are right, because one of my concerns is that, in the run-up to transition, we do not take our foot off the pedal in doing this, that we hand over to the boroughs at the end of the life of the organisation a running rate of change which is credible, and that somehow, in running down the organisation, we do not let up that. That is why I am so pleased that the partners in East Bank are taking such interest in bringing what they do into the local community now, because that is one of the additional features which the LLDC is bringing on which will be a permanent legacy.

Shaun Bailey AM: Thank you for that. I also agree. What effect is the deficit that the Stadium runs at going to have on transition?

Sir Peter Hendy (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): It is a really good question. One of the reasons that we have to work so hard to put the Stadium on the best possible footing is because there is a view, or there has been a view, certainly, from a long way away, that somehow this is a priceless set of assets which needs to be carved up between people willing to take them. The truth is that there are some wonderful assets in the Park, but clearly a stadium with a continuing deficit is not one of them. I think our job is to reduce it to the lowest feasible level so that, as we move to transition, whatever goes into transition is in the best possible place.

Lyn has taken on a workstream to look at the venues in the Park as a whole to see that we are marketing them as a whole, but when we talk about a transition with the boroughs and other interested parties, it is about the whole thing. It is about how the Park looks. It is about what is in it and what it is doing for the community. There are liabilities, because the Stadium is one of them, in financial terms. The other is that the upkeep of the Park – if it is going to remain in the long term a place where people are proud to live, where people want to

visit and where the quality of the employment and education is to a high standard – is quite a considerable cost burden. We need to make sure that, as we hand it over, everybody takes it in whatever form it comes, understands what the costs are, and is in a position to shoulder that burden for the future. It is quite a big undertaking and it is not just deciding where everything goes. That is really the point, and the Stadium is one of these principal things.

Shaun Bailey AM: I take your point. Of course, if you are a local authority who is expecting to take on the Stadium, if it is a huge liability, of course they will not do it.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes. Ultimately, the assets, the venues and the Stadium and the Park are in the freehold ownership of the Mayor of London.

Shaun Bailey AM: We will be left with the bill for that?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): The aim here is to bring down the public subsidy to the lowest possible amount. That is part of our job, and that is part of the commercialisation of those venues. It is perfectly possible, in my view, to make a big difference to the current numbers. There is still a lot of work that can be done.

As far as the Park is concerned, there is something called a fixed estate charge. All of the occupiers of the Park, be they businesses or residences, not in affordable housing but private residences, pay something called a fixed estate charge. That helps with keeping the standards of the Park where they are now. When we model the fixed estate charge over the long term, that is looking quite robust in terms of the current costs for the upkeep of the Park. We are reasonably confident that the upkeep of the Park as a single estate can be maintained by the businesses and the residents who are part of that Park. I think it is the venues where we need to really focus our efforts, and your question is key around the Stadium in particular and its long-term future.

At the moment, we control the operating company. We do not have a medium-term vision on where we are going with the operation of the Stadium, but that will be a crucial decision to be made pretty soon because the Mayor of London and the city of London, the GLA, are not really an organisation that runs venues hands-on themselves. In the next year or so, probably sooner than that, we need a strategy for what is happening with these venues: who is going to run them, where the contracts will sit, and how arm's length they would be from any Mayor of London? I do not think that they are likely to return to the boroughs. This is why, in layers, there is quite a lot of complexity in the transition that is not just about the planning powers. What we would like to do is, at the end of the development corporation, have a strategy that covers the whole thing, where we can all see what is going on with the finances and who is picking up what, and in what measure and so on.

Shaun Bailey AM: OK. Thank you, Chair.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): Assembly Member Boff.

Andrew Boff AM: How much would it cost to demolish the Stadium?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I haven't a clue.

Andrew Boff AM: Why not?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I have never thought about demolishing it.

Andrew Boff AM: That is not one of the options you are considering, and replacing it with something that is actually fit for purpose?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): We are not currently considering that. I am sure per square metre there is a demolition cost that could be applied to the building, but I do not know what it is.

Andrew Boff AM: Sure. Is that building fit for purpose?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): I think as a multi-use venue it is fit for purpose. It works very successfully.

Andrew Boff AM: For £28 million a year, and that is fit for purpose?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Pardon? The losses?

Andrew Boff AM: £28 million a year. Do you think that is fit for purpose?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): My view is that we need to reduce the subsidy as far as possible, and then decide what we want to do with this venue and whether we want to keep it in public ownership or not. First of all, we ought to try our best to reduce the subsidy so that we are getting some kind of economic return from the Stadium, which we inevitably do from the hundreds of thousands of people that come there.

Andrew Boff AM: You told us just earlier that you wanted to reduce the costs by £7 million. That would take it down to --

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): About £10 million operating costs.

Andrew Boff AM: About £10 million. Is that fit for purpose?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Yes.

Andrew Boff AM: £10 million is fit for purpose? Public loss?

Sir Peter Hendy (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): Part of the consideration of that is what the wider economic benefit of doing things in the Stadium actually is in terms of the wealth it brings to the locality in London and also what it brings to the community. We have not really talked about it here, but West Ham has done a very good community engagement programme.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): The foundation, yes.

Sir Peter Hendy (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): The foundation, which is very good. We are able to quantify the benefits that things like MLB and other major events bring. You cannot just

consider the cost of running it on its own. If somebody wants to take a decision in the end that they do not want such a thing, they can do that, but it --

Andrew Boff AM: All I am asking is whether or not you have in mind a cost for how much it would cost, because, frankly, don't you think it would be much better to spend £28 million on things like encouraging sport at a local level in London? That would be an incredible contribution and serve the legacy of the Olympics better than it currently does.

Sir Peter Hendy (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): So it might be, but in terms of the cost of running the Stadium, one aspect of what we are doing is to attempt to reduce it to its lowest possible level. You do have to put that - at the end of doing that, whatever we wind up with - against the benefits of the events that you have in it, otherwise you have not done a proper equation, have you?

Andrew Boff AM: Have you considered removing the running track?

Sir Peter Hendy (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): No, because we have an obligation with the athletics to --

Andrew Boff AM: There were all sorts of obligations made during the Olympics which, frankly, we did not stick to. Why should this be any different?

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): We have not considered either removing West Ham or the athletics track or demolishing the building. We have a 97-year contract to run with West Ham with no break clauses and a 50-year contract still to run with UK Athletics.

Andrew Boff AM: OK, so 97 years of it being a drain on the public purse. Thank you very much. Thank you very much indeed.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): That is the situation.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair): Any other questions? Everybody is out of time, so thank you, Members. Thank you to Sir Peter and thank you to you, Ms Garner, for your detailed account of the work and policies of the LLDC. We will meet again, I am sure.

Lyn Garner (Chief Executive, London Legacy Development Corporation): Thank you very much.

Sir Peter Hendy (Chair, London Legacy Development Corporation): Thank you.

**Written Answers to Questions Not Answered at the Plenary Meeting on
5 September 2019****SEND inclusion at the LLDC****Question No: 2019/17040**[Jennette Arnold](#)

Your Ten Year Plan and Five Year Strategy both contain policies to improve inclusion for Londoners with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND). How is this work progressing, including but not limited to your physical accessibility programme?

Response

LLDC is committed to ensuring Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park is an example of the best principles of accessibility and inclusive design. All LLDC venues are fully inclusive and the Park and public realm has set a new standard on inclusive design. The Park Mobility Service has helped transport 23,151 people with access needs around the Park, and 65 sighted guides have been trained. In addition, there is a nominated SEND representative on the LLDC Board and Youth Board to ensure these needs are taken into account at a strategic and operational level.

Motivate East, a five-year programme aimed at delivering the Paralympic legacy, engaged 16,662 participants, provided a range of accessible or adapted specialist equipment to local centres, trained 160 inclusive sports volunteers with 33 per cent of the activities led/co-led by people with a disability or long-term health condition.

LLDC runs a free weekly community sports programme which is designed to be accessible to all. In addition, Active East – a month long free festival of sport held in July 2019 with over 6,000 participants – provided 25 per cent dedicated all ability sessions to ensure SEND requirements were met. All other sessions were designed and delivered to be inclusive and adapted to participant needs.

Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park's volunteering programme to develop Park Champions is also fully inclusive and provides support for those that have additional requirements. 149 Park Champions have disclosed a special education need or disability and 24 of these to date have obtained Level 3 accredited training in Customer Service through a programme delivered in partnership with voluntary sector organisation The Tower Project designed to train and support those with special education needs and disabilities.

Diversity at the LLDC

Question No: 2019/17041

Jennette Arnold

You have set targets for a diverse LLDC workforce, including BAME people, women and people with disabilities. How did you determine these targets and what progress has been made towards achieving them?

Response

As set out in its Diversity & Inclusion Statement, LLDC is committed to building an equitable, diverse and inclusive workforce. This statement was devised by the LLDC Diversity and Inclusion Group which works to ensure the development and delivery of LLDC's Diversity and Inclusion agenda and is accountable to the LLDC Board, via the Executive Management Team.

The policies and strategies implemented by LLDC continue to ensure the workforce is representative of the local community and the focus of LLDC's future efforts will be to maximise the considerable opportunities that Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park offers in the areas of education, cultural activity, employment and entrepreneurship.

LLDC continues to work towards increasing representation in all areas and the below table shows progress in achieving this over the last three years.

Disability		
	% Disabled	
2016/17	2	
2017/18	4	
2018/19	7	
Ethnicity		
	% BAME	% Non-BAME
2016/17	17	79
2017/18	18	78
2018/19	25	75
Gender		
	% Male	% Female
2016/17	39.7	60.3
2017/18	39	61
2018/19	40	60

Support for schools

Question No: 2019/17042

Jennette Arnold

How are you ensuring that your work with local schools benefits the most vulnerable children, including those with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND)?

Response

LLDC's school engagement programme involves targeted work with schools which look after vulnerable children, including those with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND). There have been over 7,000 downloads over the last academic year of Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park learning resources, which have been developed with teachers to be inclusive and adaptable so they can be appropriately tailored for all needs including those of SEND students. In addition, focused relationship building is being undertaken with two specialist SEND schools – Stormont House and Ickburgh School. This includes, for example, working with them to ensure they can participate in curriculum challenges.

The 2019 East Education Summer School, delivered with LLDC's East Bank partner organisations and other local partners, welcomed 353 local young people on a programme of courses across two weeks. The summer school was specifically designed with holiday hunger and broader participant reach in mind. Targeted outreach was undertaken through schools, youth groups and youth workers to ensure the opportunity reached vulnerable children, all course places were free and free healthy meals were provided.

Gender pay audit

Question No: 2019/17043 [Leonie Cooper](#)

How are you working to eradicate the gender pay gap at the LLDC?

Response

Please see response to Question No: 2019/17044

BAME pay audit**Question No: 2019/17044**[Leonie Cooper](#)

How are you working to eradicate the ethnicity pay gap at the LLDC?

Response

LLDC has a detailed Diversity and Inclusion Action plan, updated annually, which ensures LLDC focuses its work to eradicate the gender and ethnicity pay gaps.

On a strategic level, an LLDC Board Sponsor for Diversity & Inclusion has been created, a Diversity & Inclusion steering group has been established, and all managerial and executive staff have clear objectives around Diversity & Inclusion which are monitored throughout the year.

Recruitment processes have been updated to engage a wider diversity of applicants, a 'blind application' process has been introduced and equality monitoring is undertaken.

For existing staff, LLDC participates in and champions the Our Time sponsorship programme as part of the GLA family, and has launched a series of Inspirational Female Leaders events. LLDC has also introduced an Agile Working approach and continues to promote Flexible Working, with over 40 per cent of the workforce operating with a formal flexible pattern.

Employment at the LLDC**Question No: 2019/17045**

Leonie Cooper

How many local people are employed at the LLDC? Can you break this down by borough and year since 2012?

Response

Year	Total Local	Newham	Hackney	Tower Hamlets	Waltham Forest
2012	25	5	6	5	9
2013	41	13	13	4	11
2014	38	10	13	4	11
2015	38	10	10	5	13
2016	49	15	8	8	18
2017	48	18	9	10	11
2018	53	19	9	14	11
2019 (to August)	44	19	8	7	10

Please note that LLDC has had approximately 130-150 people working in the organisation in each year from 2012 to the present day.

Tourism at the LLDC**Question No: 2019/17046**[Leonie Cooper](#)

How are you promoting the LLDC to encourage domestic and international visitors to the LLDC?

Response

LLDC undertakes dedicated marketing campaigns to promote Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park to local residents, and domestic and international visitors throughout the year. These include out of home advertising (for example, on tube, rail and bus networks), print and radio advertising, PR campaigns, and targeted ads across digital channels. In addition, LLDC encourages visitors to the Park through a range of ongoing activity, such as through social media channels, the Park website, a monthly e-newsletter, media coverage and journalist/blogger visits and a range of materials such as What's On event leaflets. LLDC also works with partners and venue operators on and around the Park to promote the Park and its venues via their marketing and communications channels.

London Living Wage at the LLDC (1)**Question No: 2019/17047**[Leonie Cooper](#)

What steps are you taking to encourage employers within the LLDC area to pay their employees the London Living Wage?

Response

LLDC takes a number of steps to encourage employers within the LLDC area to pay their employees the London Living Wage (LLW). This includes the promotion of the LLW through s106s for all developments within the red line boundary of the Mayoral Development Corporation area. In addition, LLDC sets standards by including the LLW in leases.

Within the LLDC organisation, payment of the LLW is mandated to LLDC's workforce and the directly employed workforce of tier 1 employers at Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park. All LLDC venues on the Park, including the London Stadium, are LLW employers.

At the end of 2018, this commitment was extended, underpinned by the new GLA group-wide license, to achieving a standard whereby for all new contracts that the LLDC lets, the London Living Wage is paid to all workers, including those in the supply chain.

London Living Wage at the LLDC (2)**Question No: 2019/17048**[Leonie Cooper](#)

What percentage of employers within the LLDC area pay their employees the London Living Wage?

Response

LLDC doesn't hold this information. However, through its annual audit, LLDC can confirm that all of its tier 1 employers pay their directly employed workers the London Living Wage.

Through its work on Responsible Procurement, the LLDC is working closely with its sister functional bodies in the GLA family to ensure compliance with the requirements of the new GLA group-wide licence which includes mandating the payment of the LLW throughout the supply chain for all new contracts.

Started Homes by tenure and size**Question No: 2019/17049**[Tom Copley](#)

Could you provide a breakdown of all homes started to date across the LLDC by tenure (private, shared ownership, London Living Rent, London Affordable Rent, social rent, etc) and number of bedrooms? Please separate London Living Rent from other intermediate products.

Response

Please see answer to Question No: 2019/17050

Planned homes by tenure and size

Question No: 2019/17050

[Tom Copley](#)

Could you provide a breakdown of all homes planned but not started across the LLDC by tenure (private, shared ownership, London Living Rent, London Affordable Rent, social rent, etc) and number of bedrooms?

Response

London Legacy Development Corporation monitors housing delivery on the basis of tenure and housing size mix. The definition of 'intermediate' includes a number of different products including shared ownership, shared equity and discounted market rent. London Living Rent was introduced as a new intermediate tenure by the Mayor of London in 2017 therefore monitoring information is only able to provide this information for 2017 onwards.

It should be noted that the table below includes all schemes with residential, including non-self-contained accommodation and therefore includes schemes where affordable housing is not required (ie schemes of 10 units or more).

	Market	Social Rent/Affordable rent	Intermediate (all)	TOTAL	Of which	
					London Living Rent (Intermediate)	Social Rent (S/AR)
Started/completed	11279	1563	979	13821	6	864
Not started	6469	1421	1096	8986	93	595
	17748	2984	2075	22807	99	1459

The table below includes schemes permitted by Prior Approval where the bedroom sizes are not necessarily known (and have been entered as 1 beds).

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed plus	Total
Started/completed	5760	4780	3282	13821
Not started	2891	2916	3178	8986
	8651	7696	6460	22807

Future housebuilding

Question No: 2019/17051

Tom Copley

Could you provide an estimate of the number of new homes that have not yet been started or planned but are anticipated to be built in the coming years across the LLDC?

Response

A majority of the housing delivery within the area over the course of the Local Plan period to 2036 already has some form of planning permission. In total, LLDC anticipates 33,000 homes to be built by 2036, and by the end of this year it is expected 10,200 homes will already have been completed.

The following table breaks down the anticipated delivery by source: site allocations where there are currently no extant permissions; planning permissions; and additional capacity assumed for the area as a whole. It shows that 11,782 homes are anticipated from schemes without planning permission at present.

Source	2018/19 and 2019/20	2020/21- 2024/25	2025/26- 2029/30	2030/31- 2034/35	2035/36	Total
Site allocations	0	1611	2441	2061	890	7003
Permissions	3330	8044	3428	1495	0	16297
Additional capacity	0	1279	1859	1264	377	4779
ALL	3330	10934	7728	4820	1267	28079

Shared Ownership in LLDC**Question No: 2019/17052**

Tom Copley

Could you provide the average sale price, average share purchased, and average household income for Shared Ownership properties in the LLDC in each of the last five years?

Response

	2017/18	2016/17	2015/16	2014/15	2013/14
Total number of homes*	49	95	196	331	44
<i>Total number of shared ownership</i>	<i>48</i>	<i>94</i>	<i>194</i>	<i>331</i>	<i>42</i>
<i>Total number of Older Person's Shared Ownership</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>
Median value of full property	£425,000	£355,000	£365,000	£385,000	£239,125
Median equity share	35	40	40	40	37.5
Median household income**	£50,000	£45,000	£46,000	£46,000	£36,193

*The total homes include both shared ownership and Older Person's Shared Ownership within the following postcodes: E15, E20, E3, and E9.

**Due to incomplete data, the median household income is based on slightly fewer properties than the number analysed for value and equity share (40 in 2017/18; 89 in 2016/17; 192 in 2015/16; 317 in 2014/15; and 40 in 2013/14)

Short term lettings in LLDC**Question No: 2019/17053**[Tom Copley](#)

Do you have an estimate of how many properties within the LLDC are being let on shortterm lettings platforms such as Airbnb?

Response

According to the analytical firm, Airna Market Minder, across London there are c.72,000 active short-term rentals advertised through AirBnB and HomeAway. Within the LLDC area there are c.30 active rentals through AirBnB and HomeAway, the majority of which are a room within a flat. The likely reasons for relatively few short term lets within LLDC's area is three fold:

- 1) the majority of short-term lets across London are in central London
- 2) LLDC has a very high portion of institutionally managed rental stock, like Get Living London's East Village
- 3) access to good quality mid-market hotel accommodation.

GLA funding in LLDC**Question No: 2019/17054**[Tom Copley](#)

Could you provide the total amount of grant funding given by the GLA towards affordable housing in the LLDC, and the total number of units started, broken down by tenure, in each of the past five years?

Response

GLA Housing and Land only record grant funding on a borough level, so it is not possible to determine grant allocations within the LLDC area.

Manhattan Loft Gardens**Question No: 2019/17055**[Tom Copley](#)

How much money did LLDC receive in total through the Section 106 agreement for the “Manhattan Loft Gardens” scheme, and what was the on-site and off-site affordable housing contribution? Could you confirm also that the scheme is on land owned by the Department for Transport?

Response

For this scheme, an off-site affordable housing payment is required that totals £1 million (indexed) and split into two payments. The first payment of £442,020 has been received, while the second payment of £600,000 (indexed) is likely to become due in the near future, once occupation of 125 residential units has been reached. Both Manhattan Loft Gardens and London and Continental Railways (owned by the Department of Transport) are signatories to the S106 Agreement.

Planning to Build Out**Question No: 2019/17056**[Nicky Gavron](#)

What is the average time between a scheme being given planning permission by the LLDC and it being completed?

Response

Information included within LLDC's recently published Housing Delivery Test Action Plan shows that within the area the average time between permission and completion varies by the scale of the scheme, with it taking on average 1 year for small sites (below 10 units), 2.5 years for schemes up to 300 units, and nearly 4 years for schemes that are delivering over 300 units.

Neighbourhood Planning**Question No: 2019/17057**[Nicky Gavron](#)

What support does the LLDC give to Neighbourhood Planning in general, and specifically to the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Forum?

Response

There is one designated Neighbourhood Forum within the London Legacy Development Corporation area which is the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Forum. To date officers have attended their forum meetings when requested, offered advice with regard to the preparation of the recently submitted Neighbourhood Plan and have commissioned LLDC's Planning Policy and Decisions Team retained consultants to prepare a Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Opinion. With this neighbourhood plan having now been submitted, the LLDC has undertaken formal consultation and arrangements will now be made to appoint an Examiner to undertake the required Examination of the Plan.

Apprenticeships**Question No: 2019/17058**[Fiona Twycross](#)

Can you provide an update on progress against your target on employing apprentices within the LLDC?

Response

LLDC has a minimum park-wide planning target – set by the Planning Policy and Decisions Team in consultation with the boroughs - of 3 per cent for apprentices as part of the workforce in both construction and end-use.

Over the past 12 months, the LLDC has exceeded its park-wide target, achieving 4 per cent for both construction and end-use apprentices.

Apprentices at LLDC

Question No: 2019/17059

[Fiona Twycross](#)

How many apprentices were started in the LLDC? Can you break this down by year since 2012 and by sector?

Response

Internal:

Year	Total	Business & Admin	Finance	Procurement	Planning
2012	0	0	0	0	0
2013	0	0	0	0	0
2014	5	5	0	0	0
2015	0	0	0	0	0
2016	2	0	1	1	0
2017	0	0	0	0	0
2018	3	2	0	1	0
2019 (to August)	4	1	1	0	2

External:

The table below provides a breakdown of all the apprentice opportunities created through LLDC interventions since 2012. Construction includes all construction contractor apprentices including those based in site office roles such as Assistant Site Managers and Business Admin roles.

End use apprentices include all roles based with our Venue Operators, Estates and Facilities Management contractors and roles based with our tenants such as digital apprentices based with BT Sport at Here East.

Apprentice opportunities created	Construction	End Use	Total
2012 - 13	43	0	43
2014 - 15	46	17	63
2015 - 16	49	22	71
2016 - 17	17	47	64
2017 - 18	19	29	48
2018 -19	14	6	20
2019 - 20	10	1	11
Total apprentices to date	198	122	320

Apprenticeship diversity (1)

Question No: 2019/17060

Fiona Twycross

Can you provide me with a breakdown of apprenticeships started in the LLDC, by borough, further broken down by level since 2012 to date?

Response

Internal:

Year	Newham	Apprentice Level	Hackney	Apprentice Level	Tower Hamlets	Apprentice Level	Waltham Forest	Apprentice Level	Other Area	Apprentice Level
2012	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
2013	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
2014	2	Level 3	0	0	1	Level 3	2	Level 3		
2015	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
2016	1	Level 3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Level 3
2017	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2018	0	0	0	0	2	Level 3	0	0	1	Level 4
2019 (to	1	Level 5	0	0	1	Level 3	0	0	2	1x Level 3 1x Level 7

External:

Where robust data is available, to date 45 per cent of Park apprentices reside in the four boroughs surrounding the Park (Hackney, Newham, Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest). 60 per cent of park apprentices are studying for level 1 or 2 apprenticeship frameworks and 37 per cent are studying at level 3 or above.

4 borough Local	6 borough Local	Rest of London	Place of resident unknown
45%	55%	27%	19%

Level of apprenticeships on the Park	
Level 2 or below	60.14%
Level 3 or above	37.46%
Unknown	2.41%

(Taken from a sample of 90% of all the apprentices created through LLDC interventions)

Apprenticeship diversity (2)**Question No: 2019/17061**

Fiona Twycross

Can you provide me with a breakdown of apprenticeships started in the LLDC, by borough, further broken down by level and broken down again by gender since 2012 to date?

Response

Internal:

Year	Newham	Apprentice Level	Gender	Hackney	Apprentice Level	Gender	Tower Hamlets	Apprentice Level	Gender	Waltham Forest	Apprentice Level	Gender	Other Area	Apprentice Level	Gender
2012	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2013	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2014	2	Level 3	1 x Female 1 x Male	0	0	0	1	Level 3	1 x Male	2	Level 3	2 x Female	0	0	0
2015	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2016	1	Level 3	1 x Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Level 3	1 x Female
2017	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
2018	0	0		0	0		2	Level 3	1 x Female	0	0		1	Level 4	1 x Male
2019 (to August)	1	Level 5	1 x Female	0	0	0	1	Level 3	1 x Female	0	0		2	1x Level 3 1 x Level 7	1 x Male 1 x Female

External:

Breakdown gender apprentices since 2012		
	Construction	End-use
Total	198	122
Women	28	37
%	14	30

Breakdown of Park based female apprentices by level and 4 borough/London							
Size of sample for snapshot of analysis = 60	%	4 Borough	%	Rest of London	%	Unknown	%
60		35	58%	24	40%	1	2%
Level 2 and below		20	33%	15	25%		
Level 3 and above		14	23%	9	15%	1	2%
Unknown		1	2%		0%		

Apprenticeship diversity (3)

Question No: 2019/17062

Fiona Twycross

Can you provide me with a breakdown of apprenticeships started in the LLDC, by borough, further broken down by level and broken down again by ethnicity since 2012 to date?

Response

Internal:

Year	Newham	Level	Ethnicity	Hackney	Level	Ethnicity	Tower Hamlets	Level	Ethnicity	Waltham Forest	Level	Ethnicity	Other Area	Level	Ethnicity
2012	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2013	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2014	2	Level 3	2 x BAME	0	0	0	1	Level 3	1 x BAME	2	Level 3	2 x BAME	0	0	0
2015	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2016	1	Level 3	1 x BAME	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Level 3	1 x White
2017	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2018	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	Level 3	2 x BAME	0	0	0	1	Level 4	1 x White
2019 (to August)	1	Level 5	1 x BAME	0	0	0	1	Level 3	1 x BAME	0	0	0	2	1 x Level 3 1 x Level 7	1 x BAME 1 x PNTS

External:

To date 47 per cent of all of our apprentices have been from BAME groups, breakdown by year and sector below.

Breakdown BAME apprentices			
Starts by year	Construction	End use	% BAME
2012 - 13	24		56%
2014 - 15	20		32%
2015 - 16	23	14	52%
2016 - 17	2	36	59%
2017 - 18	8	13	44%
2018 - 19	4	4	40%
2019 - 20	2	1	27%
Total number	83	68	47%
		151	

Apprenticeship diversity (5)

Question No: 2019/17063

Fiona Twycross

Can you provide me with a breakdown of apprenticeships started in the LLDC, by borough, further broken down by level and broken down again by age since 2012 to date?

Response

Internal:

Year	Newham	Level	Age	Hackney	Level	Age	Tower Hamlets	Level	Age	Waltham Forest	Level	Age	Other Area	Level	Age
2012	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2013	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2014	2	Level 3	1 x 16-24 1 x 25-34	0	0	0	1	Level 3	1 x 16-24	2	Level 3	2 x 16-24	0	0	0
2015	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2016	1	Level 3	1 x 16-24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Level 3	18
2017	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2018	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	Level 3	2 x 16-24	0	0	0	1	Level 4	1 x 45-54
2019 (to August)	1	Level 5	1 x 25-34	0	0	0	1	Level 3	1 x 16-24	0	0	0	2	1x Level 3 1 x Level 7	2 x 16-24

External:

We do not report an age breakdown of our apprentices however we do know that the majority of our apprentices are under 25 years of age, specifically because until the government's recent overhaul of the apprenticeship landscape, funding for apprentices was limited to 18-24 year olds.

House prices in LLDC**Question No: 2019/17303**[Tom Copley](#)

Could you provide the average sale price of private market homes in the LLDC in each of the last five years?

Response

LLDC has used publicly available Land Registry Sales data to extract all private residential sales (new and second hand) for the LLDC area by year for the last five years. Please see the table below.

Year Sold	Average Sales Value
2019	£586,852
2018	£528,364
2017	£509,069
2016	£483,986
2015	£457,603

Apprenticeship diversity (4)

Question No: 2019/17064

Fiona Twycross

Can you provide me with a breakdown of apprenticeships started in the LLDC, by borough, further broken down by level and broken down again by disability since 2012 to date?

Response

Internal:

Year	Newham	Level	Disability	Hackney	Level	Disability	Tower Hamlets	Level	Disability	Waltham Forest	Level	Disability	Other Area	Level	Disability
2012	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2013	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2014	2	Level 3	2 x None	0	0	0	1	Level 3	1 x PNTS	2	Level 3	1 x None 1 x PNTS	0	0	0
2015	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2016	1	Level 3	1 x None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	Level 3	1 x None
2017	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2018	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	Level 3	0	0	0	0	1	Level 4	0
2019 (to August)	1	Level 5	1 x None	0	0	0	1	Level 3	1 x None	0	0	0	2	1 x Level 3 1 x Level 7	1 x None 1 x PNTS

(Note: PNTS – Prefer Not to Say)

External:

The LLDC asks all its workers across Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park to declare whether they have a disability. A low percentage do self-declare, but of those that have declared a disability, 2 per cent work with construction employers and 4 per cent work with end use employers, meaning a combined percentage of 6% of the total Park workforce have self-declared they have a disability at the point of induction.