

# A CITY FOR ALL LONDONERS

Economy Workshop  
23<sup>rd</sup> November 2016, 9.30 – 13.00

## Night-Time Economy Table 6 Session 1

**Facilitator in bold - facilitator comments in bold**

Respondents in regular text

*These notes are a summary of the conversation*

---

*Session 1, Table 6*

### **Shain Shapiro, Facilitator**

Rollo Maschietto

Suzanne Johnson, London Borough of Haringey

Faraz Baber, Terence O'Rourke

Ashkan Liaghat, London Borough of Enfield

Michael Bach, London Forum of Amenity and Civic Societies

---

**Overview of the Mayor's plans and night-time commission and night czar post. The general idea is the London plan could be more pro-culture, but we must also understand the night time economy is also about sustainability. How can the London plan be pro-culture and how can we ensure the right provisions are put in place to open it up?**

On music, I worked with Ministry of Sound who were concerned with this. Residential schemes are threatening venues which have thrived and are a part of London's cultural mix. There are many clubs threatened in recent years as they become less viable when residents move in and complain about sound and so on. This is topical, with the recent deal over Fabric. A lot of developers are coming forward with major schemes, they think about how they can provide that night time economy, particularly in central London, and there are challenges in how they engage with local authorities. The Mayor won't deal with licensing but there needs to be a direction of travel, and expectations on how the night time economy should work. Not necessarily prescriptive, but there must be expectations over licensing and so on. London also needs to service itself: that includes deliveries, operational activities, and so on. Agreements are too challenging without expectations set. Need to look at growth areas.

**When night time economy is one in eight jobs, hospitality and so on are second, logistics are actually the main employer.**

I'm interested in local levels, and the survival of pubs, cinemas and theatres. Pubs are dripping assets to put housing above, there are problems created by those who come in and wish pubs

would go. Theatres where people wish to exploit the spaces above, like the Curzon Cinema, people expect the noise-generating use to pay for insulation rather than the new housing. These things are worrying. Even with major redevelopments cinemas are put into basements under shops. There's an issue of isolation.

**So, we are talking a better understanding of mixed-use developments and protection measurements that can be put - such as the national government initiative lobbied by the music industry passed by the government for noise assessments.**

The initial question over the London plan-, there is support in relation to town centres and transport; I think there is an opportunity to look at major transport infrastructure in town centres. Ultimately culture and the night time economy is part of a package, as an experience of space. Strategically the London plan can look at where growth can be fostered, and that is the area where licensing policy is involved and some kind of shared approach could be taken. Ultimately the London plan is fairly powerful in directing local Boroughs.

**Yes, local plans.**

Yes. x2

There has been no leadership, and many Boroughs have no plan.

Yes. x3

Enfield has changed that.

Definitely.

What you need is not only policy but right now policies are written in a three-tier way.

The new night czar part of that engagement is-, it's interesting because it's easy to look at what the Mayor can provide, but there's new growth areas are now starting to create a pull, so there is something about the night czar engaging with business and understanding the dynamic. There is a culmination of night time policies and it might even be zonal, while some will overlap.

Where do you think that would be? In Battersea and Earl's Court, by the time people have gone to housing there isn't a focus on night time economy.

Wembley is transforming, in terms of entertainment and there are other areas as well. It's not only entertainment, but also logistics. Thinking about distribution centres, there is a role for the night czar to play in fostering relationships within Boroughs to service the whole of London

**Our thinking is almost identical. One thing we commissioned was the University of Westminster to measure the night time economy in 4 areas - Westminster, Lambeth, Croydon, --Forest. In all four the night time economy has increased since 1997, led by food business. Food-led businesses has increased, vertical drinking has decreased. We propose a different definition of the night time economy to make it more expansive. Sometimes there is a mindset issue, when we work on supporting licensing, we find out the Boroughs and licensing partners haven't spoken to each other, there is a disconnect between parties.**

That is why we have the night czar to facilitate conversation. I read about how Amsterdam has used a night czar to facilitate 24-hour licensing in outer Amsterdam, and a school?

It's a multi-purpose place, with a nightclub and an incubator for other businesses during the day, such as yoga lessons and other freelance operators.

**Yes, it's redefining.**

There is a very large central London scheme today which is working to bridge the issue between planning and licensing, and it is struggling. They want to let the scheme out with the context that it is helping to service the night time economy.

**I'm working on a scheme in central London with two music venues, it is challenging.**

So how can we allow the future night time economy to be serviced, but it is a struggle. It's not just about here and now, it's about big developments coming forwards. It is exciting but everyone is cautious.

Can I ask about the definition - in the accreditation process used by AC? Introducing the flag system, there is a big gap between 6 o'clock and when other things start happening such as cinema and eating. The night time economy might be starting eleven onwards, while some places say they have an evening economy they aren't certain they have a night time economy - it's a different animal.

What do we mean by night time economy? I just think about restaurants.

Well, that's sort of evening: eating finishes by about ten o'clock.

Pubs, bars, restaurants, clubs... I'd say those are the main four.

A lot of these venues are interchangeable in their uses and can attract a broad range.

**So, we need a better definition.**

Some areas become specialised in restaurants, while some have a few attractions which are night clubs. Those are very different. When you start to accredit various areas in London as flag areas, some of them were really struggling. Areas such as Angel and Smithfield only have a couple nightclubs, for example, that's very different from the real concentrations you get.

**We have a real challenge with this. When the night czar releases her vision early in the New Year, we are moving towards a definition of 24-hour city and less night time economy. The globally agreed upon definition is 11pm to 6pm, with the evening economy earlier definition. Evening and night time economy is too long, but we do embrace the evening and the term 24-hour city. That will be the tagline. It's dangerous to focus only on hospitality and entertainment, that is an important sector but road and train noise is an issue, where people can't sleep. I hear trains at one in the morning. The noise team at the GLA is working with TfL and Noise Abatement Society, they are looking at that. That is equally important. We are pursuing a holistic definition.**

Yes, but that requires a more holistic definition about how to set out the future role of town centres.

**Yes.**

These parts of London see themselves changing, we all think these town centres are great in principle, but in reality many are declining. Do we want to manage that decline and focus activity where it is viable, or reach out to local activity spots and suffering town centres to seek an all-round approach? I don't think that would work, unless we promote these centres to bring residential usage and spending power, activating uses we feel are appropriate for an all-round economy with restaurants, shops et cetera. Right now, the plan is archaic, saying we have to protect high streets in relation to shopping patterns. Town centres often have survived due to creeping hospitality and are dependent on the night time centre. Many are now purely restaurant based.

But it means they still exist, which is good.

We need to recognise how we see changes, and what changes we want. More people want to stay local.

### **It's about town centres.**

Where the Mayor could have more of a say is where the Mayor is intervening with the GLA family about investment of infrastructure. He could say we want to see a 24-hour London. Broadly it is local authorities who are in charge, though.

But they do need that support.

Night time spaces are dead in day time, if you try to revitalise a town centre it is a problem if nothing happens before midnight.

### **Yes, about mixed use. In Zurich, night clubs double as day-care centres.**

I'm saying it is an issue. The attitude that housing prevails is a problem, because what is left after everything changes to houses?

When you go to the ministry of sound, it also has an office function; it services radio stations, businesses of CDs and artwork. I can see a point that if there is no imagination there is a dead space.

You're talking about critical mass: diversity within a building. The location of clubs could be in the basement of buildings where you wouldn't notice it in the daytime, but something like Hammersmith Palace used to be, it would be dead for most of the day.

Potentially the Mayor could help new use classes, encouraging multi-functional spaces.

That would be a major change.

I love the idea about schools, which waste space currently and could have great potential for the community. Likewise, current use classes approach assist decline. There needs to be a balance.

That would be a huge change. Use classes have become slightly more flexible, but I think that is an interesting idea but also a big battle as there are national use classes. Ultimately it is planning-

But be careful what you wish for. Some constituencies don't want these things.

Use classes show how planning has a role to play, and could be looked at. I have no solution right now but it is interesting.

The market would go for the highest paying use.

**Moving on, one of the things we have discovered is that asset community value designations acts are not doing what they should be doing, and when we look at protection of existing spaces - let alone building new stuff, what is the best way to go about that? Is pursuing an article 4 mentality, like Wandsworth with its pubs, appropriate?**

I think it's a local function, in my local authority we have pushed the council so hard, as the threats come along to pubs and restaurants. In Kensington and Chelsea. It's based on the philosophy because of differences in values, housing will take over everything and unless you protect uses with policies, we have to persuade and batter the council to produce a policy that helps. In the interim while they were getting policy they kept turning things down and the community was defending itself, buying time. Now adventurous developers decide they'll do the assets stripping approach, taking off the top and leaving the remainder. Community pubs are changing.

That's what you're doing, essentially-

That's what the market's doing.

Pubs change to eating establishments, away from traditional pubs. No policy could restrict changes in the nature of the value.

Article 4 direction means the values are so high the prospect of a local community buying a pub are remote. We have to find our own buyers.

We want them to become enablers rather than disrupters. There is another layer below the local authority.

**That's a good idea.**

Some are forward thinking but many are old-school. We have to think about how the night czar understands the local layer.

That's right. It's local empowerment.

One problem is that with increasing freedom, shops are going in favour of cafes and restaurants. There comes a point where it is too far, for example around South Kensington station, due to people going to the museums it is all eating establishments at the expense of a local community or town centre. As soon as the market is given the opportunity, it takes it.

That's a local authority thing, how it sees its town centre.

In this case, it's gone overboard.

There must be a clearer definition of what that centre is then.

Communities react when they are left out in the cold, so you must be careful in what you can expect from local authorities.

Coming back to the localised approach, one size doesn't fit all, for example there are many places we'd love to see more cafes.

Also, there's Westminster with its stress areas.

**In Montreal, they just initiated a rule that only one in six uses can be a restaurant, as locals were complaining they couldn't buy groceries. We are all in agreement there should be planning protection, but it should be in the local level and reflect local plans.**

The protection I'm describing is to protect uses.

**Yes. When you talk about use class, there is no use class for music venues but three potential ones. Things that are difficult tend to not work in general. This is a very salient point as the SPG is being written right now-**

When is that out?

**Summer.**

It's going to be down to the local area to better define with encouragement from the Mayor.

We need a sense of what the Mayor's expectation of revenue and what it can bring to London, and who are the big contributors. This gets us to start understanding why the night time economy is important.

That's probably best dealt with in the SPG. The London plan has limited space and vehicles.

**Yes.**

If I can comment what my authority has done, it's recognise that all uses other than housing are under threat and that building a set of policies to define social and community use-, largely cinemas and pubs, cultural uses as well, the idea is to resist the loss of those.

**Yes.**

There'll be a set of uses that are favoured, the problem is how the less socially acceptable-, how you manage and plan for those.

**That's a very good way of putting it. It's showing complete neutrality as long as they are safely operated. LGBT spaces, night clubs, art galleries - anything. Some certain uses are clearly under more threat than others. That is a social issue. That's changing trends. People are drinking less, going out less. Younger people are doing different things.**

They're doing different things; the evening economy is exploding. People are eating out a lot.

You're embracing the evening economy?

**Yes.**

We need to try, in this interim period, because it's a one-way trip to housing.

Yes, once it's lost it's lost.

You need to work out what you want to protect and how you can do it.

So, that's on the local level, but it needs support from the Mayor.

He's got it on certain cultural uses perhaps, but it needs to broaden.

I'm thinking of build to rent and new ways to target people who want to live in a bustling city and are willing to accept noise. Thinking about PRS and other schemes for city centre areas, maybe there is something to build on the ministry of sound deal Boris struck. There is this thing that is attached to it, by recognising that you are living in a live-work-play environment. You are going to have to deal with it.

Yes, deal with it.

It's what you sign up to.

That means developers have to be responsible. They have to recognise they're in a town-centre environment.

Developers will always default and say it isn't viable-, this leisure and night-time use. They won't buy it so we have to find some way in unless it's really pushed. They will always default to retail use. No politician is going to go out their way to promote night clubs, really. What are we trying to promote here?

It's a whole range.

It's restaurants.

Well it isn't.

I just mean provocatively. It has to be dynamic and spatial.

Most developers like simple developments, mono-use developments. Mixed-use has its problems.

Yes.

We have people with very long leases, temporary leases...

It's about new spaces like areas in Tottenham, and existing spaces where you have to think harder.

It is really difficult.

We need case studies.

It requires all of us here to push and encourage it. Unless we try to push developers will go for the simple life.

We have a group of developers who work with us. We are developing a venue with UNI in Hayes, and more. New spaces are easier.

Still difficult, I think. In Tottenham people are interested in heritage buildings and town centre sites, and I think that's amazing. Another interesting thing is the industrial land that isn't protected, in creative sectors people are keen to go into those.

To do what?

A real mix: cafes, bars, music studios, a range of things. That's changing geographies a little bit.

Is it just happening?

It's just happening organically. We are trying to get our heads around it to be more strategic.

--It's a puzzle. One of the things we see in the entertainment industry-, you give an operator a shiny glass box fit for purpose, and they don't want it, they want heritage buildings with problems. Sometimes it doesn't fit the cultural aesthetics of the business.

So, it's about space curation.

Space curation, yes.

**So, the three key points I have garnered: the Mayor can provide a direction of travel on expectations of a functioning night time economy, a more prescriptive definition of night-time economy-,**

We need a better understanding.

**Yes. And we all agree that in the end it comes down to local plans, neighbourhood forums. The Mayor can provide as much guidance as possible but the implementation is local.**

We have missed that for a successful local night time economy you need coordination from the management, from policing and licensing, transport, to make it work. It needs as much management as a town centre does.

**Yes.**

But most of what we do has no management.

**That's because licensing is reactive, and planning is proactive.**

I wish, but it is not.

We need to encourage local areas to define how they want their places to change.

Yes, a directing of challenge for planning and licensing.

And to what extent do you think the London plan is the vehicle, or other things such as the SPG?

**We think it is a bit of everything, with coordination. So, the night czar, that void you spoke of, we believe it is the night czar and the chair of the night-time commission who is announced next week, it is their role to develop coordination. The plan is to produce a vision of London as a 24-hour city, hopefully taking into account what we have discussed. It is focussed on protection existing infrastructure that is economically viable, so that if the operation is successful it should be protected.**

Yes x2

**If a venue is poorly operated and closes, that is fine if it is poorly operated. In addition, we are looking to developers to provide guidance in the earliest stages possible, as feedback suggests they are more likely to listen in earlier planning stages.**

Trying to encourage imposition of article 4s and so in-,

I think if you get to Article 4 you have done a bad job.

**Yes, they're essentially plasters.**

Sometimes you have no choice, though.

We basically are buying time; putting up obstacles in the hope that we will be successful as if you don't they'll be done tomorrow.

**Yes. They're hurdles.**

It would be good if local authorities have policies on what they want to keep.

**We are working with a number of local authorities to include night time economy provisions in the local plan provisions. A lot of local authorities are doing their licensing reviews.**

# Night-time Economy

## Table 6 Session 2

**Facilitator in bold – facilitator comments in bold**

Respondents in regular text

---

*Session 2, Table 6*

**Shain Shapiro**

**Rollo Maschietto**

Adam Mills, Greenwich Council

Ben Johnson, London Borough of Islington

Collette Kelly, Kingston Council

Mark Allen, Brent Council

David Lutton, London First

---

**The biggest question which came out of the first hour is: what is your definition of night time economy? At the GLA this is a definition we are grappling with. We are venturing towards using the term 24 hour London instead.**

I think we have a tendency to split, it but principally it is any business that operates into the evening. It's also a question of the infrastructure which allows these businesses to operate. It is difficult.

**Yes.**

From a different perspective, it is also about types. I think '24-hour city' is a better way, as otherwise you start segmenting the activities which can be valuable. It depends which lens you're looking through, whether it's about economics, public protection.

24-hour city makes more sense because otherwise you risk segmenting the economy which leads to a lull in the daytime. It's better for strategic planning.

We like to focus not only on music and licensing issues, but also a broader sense from seven till seven. So, how can we use the night time economy to leverage and support other clusters we are already well-known for such as culture, and so on.

**40% of London's music venues since 2007 have closed. We recommended appointment of a night Mayor. A night time commission was also set up. The Mayor has appointed a night czar in Amy Lamé, who is responsible for the vision of London as a 24-hour city. The night time economy has become a priority in the manifesto. We are committed to writing an SPG for night time economy.**

When is that out?

**June, or July, we hope. It's a priority. We are also doing an economic modelling of music venues, pubs, theatres and arenas.**

Live music?

**Yes. Anything from a DJ to playing guitar. Anyway, the policy from 2006 did not get very far but we hope to rewrite that with the czar. In relation to the Mayor and the London plan, everything is down to local plans. What can the Mayor do to provide a positive direction of travel into encouraging local authorities to make the most of their night time economies safely and responsibly? That isn't just hospitality and entertainment, but health and social care, hotels, logistics. The number one employer is actually logistics.**

One of the first things to do is identify where jobs in the future come from and where they will be spatially. Tourism and retail, a growing sector in London, could already say they don't get enough support from the Mayor. It's about job opportunities which exist within the night time economy as well. It has to be broad. It's also about continuing to make an economic case-; the night-time economy is not inconsequential.

**From a local perspective, what can we do at the GLA to support the creation of night time economies under the responsibilities that we have? What can the Mayor do? Is there something you'd like to see in the London plan?**

I think anything highlighting the importance of it, and setting a framework for local plans. It is a very local specific issue and local authorities have different pressures. It's not about mandating a particular approach, but putting in place the research and evidence which can be drawn upon, and defining its importance in the local area. I like the definition of it being about everything, it allows a broader picture. It's not about one thing, there can be certain aspects to pick and choose, cross-Borough links. Logistics in one Borough can help the night time economy in another Borough, for example.

There is something in the vision which helps all Boroughs. There are aspects where Boroughs can work together.

It could be a London-wide entity, even operated on a super-Borough level. I don't know how you approach it.

I think there is something-, it probably builds on that, about having a framework, but something about licensing as well, and how we use flexibilities. Boroughs have used licensing in other cities to enable growth of the night time economy, such as in Newcastle. It's useful to look at other places to see how it's used. Locally it's 'the licensing committee says this so you can't do that' but it's sometimes about turning it round and highlighting flexibilities.

**Yes.**

A late-night levy could be used to mitigate the impact of certain elements of the night time economy, and not all Boroughs use it. Tying this together and looking at how the money could be spent, and a strategic way to benefit multiple Boroughs across London.

Is the night time levy available right now?

Yes. x3

**There's a policy structure in which as long as its agreed upon on cabinet level and local authorities it is a tax on late-license businesses.**

Applied through businesses rates?

**It's been tested a lot in Camden, it's a great idea in theory but hard to implement successfully in practice.**

What do you spend it on?

**Mainly cleaning up streets and litter, policing and security.**

It goes back to how you manage housing with night time economy, as in Camden.

**The key is for all local authorities to have an independent strategic approach to this. Do you feel that providing guidance towards provisions about night time economies in local plans would be good?**

Yes.

I think it could be done through the London plan. I think strategic policy first would be a better way to do it. The SPG first-, well, I understand there is a time lag.

**Yes, it is the time issue. That is the issue with doing the SPG first, it's backwards, I understand that. We want the London plan to be as pro-culture as possible. What does that mean to you?**

What do you mean by culture?

**Good question.**

It's not just art, but also the way we live. We need to tease that out more.

**Define culture in the London plan, yes.**

The GLA deals with cultural institutions.

**Yes-, and output, industries.**

So, what does it actually mean?

It's lifestyle: going out to dinner or going to the west end is part of the culture of your life. Clubs, they're a form of culture too.

We're interested in looking at culture in helping developers develop town centres. In one we have a new theatre, which is a classic idea of culture, but also an emergent culture in workshops and the film industry which ties into the cultural output of London as a whole. It's about tying that all together and using culture to piggyback development of other uses off the back of that.

Culture isn't necessary the same as night time economy.

No. x3

There is an overlap, and many cultural strategies try and define culture but it ends up going on forever. I'm interested to see what the GLA is proposing in the cultural enterprise zones.

**It's the same as business enterprise zones - what can be put in place to encourage cultural businesses, whether it's provision of affordable workspace or so on.**

Is it the Boroughs that do this?

**The Boroughs deliver it but there is a set of incentives. We looked at the provision of entertainment zones and music zones, but ruled it out in the end. It ends up becoming a stress area over a period of time. When a place is successful it becomes a stress area, which does the opposite of what you want it to do.**

Looking at how you use expertise, and how you get people over there to define links, who will operate the spaces... are there agglomeration benefits? There are agglomeration benefits, not so obviously as with business, but they do have it.

You get an overlap as it is also smaller businesses; those are cultural enterprises as well. It is a very nebulous area.

**It's a lot easier-, well, nothing is easier, but there is more scope to provide night time economy uses in new areas as opposed to existing infrastructure.**

But there is the issue of noise.

**Technology exists to suppress noise. Most complaints are about dispersal, people outside. This goes into the next question, which is protectionism: should we be focusing on looking at how we can enable local authorities to use Article 4 directions on cultural infrastructure more? What protections can we place in the London plan? This is in relation to the commitment to bring change.**

There's the issue of how the night time economy mixes with residential areas.

**If a venue wants to be set up in a housing area, they have to display the residential use is protected.**

That would generally be encompassed within it, most Boroughs have some agency for that. That is something we would support. In terms of article 4, it's always helpful having high level guidance over their impact, but they are very narrowly focused. If there were some higher-level research around how the introduction of residential use can harm areas with particular night time economy assets, it would be useful.

**Do you support, for example, cases like Wandsworth's use of Article 4 for pubs?**

I'd say just providing research is part of the solution. I don't agree necessarily with using Article 4 like that, it's too laborious.

**It's about allowing the housing to happen, but ensuring it doesn't drive other things away. What can we do?**

Article 4 can work. Not necessarily having stringent policies but looking at evidence to avoid harming infrastructure and economy is important. It's more of an extreme scenario, you could look at whether a different approach could be used for larger cases. Whether there is some standardised approach you could bring to planning. There is precedent for it now, but whether it's something the London plan can explore.

Does legislation actually work?

Yes, very well in other countries.

Are there examples here, in London where it has worked?

**Koko in Camden: a version of agent of change argued against a residential block.**

I think agent of change is essentially soundproofing largely, but a lot of noise issues can be designed out, you're right. But then you can't open a window in summer. There are issues that lag. There's a storm there about seeing an increase in complaints.

**In the previous hour we discussed this often comes down to mindset, and people moving into high-activity economy uses, and maybe not realising.**

That is an interesting point, as many who move in love the vibrancy when they move in but after some sleepless nights they lose that opinion. Local authorities have to investigate this. It is unfair on existing uses, so I suppose that is the key element to look at. It's about that sort of nebulous element of how you minimise complaints and stop penalisation of existing use. There is pressure for housing as well and the Mayor is looking at urban intensification - there is going to be a fight there, but can you achieve the right balance, allowing housing development, and promoting a 24-hour economy.

**We have seen this with venues that are facing licensing issues, a lack of communication between departments. Police, licensing and the rest are not communicating. The night czar's role can be to provide communication pathways and guidance, working with both neighbourhood forums and local authorities to involve licensing authorities in planning decisions and vice versa. No matter how brilliantly a building is planned, when a person complains-, you know what happens.**

Yes.

**That's one of the questions, when it comes to the night time economy, what can the GLA do? We see potential to provide leadership to bring departments together.**

That is a good idea. Licensing is clearly an issue. Providing structure and discussion about how licensing can engage with planning would be useful.

There is a tension between there. If the GLA could look at how outdated the system for licensing. It's from many years ago, it needs total overhaul.

**Because the GLA does not have jurisdiction over licensing we have to have a light-touch approach.**

Looking at different models would be good, looking at best practice.

**I'm glad to hear that, that is what we are doing.**

What role would the night time czar have played in the Fabric case?

**She's working to create a mediation-based approach. We think that in that case, if a night czar had existed 8 to 10 years ago, this wouldn't have happened. There are some issues like the good ship in Brent. There is mediation and communication that could be done to mitigate issues. We think that is the best use of our time, to provide guidance without being prescriptive about local night time economies. We are struggling with what is the thing we need to do first: we though producing a vision, outlining the type of London we want to help create. Again, about how we value the 24-hour city, not a specific use.**

To come back to earlier, getting beyond licensing and planning and thinking about Boroughs can use 24-hour economy to challenge issues around freight and delivery for example. It's helpful to think about it in a 24-hour way, not a seven-to-seven way.

**Thank you. Another objective is seeing the night tube as a two-way street. We want to work with outer Boroughs like Kingston to develop more robust night time economies in those areas to relieve central London. I live in Waltham Forest and there are a couple things to do, but not a huge amount: try to get a meal at 10 o'clock and it's impossible. What can we do with outer Boroughs to encourage more night-time economy uses?**

What about the downside?

Like Hackney for example.

**An objective is trying to bring together these Boroughs with outer Boroughs and work in partnership. We see a number of cultural uses in Hackney moving out. There are now some art uses in Hackney, even Newham. Collectively that can be seen as a positive for everybody, but it is very early stages.**

It's for local authorities to decide: if they have had enough of the night time economy and they want to focus on housing, they have the ability to do that. Hackney did it with The White Horse; it was a community valued use. It's about the communication and the Mayor's input. I know he doesn't have a licensing role, but he can influence licensing policy. Best practice can be updated. An existing Borough that is suburban may not want to develop a night time economy as such, though.

Bromley, others are probably good examples. It may be a policy that they don't want to build up the town centre.

**Another thing we are looking at is the relationship between growth of time centres and night time economies. I think you can't have one without the other. From the Mayor's perspective, is linking those two together a good thing?**

I think yes. Diversity is key and building resilience. You can't just have town centres of purely retail, more diverse town centres are much more likely to be successful.

In Horsham, it's one-dimensional: after 5 o'clock it is dead. Nice for old people, but no night time economy at all. I don't know if it would grow there, but there must be something happening somewhere.

**In the report by Westminster, we looked at TfL and Uber data to look at density issues. We also looked at the relationship between crime rate and night time economies: in high density and low density areas crime rates were equal. There is a way to at least develop a vision of medium-density night-time economy uses. Not every place should be open, but enough. Certain crimes are higher in the day, others at night: there isn't a complete correlation. One thing we look at is whether this night time economy vision can encourage Boroughs to think about density issues. We want to create a zone but not a stress area.**

If a Borough wants to jump on night time economy but there is concern about crime from residents. Is there any strategy for this, to alleviate concerns that night time economies increase crime?

It depends on types of venues, too. We're talking about seeing a film to drugs notorious for drugs, and everything in between.

That's a downside to the term 'night time economy'. We have defined it broadly, but a resident next to a town centre might not like it.

They wouldn't like it.

They'd be expecting a club. Perceptions are important.

**Can there be a debate around night time economy use classes more? For example, music venues have no specific class. Speaking to planners, complex uses mean they are not as robustly fought for. Developers prefer simple solutions.**

The issue with use classes-, it's an issue where you have a new development which has a variety of use classes permitted, which may not allow for night time economy uses but I don't necessarily think having a specific use class would help.

**Yes, or anything else for that matter. But is it too blunt?**

Probably yes, but that is the system we have. A lot of people want different use classes to get around planning which is a perverse way of looking at it. I think it's about getting the image of the night time economy and applying it at a local level, if you have that, you'd find it would develop naturally as long as people aren't too worried about its effects.

**Yes, we spoke about that before as well. In the end, what do you think the night czar should be doing? What are the top 3 things that we need to consider?**

It is advocacy and discussion, which you already mentioned. That is the most important thing. Having resources and tools to help Boroughs get a picture of what the night time economy is and how it could benefit them. And, to be honest about downsides, instead of painting a rosy picture of the night time economy coming into Boroughs and solving all the issues.

**Yes.**

There's also the role around mediation, where there are issues. The important one is to have the knowledge of what is happening in all Boroughs and share that. There is a view, going back to licensing that the night time economy in some areas is a bad thing, and it's about saying it can be a good thing. It's going to have to be balanced with the densification, and you can't keep refusing licensing because you end up with Kingston where it's just shop.

You don't like Pryzm, then?

Pryzm yes: that end of town is that end of town, and the other is for shopping. But it should be a little more complicated than that.

**Yes, and it has The Fighting Cocks as well which is an important institution. The night Mayor for Amsterdam always says speak in facts, not emotion, but we are discovering a lot about mindset. It is about saying the same things over and over, and backing it up with data which hasn't been mined before. There is a higher rate of crime across London at night, but it is nuanced.**

Yes, a lot of that happens regardless of entertainment venues.

There are fewer people around.

**And the worst time for mobile phone theft is about actually about three o'clock in the afternoon.**

Schools.

**And people leaving their phones out at cafes, and so on.**

Yes, and lots happens at rush-hour when it is crowded and busy. So, it's also the role of the night czar and Mayor to get rid of misconceptions. They aren't entirely misconceptions, but they are to a degree.

**Yes, and there is an understanding, of course, that is about communicating risks. How responsible are licensed premises for their customers when they leave? Some think they are not responsible at all, others they are completely until they are in a taxi to get home. I think it's somewhere in between.**

There have been court cases, haven't there? And there's the issue of normal employers being responsible for their staff. A lot of this is beyond control, and about how people choose to spend their time. No one has to spend this money but people do because we want to, and it's what makes life worth living.

**Yes, if only it were so simple to communicate to everybody. I think our main three takeaways were about the night czar and Mayor's role as mediators and communicators, leaving policies to local planners while still providing support-,**

Yes, and putting facts on the table for Boroughs to use. The 24-hour city thing is what's important, and the range of things that come under the night time economy, not just pubs and restaurants.

**Yes, there is even a 24-hour bookshop in Brick Lane.**

So there should be.

**I agree. And gyms are the fastest growing night time economy right now, not bars.**