

1 Tuesday, 6th June 2006

2 (1.05 pm)

3 Round table discussion

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. The
5 Inquiry is now resumed. As you know, this is the
6 Inquiry into the London Development Agency (Olympic and
7 Legacy Compulsory Purchase Order) 2005. Most of you
8 will know that my name is David Rose. I am a chartered
9 town planner and planning inspector appointed by the
10 Secretary of State for Trade and Industry to conduct
11 this Inquiry and to report in due course.

12 In this afternoon on my left I have Alan Nettey, a
13 planning officer with the planning inspectorate, and he
14 is here to assist me in terms of taking some notes and
15 supporting me with documentation, as necessary. In the
16 usual way, can I start by taking appearances? I am well
17 aware that I have done this many times, I did it last
18 week when a number of you were here, but it would help
19 to start the process. If I start on my left with
20 Mr Walker, please.

21 MR WALKER: Yes, Hedley Walker, from Capita Simons.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Your specialist subject is?

23 MR WALKER: A transport consultant for the LDA.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Jones?

25 MR JONES: Andrew Jones of EDAW, a town planner on planning

1 and planning policy issues for the LDA.

2 MR PRIOR: Jason Prior of EDAW, urban designer and landscape
3 architect, and I have been leading the design team for
4 the Olympic project.

5 MR BLACKER: Gareth Blacker. I am the Director of
6 Development at the LDA.

7 MR PERRY: Robin Perry from Capita Simons, stepping in for
8 Peter Hine, who is unexpectedly on leave, on
9 environmental contamination.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Starting at this end of the table, please?

11 MR CHEYNE: My name is Julian Cheyne. I am a resident at
12 Clays Lane.

13 MR SANDISON: My name is Ian Sandison, resident of
14 Clays Lane.

15 MR SOLE: John Sole, and I am a resident of Clays Lane.

16 MR ARMSTRONG: Anderson Armstrong. I am a resident of Clays
17 Lane.

18 MS MORTON: Anita Morton. I am a resident of Clays Lane.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Have you submitted a formal objection?

20 MS MORTON: Yes, I have.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you know its reference number, please?

22 MS MORTON: No, I do not.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have any other paperwork?

24 MS MORTON: No.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Can I just get that checked out.

1 MS SPENDIFF: Dorothy Spendiff, resident of Clays Lane, and
2 a statutory objector.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: A statutory objector. If I could ask the
4 programme officer, can I have a copy of those
5 objections?

6 There are a number of other residents indicating
7 they may wish to take part in the round table. Clearly
8 I will accommodate them if they arrive this afternoon,
9 but there is a further session on Thursday afternoon.
10 The agenda has been specifically broken down into
11 topics, so it may well be that their specific interest
12 is in topic two, but we will deal with that as
13 necessary. I should also say that there are three
14 non-statutory objectors on the basis that their
15 objections were late, submitted very recently:
16 Tariq Masood, Jamil Hamood, Charlton da Costa. If they
17 wish to appear I have no problems with that other than
18 their status is non-statutory, rather than statutory.

19 MR CHEYNE: We did not know the programme today, so we have
20 not come along specifically knowing which witnesses we
21 would meet today. We have only just discovered. So the
22 people who have come have not come -- when you said some
23 people will come because they have come for a particular
24 day, we were not aware of the programme for today.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: I apologise for that. It was my intention,

1 and in fact I prepared the agenda on Friday for
2 circulation. I understood that it had gone out to
3 everybody that we had an email address for.

4 MR CHEYNE: Not that I am aware of.

5 MR SANDISON: No, and what I received was --

6 MR CHEYNE: We have the notes of the meeting from the other
7 day, but we did not get this.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Hopefully we can deal with it because
9 in terms of the key issues I identified when we met last
10 Wednesday afternoon, the agenda really reflects those
11 key issues, and they are broken down into the topic
12 areas on the basis that it was more convenient to deal
13 with it this way. So hopefully that will be the most
14 productive way this afternoon, but clearly if it causes
15 any difficulties then I will return to it as necessary.

16 As you can see, we have the presence of the
17 TV cameras here again this afternoon. Is there anybody
18 who has an objection to this session being filmed? No?
19 Thank you.

20 I want to say a little bit about procedure for this
21 afternoon. As I explained last week in the preliminary
22 meeting that I held, today would take the form of
23 a round table discussion, that we would bring together
24 the objectors, we would bring together the witnesses for
25 the LDA, and we would structure a discussion and give

1 the opportunity for the topic areas to be explored, and
2 that residents will have the opportunity in the same way
3 as a formal appearance of asking LDA members questions.

4 As I say, I have circulated an agenda which I hope
5 you all have in front of you now, and we will endeavour
6 do follow that as best we can. It will give us
7 a framework for working this afternoon, and hopefully
8 pick up as part of that all of the relevant issues that
9 are of concern to the residents of Clays Lane, and you
10 will have the opportunity of questioning those
11 particular elements.

12 MR SANDISON: Mr Rose, could I get a copy of this?

13 THE CHAIRMAN: I think some more can probably be circulated.

14 In front of you you have name plates. These have
15 special significance, not only for me in terms of
16 identifying speakers and for the purposes of the
17 stenographer. What I am going to ask you is that if
18 you want to speak at a particular point in time --
19 because bearing in mind I have a dozen or so of people
20 around the table; I may not always be able to pick you
21 out -- can I ask you that if you want to speak, to raise
22 your Toblerones like that, and then I can see that they
23 are in the raised position, pick people out, and then
24 give you the opportunity to speak. I know sometimes
25 with these round table sessions somebody says something,

1 and five people want to speak. Those go up; I take
2 them. If the point is covered and you no longer want to
3 contribute to that particular topic, then put them into
4 the horizontal position. We will see how it goes.

5 It is also important, as far as possible, that there
6 is only one person talking at a time. The stenographer
7 has a difficult enough job as it is without trying to
8 record what two people are saying consecutively.

9 I am also aware that there is a significant number
10 of documents that have been laid with the Inquiry.
11 I have picked out a number of those. I cannot guarantee
12 that I have them all, but I am fairly familiar with
13 documents and I will do my best to keep pace. But if we
14 need specific documents, then we will pause so that we
15 can get those in.

16 I should also say that when speaking, if you could
17 speak up, because we are not working with the benefit of
18 microphones for the room -- the microphones are for the
19 benefit of the stenographers -- and also not to speak
20 too quickly. Anybody with a mobile phone that is still
21 switched on, now is the time to switch it off and save
22 yourself from potential embarrassment later on.

23 With it being such a warm day, if any of you want to
24 remove jackets I have no objections to that.

25 Also in terms of the arrangements for this

1 afternoon, what I intend to do is to break the afternoon
2 down into one hour or one and a half hour sessions,
3 depending upon where we get to in the agenda. I will
4 not break it unnecessarily, but at least there will be
5 a couple of breaks during the course of this afternoon,
6 as necessary. If at any time anybody wants
7 clarification on any point, then please do not hesitate
8 to ask. Before I move on to the agenda, is there
9 anything anybody wishes to raise in terms of procedure?

10 Okay, thank you. I should say, I have been handed
11 the copies of the objections of Dorothy Spendiff and
12 Anita Morton, and I can confirm that those are
13 registered as objections. I had asked initially when
14 I opened, because I had not received proofs and I was
15 not aware of an appearance this afternoon. I shall make
16 sure that I have a look at those as we go along,
17 probably in the first adjournment to make sure I have
18 read those. There is also one other convention we have
19 adopted at the Inquiry. If there is an aircraft passing
20 then by all means pause rather than attempt to compete,
21 because we have found that the aircraft usually win!

22 We will move on to the agenda. The first item that
23 I had identified was the background to the compulsory
24 purchase order. It seems a logical place to start,
25 really, and as part of that I have sub-divided it.

1 The first of those elements is the case for
2 regeneration of the locality, and the Clays Lane area in
3 particular. I should say that during the first week of
4 the Inquiry I heard evidence, I think primarily from
5 Mr Prior, about the long-term recognition of the need to
6 regenerate the Lower Lea Valley and to provide for
7 substantial levels of employment and housing to meet
8 future needs of the capital. In particular, he took me
9 through a raft of policies, both local and regional,
10 which from the mid-1990s had sought to achieve these
11 objectives. It was recognised as part of those
12 policies, particularly the earlier policies, that change
13 would not come about overnight, and that it would be
14 long-term, perhaps 20 to 30 years.

15 Recent policy documents seek to build on what has
16 been achieved in some areas to date, and the opportunity
17 to hold the Olympics was seen as a catalyst to speed up
18 the programme and to leave a lasting Legacy of
19 new homes, additional employment, improved
20 communications, sporting and community facilities, and
21 an improved environment.

22 (An Objector arrives)

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon. I understood that you have
24 other commitments before getting here. We have not
25 started any discussion yet, and I had just been

1 explaining procedure. I was going on to the first item
2 on the agenda. If you have not got one I am sure you
3 can share, or one will be provided shortly. And just
4 explaining a little about the background that I had been
5 given during the first week of the Inquiry, about the
6 policies leading up to the aim of regenerating the
7 Lower Lea Valley.

8 I was not intending to revisit any of those policies
9 in detail, but if there is anything we need to look at,
10 then clearly I will go back to those. But it seems as
11 though that policy background is largely undisputed, and
12 it provides the framework for the way that matters have
13 subsequently been brought forward.

14 There was one matter which was raised during the
15 first week of the Inquiry which might be useful to clear
16 up at this particular point in time, because it relates
17 I think to part of Mr Cheyne's objection in terms of the
18 lasting Legacy, in terms of what it means for homes and
19 jobs. There was some concern that there might have been
20 conflicting estimates of the number of jobs and the
21 number of houses that would be provided in Legacy. So
22 can I clear that one up first? Is there somebody for
23 the LDA who can deal with that?

24 MR CHEYNE: Can I clarify a point? I am not sure I am
25 really in agreement with the idea -- I am not sure how

1 this programme is going to work. I have actually
2 prepared notes on all of the different witnesses. I do
3 not know if this is going to be appropriate, but I was
4 hoping to be able to go through them. Because there are
5 a lot of different issues which have been raised by, say
6 for example Mr Prior, about the nature of the programme,
7 and the assumption that these programmes are beneficial.
8 I have produced some documents questioning whether or
9 not programmes of these kinds, these sort of mega-events
10 are necessarily appropriate, and the assumption also
11 that a programme of this kind, which is a sort of big
12 kind of infrastructure project, is necessarily
13 desirable. Mr Prior objects, for example, to the idea
14 of piecemeal development. I think piecemeal development
15 has a lot to be said for it. I did have points to make
16 on this, and as I said, I do not know how this is going
17 to be dealt with, but I have prepared notes on
18 Mr Prior's evidence.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: What we have is an agenda which provides
20 a framework. It is not a straitjacket, it is hopefully
21 a way through, and then somewhere under those
22 subheadings there will be the opportunity of asking
23 those particular questions. What we will do, as the
24 afternoon goes on we will give you time to review the
25 progress that has been made. So if there is

1 a particular area that has not been questioned
2 sufficiently, then I will invite you to go back to it.
3 Or if you indicated a particular point in time: "Is this
4 the best area where I can deal with...?", then we can
5 decide whether it slots in conveniently to the agenda.

6 MR CHEYNE: I am quite happy to go along with that, but
7 because I have not prepared it in exactly the format
8 that has been laid out here, what I have done is just
9 gone through everything. And therefore the point is
10 there are issues which it is going to be maybe difficult
11 for me to simply say: I can suddenly remember, there is
12 a section in Mr Prior's evidence... So what I would
13 like to have is the opportunity to go through his
14 evidence, and it may be there are issues which you say
15 will have been covered, but what I would like to do is
16 be able to look at them in detail.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Just tick them off. Yes, indeed. In fact
18 the point that you have making about the 'big event', as
19 opposed to a series of sequential smaller events, or the
20 usual way of policy and so on, that hopefully we will
21 pick that up as we go along. At least you flagged it
22 now anyway. Hopefully it will just be useful to start
23 with being clear about what was left uncertain in that
24 first week, although I do know that there has been
25 a subsequent note, LDA 11, which deals with it. But it

1 was really for the benefit of the local residents who
2 may not have seen that; it is just to recap on that
3 position.

4 MR PRIOR: I will take that. It is in my evidence-in-chief
5 in 3.93, where I talked about the additional employment
6 space which -- it was estimated in the application that
7 10,000 jobs, which is a net gain of about 4,500 within
8 the Olympic park itself. Over 9,000 new homes, and the
9 other issue within this was the percentage of affordable
10 housing, which was targeted at 50 per cent under the
11 mayor's plan. To support that, supporting schools,
12 social infrastructure, health centres, et cetera, and
13 that was all set out in the original planning
14 permissions for the Legacy part of the Olympic plan.
15 And then sitting at the core of that was the major new
16 park space which formed the centrepiece of the Olympic
17 games, and became this major new recreation and
18 ecological space at the centre of this redevelopment of
19 the Lea Valley.

20 In order to spread the benefit of that, I talked in
21 my evidence about the connections out to the wider area,
22 east and west across the valley, the routes north and
23 south through the valley, and in effect as we have seen
24 in other parts of the evidence, put it in the context of
25 the Lower Lea Valley opportunity area framework, which

1 talks about this as a regeneration element within
2 a bigger strategy and context for the Lea Valley as
3 a whole.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: In terms of the number of new homes, you say
5 9,000, and I know Mr Cheyne, in your statement you were
6 indicating that the LDA Statement of Case refers to:
7 "the London plan anticipated 4,500 homes would be built
8 in the Stratford area, and 6,000 in the Lower Lea Valley
9 by 2016". So that comes to 10,500, and I think the
10 point you were raising perhaps with Lord Coe in the
11 first week was: is it 9,000; is it 10,500? Why the
12 difference?

13 MR CHEYNE: Slightly different. That is certainly a point,
14 but I think my concern was 9,000 new homes I understand
15 would include the homes built on Stratford City -- that
16 is, the Olympic village. Is that correct, or not?

17 MR PRIOR: It included elements of the Olympic village, but
18 it is not the total of the Stratford development.

19 MR CHEYNE: Right. What I am getting at is -- I do not know
20 how many homes are going to be coming out from the
21 Olympic village, in terms of the legacy. How many homes
22 are expected to be produced by the Olympic village?

23 MR PRIOR: I will have to check my notes on that.

24 MR CHEYNE: The principle of the point is that if those
25 houses are included in this total of 9,000, then those

1 homes would already have been provided by Stratford
2 City, because the Olympic village is now situated for
3 the most part on Stratford City. So any homes which
4 would have been built were already designed to be built
5 on the Stratford City site. So if the Olympic village
6 is producing new homes, then those homes are already
7 included, because eventually they would have been built
8 on that site anyway. So the 9,000 figure cannot include
9 those figures, those houses.

10 MR JONES: The figures for Stratford City are partly covered
11 by that 9,000 total, but not in total.

12 MR CHEYNE: I understand. So Stratford City is supposed to
13 produce somewhere around 4,500 houses, of which I think
14 about 3,000 roughly are Olympic village houses. So that
15 means you have to subtract the Olympic village houses,
16 because they are already part of the Stratford City
17 development. So if your figure of 9,000 includes those
18 houses, then effectively it is not 9,000; it is actually
19 more like 6,000 or 5,000, or whatever, because those
20 houses are part of a site. They are simply going to be
21 modified after the project, and they would have been
22 there anyway because they were already included in the
23 Stratford City development.

24 MR PRIOR: I understand where you are coming from. I think
25 the point to make is that you have the wider valley

1 development of housing, plus Stratford. There is
2 a component of those within those numbers which were the
3 overlap with the Stratford scheme. What has happened
4 with the amendments to the Olympic village going
5 forward, which as you quite rightly said has brought it
6 further inboard to Stratford, that that does not
7 actually detract from the total number of houses,
8 because the intent is still to take the development of
9 Stratford up towards the M11, A12. So in effect you end
10 up with a quantum of houses in the area that should stay
11 approximately about the same.

12 MR CHEYNE: I understand, but the point I am making is --
13 let us simplify it. Does the 9,000 include the housing
14 in the Olympic village?

15 MR PRIOR: It will be a larger number now in terms of --
16 there is more of that number within the Olympic village,
17 and therefore the elements being delivered above and
18 below the Olympic village will be a larger number. But
19 the total quantum will be the same, i.e. 9,000 plus that
20 which was a residual from Stratford.

21 MR CHEYNE: Maybe you can answer the question fairly simply,
22 because I am getting a bit confused. Does the 9,000
23 total simply include the figures from the Olympic
24 village? Are they part of this total?

25 MR PRIOR: They were part of the original total, yes.

1 MR CHEYNE: Okay. In that case, the figures, the housing on
2 the Stratford City site which was -- which included
3 Olympic housing from the beginning --

4 MR PRIOR: Start the point again.

5 MR CHEYNE: The 9,000 houses include the houses which are
6 going to be built as part of the Olympic village, and
7 the Olympic village was located from the beginning -- a
8 large proportion of it -- on the Stratford City site.

9 MR PRIOR: A proportion of it. It was not a large
10 proportion.

11 MR CHEYNE: Well, most of it. But whatever proportion we
12 are talking about, that proportion was on the
13 Stratford City site. So that proportion was always
14 going to be built as part of the Stratford City site --

15 MR PRIOR: Yes.

16 MR CHEYNE: Because it is going to be modified for the
17 purposes of the Olympics. So that proportion of housing
18 was going to be built regardless. So the 9,000 homes
19 are not new in that case; they are converted houses,
20 some of them, from the Stratford City site. So that
21 means they cannot be extra to what was going to be
22 produced anyway. These houses were going to be built
23 whether the Olympics came or not. Therefore the homes
24 on the Stratford City site cannot be considered to be
25 new in the sense of the Olympics as opposed to what was

1 already going to be built for Stratford City. So the
2 9,000 figure is an overestimate.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: As I understand it, what you are saying is
4 that it is not 9,000 new homes are going to be provided
5 as a block from the Olympics, because so many of that
6 9,000 would have been built irrespective of the Olympics
7 on Stratford City.

8 MR PRIOR: Exactly. If this is the Stratford box here,
9 there is an area of housing north of Stratford which is
10 the primary residential area of Stratford. Clays Lane
11 estate lies in about this location here. The estimate
12 of 9,000 was the entire housing in the Olympic valley,
13 some of which was the part of the Olympic village which
14 was to be built and accounted for by the Olympics which
15 partly overlapped the Stratford site.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: If there were to be no Olympics, would the
17 number have been the same?

18 MR PRIOR: That proportion had planning permission under
19 Stratford planning application, so this element would
20 have been in the Stratford numbers. But it is not --

21 MR CHEYNE: That is the point I am making. There is
22 a figure of 9,000 --

23 MR PRIOR: There is an overlap.

24 MR CHEYNE: It is not an overlap, this is an overestimate,
25 because you are claiming that these 9,000 houses will

1 come simply from the Olympics. But actually
2 a proportion of these houses would have been built
3 anyway with Stratford City. So the 9,000 houses may
4 indeed all be part of the Olympic village and so on,
5 some of them, but nonetheless they would have been built
6 anyway. So the 9,000 figure is an overestimate.

7 MR PRIOR: Other than the fact that the LDA's regeneration
8 activities in this area and its building of the Olympic
9 village makes certain that those actually happen.

10 MR CHEYNE: You are suggesting Stratford City would not
11 build the houses? I think that is a bit rough on
12 Stratford City. I am sure they would end up building
13 the homes which they said were going to be built. Are
14 you suggesting that they would not build them?

15 THE CHAIRMAN: I will come to Mr Armstrong in just a moment.
16 We will just finish this particular point.

17 MR BLACKER: I think in terms of Stratford City the LDA had
18 very serious concerns even before the Olympic decision
19 was announced about whether Stratford would actually be
20 able to deliver the scheme that they had got planning
21 permission for, and we were looking very seriously in
22 terms of regeneration and the Compulsory Purchase Order,
23 whether we would have needed to take that land forward
24 as we have in another part of the Olympic consents.

25 Certainly there were serious issues about access to

1 the site, very, very significant section 106 costs, and
2 also doubts about the actual consortium's ability to
3 deliver. The consortium has, since -- you may have
4 followed in the news, has actually disintegrated. We
5 are now back with London and Continental Railways, and
6 the only way that Stratford City is actually going to
7 get delivered now is in partnership with the Olympic
8 Delivery Authority and the London Development Agency.
9 And in a non-Olympic scenario, clearly serious issues
10 would have had to be looked at.

11 So I do not think you can take it as a given that
12 the Stratford City land and Stratford City residential
13 units would have been built without the intervention of
14 any other public bodies coming in to make the
15 development happen.

16 MR ARMSTRONG: There are a number of points which are being
17 melded together between Mr Prior and Mr Blacker. First
18 of all, as far as I am aware -- and it would be
19 beneficial if at a future point we have the full-sized
20 drawings of the Olympic Legacy and the non-Olympic
21 Legacy available for all in this room to observe. As an
22 architect myself, I was aware that the Olympic Legacy
23 plans, in the last time that I saw them, they had
24 a development for the Olympic village that straddled the
25 boundary between the Stratford City development and the

1 wider Lea Valley, Lower Lea Valley area, in a manner
2 which is similar to the kind of set drawings that you
3 have illustrated there. But the non-Olympic Legacy did
4 not have that, but still had the provisions that
5 Mr Cheyne was referring to. They were not present in
6 the -- obviously the non-Olympic version was not
7 present. So when you are asking the question, as you
8 rightly asked: would the non-Olympic village --
9 non-Olympics version of the development plan for the
10 Stratford area include the 9,000 houses, they would not
11 have included those 9,000 houses. They would not at
12 all, because they would not even be present; they would
13 not even be -- they were not visible on the Legacy map,
14 they were not visible on -- they were not illustrated.
15 As far as I was aware it was a computerised mock-up of
16 an aerial shot which would have included the non-Olympic
17 Legacy. They were not there; they were not part of the
18 20 year development plan. They were not there. So I do
19 not know how they could materialise, as you put it,
20 simply because the other side of the divide between
21 Stratford railway lands, the Stratford lands, and the
22 wider Lower Lea Valley area. To me it does not work,
23 I am sorry.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Prior?

25 MR PRIOR: I was asking for clarification. When you are

1 talking about the non-Olympic plan, were you referring
2 specifically to the Stratford planning application, and
3 the illustrations for the Stratford project?

4 MR ARMSTRONG: I am referring to, as a Clays Lane
5 resident -- because that is always my point of reference
6 -- the numerous occasions where the consortium you were
7 referring to before, Chelmsfield, and the LDA, they came
8 and made presentations. A number of those presentations
9 are still extant in the main meeting room on the
10 Clays Lane estate. And they presented two formats; one
11 which involved -- a format which involved the Olympics,
12 and one which in those days involved the non-Olympics.
13 I would not be referring to the non-Olympic thing at all
14 until you raised it, but as you raised it and then you
15 made this point that they would have included these
16 extra homes because they were the other side of the
17 boundary, I cannot allow that to pass. That is a
18 misnomer.

19 MR PRIOR: I think we are talking at cross purposes, maybe.
20 Possibly I can try and clear that up.

21 MR ARMSTRONG: My original point is separate, so I will keep
22 this raised.

23 MR PRIOR: If I go to the plans in CD25, and look at
24 possibly plan 21 --

25 MR ARMSTRONG: Bearing in mind the CPO is for a specific set

1 of plans.

2 MR PRIOR: Yes.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: I do not want to get drawn too far into this,
4 but clearly I need the information. It was something
5 that was raised in the objections, and it is a matter of
6 clarifying this point as to whether the element of 9,000
7 homes is 9,000 purely associated with the Olympics, or
8 whether it draws on other planning permission that would
9 have happened or would have been capable of happening in
10 any event, subject to resolving section 106 and access
11 issues. So it is that sort of breakdown that I am
12 seeking to establish here.

13 MR PRIOR: Turning particularly to the inspector's last
14 point, the 9,000 houses are those which lay outside the
15 Stratford planning application boundary area, or were
16 delivered by the Olympics within the Stratford planning
17 application. So that is where the delivery of the
18 Stratford housing was taken into that 9,000 number, for
19 the pints that Mr Blacker has made, plus the rest of the
20 housing provision that was within the Olympic zone as
21 part of the Legacy scheme.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Are you able to say how many of those 9,000
23 are specifically as a result of the Olympic proposals as
24 opposed to the Stratford proposals?

25 MR PRIOR: We can get you that number, sir.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is the key point. We do not
2 need to know the mechanisms; what we need to know is an
3 indication of the number to the nearest 100 or so.

4 MR CHEYNE: I think the point is is that the figure they
5 have given is not correct. They have said 9,000. It is
6 not 9,000, because some of these houses would have been
7 built on the Stratford City site because they are going
8 to be modified. They are buildings which were already
9 planned, already agreed, and they have been modified for
10 the purposes of the Olympics. The LDA is claiming 9,000
11 houses would be delivered simply by the Olympics. That
12 is not true. Some of these house would have been
13 delivered as part of the Stratford City programme
14 anyway.

15 MR PRIOR: Subject to Mr Blacker's point about concerns
16 about the delivery.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: That was the basis on which I explained it,
18 that would have been capable of implementation if the
19 issues of the section 106 and access could be resolved
20 on the basis there was a planning permission, that there
21 were difficulties associated with it that so far as your
22 case is concerned, that the Olympics is the mechanism of
23 actually bringing forward Stratford City because you
24 have the wherewithal to resolve access and other
25 considerations. But I was simply seeking to separate it

1 on the basis that there was a planning permission for
2 that, and to be quite clear in terms of -- if you
3 separate Stratford City, you separate the Olympics, then
4 we can get some indication as to those numbers.

5 MR PRIOR: We will get that number.

6 MR CHEYNE: I would also like to say, it is kind of
7 prejudicial to be referring to the Stratford City
8 developers here when they are not here to answer the
9 accusations being made. I cannot say whether these
10 points are correct or not --

11 THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think we need worry about those too
12 much.

13 MR CHEYNE: Others decided to raise this, and I think it is
14 difficult for us to deal with such points. And I think
15 it is very difficult also, as I say, for people who are
16 not present to have statements made about them. It may
17 be that the whole programme is a complete disaster, but
18 the whole bid has been set out along the lines that
19 Stratford City and the Olympics are joint projects, that
20 they will assist each other, and that is the programme
21 that has been agreed. So they have put it across that
22 Stratford City is essential to their programme; as much
23 as that Stratford City needs the Olympics, the Olympics
24 needs Stratford City. That is the line they have taken.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: That is the line raised in your objection.

1 We may need to come back to that, because one of the
2 issues was Stratford City -- it may, by the time we get
3 to that point proper on the agenda, we may have dealt
4 with it. But at least it will give us a time for
5 reflection so that if there are areas you want to
6 explore further, they you can do.

7 MR SANDISON: Probably an extremely silly question, but what
8 is section 106?

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Planning applications are subject to
10 conditions in the normal way. The development should
11 start within so many years, details of road layouts,
12 materials; all sorts of things. Sometimes there are
13 areas which cannot be dealt with by condition, because
14 they might require works to be done on other land which
15 is not part of the planning application. It might
16 require funds to be made available for recreation
17 provision, education provision.

18 Those matters cannot be the subject of planning
19 conditions; they have to be the subject of an agreement
20 between the applicant and the local authority. Those
21 are referred to as section 106 agreements. In very
22 simple terms, they are a condition that needs to be
23 fulfilled before the development can go ahead. So it is
24 an area that needs agreement. So it is a similar effect
25 to conditions, but for legal reasons there are certain

1 matters which cannot be imposed as conditions; they have
2 to be achieved by agreement.

3 MR ARMSTRONG: Can I just make the point that I wanted to
4 make. Mr Prior, you made the statement -- and this
5 might seem a small point -- but I just need
6 clarification as to what you mean by "affordable".
7 Because it has been used so many times, and I need to
8 have a blanket statement that then we can refer to at
9 a future point.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Can somebody cover affordable housing,
11 because I think whilst it may not be strictly relevant
12 to this area, but I appreciate what you are saying, and
13 we will need at some stage to be clear what -- I am not
14 arguing with you, I am confirming the reason why I want
15 it. We will need to know what affordable housing is,
16 and may well assist us more on Thursday.

17 MR BLACKER: Certainly by Thursday we can get a detailed
18 sort of definition.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Can we have an off-the-cuff one, and if need
20 be we can have a written one.

21 MR BLACKER: It is affordable housing to be delivered by
22 registered social landlords. It will be a combination
23 of intermediate to rent, shared ownership, and
24 social rented accommodation, and will be working within
25 constraints set by the Housing Corporation in terms of

1 the levels of rent that would be set for those
2 properties. But I am happy to get a more detailed --
3 THE CHAIRMAN: Does that help you, Mr Armstrong, as
4 a starting point?
5 MR ARMSTRONG: That helps as a starting point.
6 THE CHAIRMAN: Again turning to Mr Cheyne. One of the
7 elements you have referred to is this issue about
8 Stratford: does Stratford need the games, does the games
9 need Stratford.
10 MR CHEYNE: You also raised the point talking about homes.
11 And the issue of jobs, exactly how many jobs are going
12 to come out of this?
13 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, there are a number of 10,000 I think
14 which was a net gain of at least 4 and a half thousand
15 over existing employment levels.
16 MR CHEYNE: What I would like to ask really is -- I thought
17 they were going to come up with a bigger figure than
18 this. I was a bit surprised to find only 4,500 jobs are
19 going to be created by this project, and I am assuming
20 we are talking long-term rather than simply the Olympic
21 period itself.
22 MR PRIOR: Yes.
23 THE CHAIRMAN: This is part of Legacy, is it not? Yes.
24 MR CHEYNE: I was expecting them to come up with a bigger
25 figure than this. Again, there are different issues

1 here. One is: "What separation is there again between
2 Stratford City and the Olympics?" is one issue.
3 The second issue is how exactly these figures can be
4 calculated, because it is very difficult to know how
5 many jobs are going to come out of a particular project.
6 And thirdly, is this a kind of viable -- at what cost?
7 How much are you working out to create each job? We are
8 talking a very large programme, and how are you going to
9 assess the cost of creating each job? Is it assessed on
10 the cost of the total expenditure, or how are you going
11 to be able to actually work out whether this is
12 a cost-effective way of doing it. For example, there
13 are other ways of creating jobs which do not require
14 massive infrastructure projects; you can create them
15 as much smaller scale projects. So is it a cost
16 effective way of creating 4,500 jobs, or would it be
17 better to do it some other way?

18 MR PRIOR: I will take some of these points. The numbers
19 are based on the same basis that we looked at the
20 housing numbers. It is that which the Olympic is
21 responsible for delivering, and also the Legacy. The
22 jobs number therefore is primarily about the Legacy
23 situation, so there is a small overlap with Stratford in
24 terms of any jobs that might be within the housing
25 areas. But those 11,000 do not include the jobs in the

1 major employment zones, or the retail, or the leisure
2 facilities being planned for Stratford -- that is
3 outside that number. So the 11,000 is calculated from,
4 in effect, the land use consequences of the Legacy plan
5 that was brought forward. For instance, in the
6 Hackney Wick area we have planning permission for
7 a quantum of floor space in business use, and in the
8 nature of that floor space there is a --

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry to interrupt, but let us not get too
10 detailed into specific areas. Can we just concentrate
11 on the global picture in terms of how we assess the
12 anticipation of the net gain of jobs. Is it purely in
13 terms of employment density? What is it, how do we get
14 there?

15 MR PRIOR: You come at it from several directions. The land
16 use allocations in the Legacy plan cover both
17 traditional forms of work space. They include, for
18 instance, the sports facility themselves, which have
19 ongoing people working within them; there are things
20 like the social and schools infrastructure we put in,
21 which has teachers, classroom assistants, et cetera, all
22 of that. So you amalgamate that all together and you
23 have, as it were, a picture of the potential job
24 quantity that come out of an area like this. You are of
25 course trying to raise that number of jobs, and

1 therefore that affects what you are saying about the
2 type of land use you want to have in the long-term.

3 In terms of the net gain, you are simply subtracting
4 from that the jobs which are displaced by the building
5 of the games from the position that we have there at the
6 moment, and those numbers are quite easy to calculate.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: So in terms of, for example, the schools, the
8 sports facilities, presumably that is a fairly
9 straightforward exercise in terms of number of
10 classrooms equals numbers of teachers, equals numbers of
11 support staff.

12 MR PRIOR: Yes.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Then in terms of land allocations, presumably
14 that is on the basis that a certain proportion of the
15 allocations will be, say for example, warehousing and
16 distribution, low density employment; some will be
17 industrial and office, assumption about a certain
18 density, and so on. So presumably that is a simplified
19 basis as to how it might be calculated.

20 MR PRIOR: Yes, and those calculations were agreed with the
21 JPAT team -- the Joint Planning Authorities Team -- as
22 being the model that was seen as being the sort of
23 mid-point we would arrange those jobs over. And that is
24 what went into the planning applications, the
25 environmental assessments, as the position that was

1 assumed in terms of jobs provision.

2 Subsequent to that we have had a request about --
3 and a note has gone in on the relative density of jobs
4 which therefore arises compared to the position as we
5 see it at the moment. And of course you see what that
6 says is that there is a major increase, as it were, in
7 job density per hectare delivered by the Legacy
8 position, as opposed to where we are now, which is
9 fairly low density in terms of jobs provision in its
10 current state.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: What confidence do you have in terms of that
12 calculation being fairly accurate?

13 MR PRIOR: We are very confident, because it was in the
14 nature of the way we put the scheme together, and the
15 conversations with the local authority -- this was
16 a discussed and debated point with the local authorities
17 to get to those numbers, and it was of particular
18 interest to the local authority, in particular Hackney
19 in terms of work space provision at Hackney Wick.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Sandison.

21 MR SANDISON: One of the things you did say -- because
22 actually you were talking about creation of
23 environmental space, or "employment space" was the term
24 you used.

25 MR PRIOR: Yes.

1 MR SANDISON: So you are not actually talking about
2 job creation, you are talking about available space for
3 people to work in, in the event that you actually get
4 interested parties to come along with jobs to fill.

5 Because there are large chunks of documents, or chunks
6 of documents still as yet unutilised. So that is --

7 MR PRIOR: It is a very good point. You are absolutely
8 right. Just by creating space does not mean jobs will
9 follow, therefore one of the major strategies within the
10 planning applications, planning permissions for the
11 games, and one which the local authorities and the LDA
12 are taking forward, is a skills and training programme,
13 which has in effect two parts.

14 We know that the position of the adjacent boroughs
15 at the moment are relatively high levels of unemployment
16 in relation to London. We know where the skills
17 deficiencies -- we know we have language skills, we have
18 standard formal educational skills deficits. So those
19 training programmes are twofold in effect. One, to make
20 certain that the local workforce is trained to a level
21 where it can get access to the jobs created by the
22 delivery of the Olympic games. And that is not just
23 works on construction sites, it is to do with the
24 management and organisation of the process. This is
25 a six year, £3 billion construction programme; there are

1 a lot of jobs as it were embedded in both the delivery
2 of the games and Stratford.

3 More importantly though, it is how you, as it were,
4 train, educate, and retrain that workforce to be able to
5 go through that process and also be able to gain access
6 to jobs which effectively are in more modern sectors of
7 the economy compared to what is on site at the moment.
8 So there is an important element which is to do with the
9 training and skilling of the local workforce to have
10 access to that job provision.

11 MR SANDISON: Having spent some time in teaching and
12 further education in East London, looking at the way the
13 educational system is actually set up now, and the way
14 that it is planned to be set up, there is very little
15 planning or allowance made for the actual constituency
16 that you are addressing, in terms of what you hope that
17 your outputs are actually going to be.

18 MR PRIOR: Maybe Mr Black the can pick up on some of this,
19 but there are certainly major pieces of work going on in
20 the LDA at the moment about these issues and about these
21 training issues, and it is certainly a major issue in
22 the boroughs at the moment in terms of making certain
23 that -- and I said in my evidence over the last couple
24 of weeks, regeneration is not just about physical
25 change. We must have social training, education, and

1 cultural change alongside, otherwise we do not complete
2 the picture. And that is certainly a major piece of
3 work that the LDA are on with.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Cheyne, is there anything you wanted to
5 add that might be relevant?

6 MR CHEYNE: Quite a few points. I will go over the whole
7 thing, really. You seem to be agreeing that
8 Stratford City is going to produce some of these 4,500
9 jobs, so the figure again is --

10 MR PRIOR: A very, very small proportion.

11 MR CHEYNE: Take for example -- you included schools. There
12 is going to be school space and sports facilities on
13 Stratford City which were already included in that plan,
14 so those jobs presumably would be part of --

15 MR PRIOR: The Olympics are not delivering the
16 school facility at Stratford.

17 MR CHEYNE: You talked in terms of the kinds of jobs which
18 you will create, and you included schools within that.

19 MR PRIOR: Yes, but not within that number of jobs I have
20 given you.

21 MR CHEYNE: You did include at that figure originally, so if
22 you mentioned -- when you were talking about the kind of
23 jobs that were being created, you referred to schools as
24 one of the things.

25 MR PRIOR: But there are many other schools to be provided

1 within the Lee Valley or in the Olympic area.

2 MR CHEYNE: I am just trying to deal with the
3 Stratford City/Olympic overlap. You agreed that this
4 figure is, again, an overestimate. We do not know how
5 much by, but there is be a overestimate. Some of these
6 facilities would have been built on Stratford City
7 anyway.

8 In terms of other schools which will be built, here
9 we have a big problem with just deciding what homes
10 would have been created anyway. Even if the Olympics
11 had not come, Stratford is going to be a centre of
12 development. You may disagree with that, but I would
13 absolutely say Stratford is going to be a centre of
14 development, and homes are going to be built in London.
15 The figures which were provided by -- I think it was
16 Mr Jones's evidence, talk about capacity of 50,000
17 homes. So we have a very large number of homes. This
18 is in terms of -- in his section 384. And he is
19 referring to the fact that there is going to be
20 house building programmes any. So if houses are going
21 to be built anyway, other schools and facilities would
22 have been built in due course.

23 So one of the problems with trying to calculate what
24 is going to come simply as a result of the Olympics --
25 you may very well be correct in saying these facilities

1 are going to be provided by the Olympics in this
2 instance. But one of the problems of trying to estimate
3 the long-term programme is this stuff would have
4 happened, and this is part of the argument about whether
5 it should have been this kind of programme or a more
6 piecemeal kind of programme.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: In terms of those figures, the indication was
8 there would be a net gain of something like 4,000 over
9 existing employment matters.

10 MR PRIOR: That is correct.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Does that take on board what would have
12 happened within Stratford City, with schools to serve
13 residential development that might have taken place
14 anyway?

15 MR PRIOR: No, the provision of those jobs was directly
16 within the area that the games was delivering. The
17 school did not form part of that calculation. So the
18 secondary school at Stratford is outside that
19 calculation. The schools I refer to are the other
20 schools within the northern end of the valley that would
21 come as a consequence of the 9,000 houses, or
22 9,000 minus whatever.

23 MR CHEYNE: I understand that, but --

24 MR PRIOR: It is fair to say the total quantum of houses on
25 which we base those calculations will not change.

1 Whether there is an overlap with Stratford or not, the
2 total quantum of housing within the area will be what
3 the planning applications and permissions said, and that
4 is what is driving the level of social infrastructure.

5 MR CHEYNE: I understand, but it is still the case that we
6 have already agreed that that figure is overestimated.
7 All I am saying is when you are trying to figure out
8 whether a particular project is a good project, you also
9 have to consider what might have happened if you had not
10 done this project. So one of the problems with trying
11 to estimate specifically these figures is that some of
12 these things would have happened anyway. My point is
13 not that necessarily you are not going to create most of
14 the 4,500, or I think this is an overestimate on the
15 basis of what you have been saying. But we are also
16 trying to estimate the overall cost benefit, because
17 I also asked: how cost effective is this programme in
18 creating these jobs? Because when you are trying to
19 invest public money you are trying to work out whether
20 this is the best way of doing it, or whether it could
21 have been done better in a different kind of programme.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: This is one of the dilemmas that -- in terms
23 of a large regeneration project, you can perhaps say
24 that in terms of the regeneration it will create
25 X-thousand jobs. The difficulty is presumably of the

1 "do nothing" situation. What would happen in that
2 situation? Jobs might still be created, but then that
3 leaves the problem in terms of this balance.

4 MR CHEYNE: Can I try and deal with that. We could look at
5 what is going on in Stratford at the moment. It has to
6 be said that whether or not anybody is doing anything,
7 you just walk around Stratford, in the last five years
8 the place has changed quite dramatically, and there are
9 blocks of flats going up all over the place. You look
10 at Stratford High Road, which was a complete mess
11 a few years ago, and it is now beginning to become
12 a centre for Stratford. And you even have a Porsche
13 showroom in Stratford, which is quite astonishing.

14 So I think the idea that Stratford would remain the
15 same is simply not tenable. We are talking here about
16 a particular programme which is trying to produce
17 further benefits. One of the things with trying to
18 estimate regeneration in this context is that we have
19 a developing programme anyway. There is stuff going on.
20 So all of the figures about present prosperity in
21 Stratford are undergoing change, and it is difficult to
22 estimate on the basis of previous calculations where we
23 are exactly now.

24 Coming back to the cost-effectiveness of this
25 programme, have you estimated how much these jobs are

1 going to cost? When you try and launch a job creation
2 project, inevitably it is criticised later on because it
3 says: each job has costs £20,000 to create, or £100,000
4 to create. Do you have figures as to how much these
5 jobs are going to cost?

6 THE CHAIRMAN: I will let you come back to that. Sorry,
7 Mr Blacker -- every time you want to say something,
8 I stop you. But one of the other things perhaps to be
9 added in is the time issue, as well. Because in terms
10 of the job creation, the do nothing situation, and the
11 point that you make about Stratford getting on with it
12 in any event, is whether the do nothing situation might
13 eventually, 20, 30 years down the line, deliver
14 a similar number without intervention. The same of
15 intervention to actually bring it forward and to get it
16 there quicker.

17 MR CHEYNE: The gateway proposals which you have quoted, or
18 Mr Jones quoted, indicate that actually they do have
19 expectations. The original proposals, the original idea
20 was that gateway would result in these kind of -- they
21 talk about 20 to 30 years. What I would actually assess
22 that might be a long estimate because of the rapid
23 process of change which is occurring anyway. You may
24 disagree with that but however much, I think a lot of
25 these proposals will come forward anyway.

1 One of the issues, particularly for residents of
2 Clays Lane, is that this is a brutal project so far as
3 we are concerned, because we are being kicked out. So a
4 more gentle process, a more piecemeal process might not
5 have resulted in this happening to us. So the losses
6 which are occurring, for example in terms of the jobs
7 which are going to be lost as a result of this
8 programme, probably would not have happened under a
9 piecemeal scheme. So piecemeal scheme would mean that
10 certain kinds of activities which are desirable in
11 themselves -- because waste management, recycling is an
12 important activity in today's modern society -- those
13 programmes are going to be pushed out, and they are
14 going to have difficulty in finding other places to go.
15 They had a niche, and that niche could have been
16 preserved. Even while development was going alongside
17 the river to green up the river, you could still have
18 relocated some of those businesses locally. And the
19 Olympics are basically creating a completely new kind of
20 industrial or commercial landscape in that sector. So
21 you could say that the loss of jobs there is actually
22 unnecessary in terms of regeneration.

23 MR PRIOR: Lots of points there. If Mr Blacker goes first
24 then I will come back on some.

25 MR BLACKER: I have picked out three or four things that we

1 can pick up on. In terms of the issue of value for
2 money, there is not an exact science that you can sort
3 of apply: "there is 3,000 new jobs, it is going to cost
4 X-hundred thousand pounds to deliver, therefore it is
5 value for money..." You tick boxes, particularly of a
6 scheme the size we are talking about. Because it is not
7 only jobs, there is new homes, new park and community
8 facilities. It is the whole regeneration of an area
9 that has to be looked at, and the long-term investment
10 that is going to come in, the health benefits;
11 everything that flows from that.

12 That said though, when Arups did the initial work
13 for us that was being referred to in some of the proofs
14 of evidence back in 2002, there was an attempt at sort
15 of an analysis of the costs of the Olympics, and the
16 financial benefits that the Olympics would bring, or
17 trying to quantify elements of that benefit in a way
18 that justified value for money. And there was enough in
19 that that convinced us and convinced the board of the
20 LDA that it justified its commitment of the finance.

21 It did not stop there though. After we had been
22 satisfied ourselves, before we were given authority to
23 take it forward and spend large amounts of public money
24 on a big project, we then have to go through a full
25 analysis process ourselves, which we did back in 2003,

1 which would have involved a sort of economic appraisal
2 of the whole project. And that was signed off by
3 various Government departments, including the treasury,
4 before we were then given the authority to take the
5 project forward and commit to the spend.

6 It is important to know we were actually given the
7 authority to start spending that money back in 2003,
8 before the outcome of the Olympic decision was known.
9 So I think even in that circumstance, the case was very
10 clear that there was a need for the regeneration and the
11 regeneration expenditure in the Lower Lea Valley to go
12 forward. I think we picked up on change in Stratford.
13 There has been some change in Stratford, but it is small
14 change, and it is relatively isolated.

15 The Lower Lea Valley, wards in the Lower Lea Valley,
16 and adjoining the Lower Lea Valley, the significant
17 majority of those are in the 10 per cent of the most
18 deprived wards in the country, based on ODPM statistics,
19 or whatever the new department is called. And actually
20 quite a lot of them are actually in the 5 per cent of
21 the most deprived wards across the whole country. So as
22 far as the LDA is concerned there is no doubt the
23 Lower Lea Valley area is very definitely in need of our
24 financial support and assistance to take forward
25 regeneration.

1 My responsibility is very much on the physical side,
2 delivering the development, ensuring the development
3 happens, but there is an equivalent division within the
4 LDA that is completely dedicated to sort of ensuring
5 that London and East London, the Lower Lea Valley area,
6 reaps the benefits of the Olympics, particularly in
7 terms of the training and skills opportunities, skills
8 development that will come forward. And there is a
9 director in that division whose job is to work very
10 closely with the five London boroughs and the UDC to
11 ensure that those benefits for local people are actually
12 achieved and we do not just end up with lots of new
13 buildings in place.

14 You have mentioned the loss of jobs. Again, it is
15 the LDA's aim not to lead to loss of jobs. We are
16 committed very, very clearly to trying to relocate all
17 of the businesses within the affected area -- within the
18 Olympic park area, and as we are sitting here now we
19 have to a stage where almost 70 per cent of those jobs
20 we have an identified site for the business to move to.
21 Quite a lot of those are very close to the Olympic zone.

22 You mentioned the waste businesses, and using sites
23 along the river -- that is actually what we are doing.
24 The Thames Water site we have just acquired from the
25 British Rail residuary board -- which you can probably

1 see, some of the piles of rubbish when you look across
2 the dock. So 11 or 12 acres of land that we are
3 actually now using to relocate a number of the waste
4 businesses and aggregates businesses. So they are
5 moving a couple of miles south, but there is a site --
6 we have identified that there is an issue in the
7 waste sector getting planning permissions, getting
8 people to release land. That is actually what we are
9 doing. We have secured other sites for waste businesses
10 as well, so we are dealing with the waste businesses and
11 the niche market they operate in, and we are also in
12 trying to ensure there is minimal loss of jobs as
13 possible.

14 With 14 months to go before vacant possession, we
15 are very confident we will have quite a small job loss
16 number at the end of that process. So it is a net gain
17 over the actual number, but the reality will be --
18 I think it is reasonable to say you are actually going
19 to have a net gain in terms of employment in the wider
20 area of actually the 10,000 jobs.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Before I invite Mr Cheyne, there was the
22 point Mr Sandison had raised about delivering in terms
23 of education and training. Is there anything you wanted
24 to respond to on that?

25 MR BLACKER: We have a specific division that we have set up

1 to actually deal with that. It is entering into an area
2 I am not expert on, but I would be very happy to get you
3 information on what the LDA is doing in that area.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Presumably you are interested in the next
5 step, not the fact that there is an element to deal
6 with; it it is the delivery of it, presumably, is it?

7 MR SANDISON: Yes, it is. If in fact -- the indications are
8 that as far as you have got, you are expecting a load of
9 volunteers for whom you are offering some kind of
10 vocational qualification for escorting people around the
11 Olympic park. I know there is actually more to it than
12 that, but certainly listening to Transport for London,
13 the majority of the jobs that they think are going to be
14 created --

15 MR BLACKER: The jobs we are talking about, they are
16 permanent jobs. One of the big areas that we do think
17 there is opportunities for people to develop the skills
18 in is in the construction sectors, as well. And in
19 terms of the numbers we have talked about, that has not
20 included any of the construction jobs and we are
21 estimating about 7,000 construction jobs in terms of
22 taking forward the whole Olympic and Legacy development.

23 MR SANDISON: Certainly so far as I can see, certainly in
24 east London in further -- the sixth form college, and
25 further education, therefore, there are not the

1 resources available to deliver those types of skills.

2 So obviously it is going to be developed.

3 MR BLACKER: I am quite happy and to Thursday if you were
4 maybe here a little earlier on Thursday I will be happy
5 to take you through some of the things the LDA is
6 proposing in doing.

7 MR CHEYNE: Dealing with skills and stuff like that. I have
8 a report here which I have put in as evidence. It is
9 not the report itself, it is a statement in The Guardian
10 about the fact the London Chamber of Commerce has
11 referred to a problem with the skills gap between those
12 people in East London that it considers will not be able
13 to meet the requirements of the Olympics. And it does
14 not talk about the post-Olympic situation, which may be
15 is not so relevant, but it says here -- the report from
16 the Guardian says:

17 "The London Chamber of Commerce and Industry says a
18 skills Legacy may be difficult to achieve unless there
19 are efforts to train those people and equip local people
20 and firms to win Olympic contracts."

21 I know you are referring to efforts have been made
22 in that area, but plainly there is a problem with making
23 sure that local people do actually benefit from the jobs
24 which may be available.

25 To come back to some of the other points that you

1 have raised, or which we both rise raised. When we are
2 talking about issues like deprivation, that is a movable
3 feast. I am not saying your figures are not accurate --
4 obviously they were accurate at the time, but they are
5 changing, and it is difficult to know how exactly how
6 that will develop because we have to compare the
7 possibilities of one scheme against another scheme. So
8 say for example we could have a project which leads to
9 higher rental values in the area, which means that
10 local people would find it difficult to live here. You
11 could therefore have new people moving in. The result
12 would be that you would have actually a new population,
13 and the kind of indices will change. Not because
14 actually there has been any change for local people, but
15 because there had been a migration in population.

16 So one of the consequences of the Olympics and these
17 kind of events, as I put in evidence, which I do not
18 know, but if you read about for example things that have
19 happened in Barcelona and Sydney and so on, is actually
20 you end up with a change in the population, or poor
21 people suffer as a result of these programmes, through
22 rent rises, evictions, land rises going up. The
23 consequence being that actually you do not have -- you
24 are not really dealing with the existing indices; you
25 are dealing with a new set of indices created by the

1 project itself. Of course if you do this in one big
2 rush then that can a bigger consequence in a shorter
3 period of time, and make it harder for people to adopt
4 than if you were doing it piecemeal. So again, we are
5 looking at it piecemeal so looking at the different
6 opportunities that may be created by different kinds of
7 projects.

8 If we are also considering for example the kind of
9 projections that you are talking about, of course
10 projections are often wrong. The Channel Tunnel is
11 a case in point. I have put in evidence about the
12 public accounts committee which points out that all the
13 projections for the channel tunnel were wrong. And we
14 have loads of other projects gone badly astray in terms
15 of projections for jobs, costs, and so on. So it is
16 always going to be a kind of a bit of a guessing game as
17 to what exactly is going to come out.

18 Finally I would say that when we are looking at,
19 say, the particular facilities that are going to be
20 created, there is also some -- well, there must be
21 a question as to what will happen with those facilities
22 in the future? One of the results of the Olympics is
23 that facilities which have been built with the best
24 intentions end up to be left derelict later on.

25 I know some of the facilities you are creating will

1 be demolished, but that does not mean the ones which are
2 left will not also end up in difficulties. So whether
3 those projects will survive, will not go bankrupt or
4 whatever, obviously we can all look at the dome, but if
5 we look at what happened in Sydney there are a lot of
6 facilities there which have gone bankrupt.

7 So job losses may occur within those sectors,
8 because almost certainly they will require public
9 funding to keep going. We had a sports centre in
10 Eastway which was losing a large sum of money, and was
11 actually closed ironically at the same time the Olympics
12 was declared. So these facilities are vulnerable to
13 overspends, to cost problems. So those sort of jobs,
14 they may survive, but there may be threats to those
15 jobs.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: A number of points there. The replacement of
17 the population? Can we deal with that one first of all?

18 MR PRIOR: Sir, can I go back to one of the earlier points
19 that was raised, which builds up, I think. Mr Cheyne,
20 you talked about this difference between
21 wholesale change and piecemeal change, which was the
22 sort start of your point on these issues.

23 There is change going on in the area. We have seen
24 it: there are blocks of flats going up, there are
25 changes being made; there is change in the retail base

1 to some extent. The value of regeneration in this area
2 is about making this, as it were, a community and
3 a place which can be designed and delivered in a way
4 that allows us to house and deal with the issues, and
5 employ and educate a very broad range of the community.
6 I think what we see in the threat of piecemeal
7 development is that due to the nature of the terrain to
8 some extent, the level of investment and infrastructure
9 required, the level of contamination on some sites, the
10 obligations that sit there in terms of contributions to
11 schools, et cetera, you are tending to see a pattern of
12 development in the area which is primarily to do with
13 smaller residential units, usually at very high density,
14 lots of flats being built, one or two-bedroom
15 apartments. And what we have been talking about I think
16 is the ability of larger regeneration projects to deal
17 with issues of infrastructure, to deal with issues of
18 remediation, to deal with issues of undergrounding
19 things like power lines, et cetera, to release land, in
20 a way that piecemeal development cannot do. We are
21 able, as it were, to set up a structure that will ensure
22 that we get family housing in the right proportions and
23 that you get affordable housing, subject to the
24 definition, in the right ways. And those are products
25 that effectively come out of the public sector's ability

1 to control that and to set up these plans in the right
2 way.

3 So I think there is change with piecemeal
4 development, but I think the question you have to ask is
5 whether it is the right type of change, and in effect
6 does it create a stable long-term community, because
7 does it actually provide family housing, does it deliver
8 the schools, does it deliver the infrastructure, does it
9 deliver essentially in this area the scale of
10 environmental improvement you would hope to see in order
11 to create the environment which you would choose to
12 bring up your children?

13 And when you look at the local population, which
14 I think goes back to this point about changing
15 population, the demographics of the adjacent communities
16 are relatively extraordinary compared to the rest of
17 London. We have a very young population, we have large
18 numbers of children, we have a diverse population; we
19 have in particular a cool on larger properties. And
20 that is all captured in the scheme that has gone forward
21 for planning permission. This is a scheme that, working
22 with the boroughs, responds to the needs of the
23 local community. So this is about -- and all the public
24 consultation I think was about -- was about access to
25 what we create here by local people. Yes, new people

1 will come in, but this has been predicated on the nature
2 of the place as we find it today, and making certain
3 that it responds to the needs in the adjacent boroughs.
4 That has been the entire intent from day one; that is
5 what has driven this thing.

6 If you therefore go to your point about what is the
7 nature of large scale change in population, the
8 demographics and the social indicators that Gareth
9 talked about are actually worked out on a very fine
10 grain. I think now under the census we are working on
11 200 or 300 housing units at a time. This is a very fine
12 grain mapping; literally street by street you can work
13 out what the issues are. If we do not see change in
14 those adjacent areas, which is actually relatively easy
15 to attract, but we see an extraordinary event happen in
16 the valley itself in terms of a new population, we would
17 have failed.

18 That is why so much of this project and so much of
19 the work that the UDC have done is about the context
20 area and the adjacent areas to it. This must be about,
21 as we keep saying, a catalytic event in the Lea Valley
22 which is about the adjacent population. So what we do
23 here must be seen in the context of the wider area. The
24 intent is not just to bring a completely new group of
25 people into this area, and that is why the approach to

1 affordable housing and large quantities of affordable
2 housing must be about it being available to local people
3 and having access to it.

4 So I think incremental change, piecemeal change does
5 not give you what you want, because we have seen what
6 the open market is delivering; large scale change allows
7 to you, as it were, plan these big changes. And let us
8 remember that the delivery of these homes and these jobs
9 will happen over a period of time. This will not all
10 happen the day after the games; this is a long-term
11 build programme against, in crude terms, a development
12 platform and a set of infrastructure that the games have
13 established in order to allow regeneration to follow.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Pause there. Mr Sandison.

15 MR SANDISON: I was curious. You said that as far as the
16 demographic analysis is concerned, you go down to
17 a very fine mapping. My request under the Freedom of
18 Information Act for the analysis of the socioeconomic
19 impact on the residents of Clays Lane actually resulted
20 in my receiving of the Grampian condition 1.51 and 2,
21 which basically stated that in terms of the environment,
22 socioeconomic impact was unlikely to be major. I am
23 paraphrasing. But actually there was nothing specific
24 relating to Clays Lane, which is what I had asked,
25 because obviously since we are the largest single

1 residential unit affected by this, I had not
2 unreasonably anticipated that since there is that
3 capability that something -- and in fact because they
4 are part of the impact, the international impact
5 assessment group, that something like that might have
6 been done out of simple courtesy for Clays Lane.

7 MR PRIOR: I have not been aware of the correspondence, but
8 my point was that the data against which these analyses
9 take place is readily available. It is the national
10 census information. My point was about the ability, as
11 it were, to understand the existing position from
12 a fine grain, and monitor change against the fine grain.
13 Actually an opportunity which is available now that
14 probably was not available two years ago, because the
15 system has moved on.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Does that satisfy the point you raised?

17 MR SANDISON: Not in the slightest.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: That is why I was giving you the opportunity
19 of coming back. I was trying to be neutral about it.

20 MR SANDISON: Thank you. No, it does not answer it at all.
21 All it does is actually highlight to me the fact that
22 the capability and capacities that are available have
23 not actually been applied to us. That is what that does
24 for me.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Can we take that any further?

1 MR PRIOR: I do not think so.

2 MR CHEYNE: I would like to take that further, very
3 specifically. I have asked two questions of the LDA,
4 asking for the documents justifying expenditure for
5 demolishing existing housing, clearing the site, and
6 rehousing residents, against developing other possible
7 sites, and documents justifying the loss of homes,
8 residents, for the purposes of building the athletes
9 village. And we did not get any response from that at
10 all.

11 When I looked at your evidence about estimating the
12 merits of demolishing Clays Lane as opposed to siting
13 the village, for example, at Fish Island, although you
14 looked at the physical problems all of which I had
15 difficulties understanding the problem because all the
16 points you made seemed to be covered by the claims that
17 were being made for the Olympic site, in other words for
18 example, the whole point about the Olympic programme was
19 to assemble land. One of the problems identified,
20 I think it was Fish Island, I will go back to that in
21 due course, is getting hold of land. So if the whole
22 project was designed to assemble land that does not seem
23 much of a reason.

24 So you have discussed the physical problems in
25 choosing alternative sites but the Clays Lane site had

1 on it, one of the questions raised as to whether it
2 should be chosen, was the issue of disruption to
3 residents. I would not call it disruption I would call
4 it simply demolition, not just of the housing but the
5 community. And actually there was no analysis of that
6 as being a factor to be taken into account when
7 considering which site should be chosen. So although
8 physical problems were identified and they were often
9 identified in terms of infrastructure problems, the
10 location in terms of people travelling to the games, or
11 the assembly of land, all of which could be covered,
12 dealt with in other ways, the one thing which you did
13 not analyse was the impact on Clays Lane residents.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: I am in the inviting to you respond now
15 because I want to look at consideration of alternatives
16 together.

17 MR CHEYNE: Can I come back to the other points talked
18 about? When we are talking about migration of people,
19 I am not suggesting you intend to swamp Stratford with
20 a new population but the problem is with these
21 programmes is they have unintended consequences --

22 THE CHAIRMAN: You were saying it would happen organically.

23 MR CHEYNE: You could say it could happen with piecemeal
24 development as well. That could also happen. However,
25 in a major programme like this, one of the problems is

1 the impact is much more sudden and takes more time for
2 populations to adjust and of course we as a particular
3 population will be removed anyway. Whether or not we
4 are going to receive the benefits is an argument we are
5 going to have later on. So the programme is more brutal
6 in that sense. The other issues which I would say --
7 for example you are dealing with contamination. I have
8 asked again for the documents on toxicity --

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Can we come back to contamination? That is
10 a separate one.

11 MR CHEYNE: The issue here is that the kind of things you
12 are referring to about your justification for the sort
13 of large scale dynamic one-off programme is that this
14 will produce results which cannot be produced any other
15 way. I query that in the sense that first of all it is
16 more brutal. Secondly, there are things which could be
17 done, like the cycle track at Clays Lane will be
18 removed. I know there will be a replacement for that
19 but that cycle track could still be there. The question
20 of contamination of the land up to now has not been an
21 issue. So nobody thought: we have to move the track
22 because of contamination.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Can we come back to contamination?

24 MR CHEYNE: The argument put forward to justify the
25 programme is that sll these things-- you are bringing

1 together all these arguments to justify this major
2 programme. When you look at these in specific areas you
3 may come to the conclusion there is not such a pressing
4 priority for those particular elements of the programme
5 to be put in place so each of those things may indeed be
6 brought together in order to justify a big programme but
7 if you were approaching it on a piecemeal fashion you
8 may then come to a different conclusion and say: well
9 actually, it is not such a vital thing to achieve this
10 goal in order to have this particular result. So for
11 example with things like developing transport routes and
12 so on, there may be different ways of accomplishing
13 those goals than producing a massive regeneration
14 programme and then saying: this is one of the benefits
15 that will come. These things could be done in different
16 ways. I think I made the point but I am just rehearsing
17 some of the issues.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Are you satisfied you have dealt with it with
19 previous answers?

20 MR PRIOR: I think I have covered most of the points from
21 the previous answer. We obviously have a difference of
22 opinion about how the impacts of these larger scale
23 projects and the difference between incremental and
24 wholesale redevelopment, only to say that the Olympic
25 games as an element has demands which come from both the

1 games itself. So it is not as though you can have
2 a little bit of the Olympic games in order to hold the
3 Olympic games. You hold the Olympic games, there are
4 consequences of that in terms of the way the thing
5 operationally has to be put together and managed. And
6 our job, I believe, is to make certain that it can be
7 used as the most effective lever, as it were, to get to
8 a regeneration and Legacy position because that is why
9 London bid for the games, based on the policy platform
10 that the inspector talked about at the beginning. The
11 intent is to regenerate this area. The Olympics is seen
12 as a way of doing that but there are consequences of
13 using the Olympics to do that and I think we have
14 probably exercised most of those points.

15 MR CHEYNE: One final comment on that. Absolutely. And
16 therefore it raises the basic question as to whether it
17 is a desirable programme, whether in fact the Olympics
18 should be in Stratford because plainly one of the
19 concerns here, to me anyway, is the main reason that
20 Stratford has been chosen is not regeneration, it is
21 that Stratford offers opportunities for the Olympics and
22 then in order to justify the coming of the Olympics you
23 then have to try to find all the different arguments
24 that need to be put together to say: this is why it
25 needs to be here rather than in some other place. We

1 effectively have two programmes claiming to be
2 regenerating Stratford. Talking about regeneration as
3 opposed to hosting the Olympic games, there are other
4 parts of London that could do with one of those
5 programmes. If the idea that regeneration is the goal
6 of the Olympics, which I do not think is true, then it
7 might have been sensible to divide that up and allow
8 somebody else to have some of those benefits rather than
9 piling them all into Stratford.

10 MR PRIOR: Big picture stuff. We started our evidence in
11 the first week with the long running series of policy
12 documents that have identified the need for regeneration
13 in this area and, I think, a trail of evolving planning
14 policy that has set out that objective long before the
15 Olympics came along as a mechanism of doing it. My
16 belief is London went after the games to use it to
17 deliver one of those regeneration needs within the city.

18 Across London there are many, many major
19 regeneration projects going on. You can see this site
20 here is one of those and they are all looking at
21 different mechanisms to make them happen. But none of
22 them is on the scale of this one which in effect is why
23 the Olympics is here and why we are using the Olympics
24 as a tool to make that scale of regeneration happen.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Blacker, then. I am going to move down to

1 this side of the table.

2 MR BLACKER: Again going back to 2001 and 2002 when the LDA
3 was working with the GLA and having early discussions
4 with the British Olympic association. We did look at
5 the whole of London and looked for alternative sites
6 across London and it became clear that the Lower Lea
7 Valley was the best site to take forward. The mayor
8 himself, after we had done that stage of work, the mayor
9 by his own admission is not one of the greatest sports
10 fans or sports participants and so certainly would not
11 be driven by the Olympics in isolation. He basically
12 said he was only willing to back after we had done that
13 analysis, back the Olympic bid if it was going to be
14 located in that area if it would bring significant
15 regeneration and economic benefits to that area. That
16 was the primary reason for the LDA and the GLA getting
17 behind the Olympic bid.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Miss Spendiff?

19 MS SPENDIFF: I am kind of backtracking on some things
20 because things have moved on by quite a few minutes in
21 the meantime. I am somebody who has lived in the
22 regeneration area before, in Doncaster as part of the
23 south Yorkshire coalfields regeneration. I was
24 a volunteer learning mentor with Learning Direct and
25 Basic Skills Tutors which was aimed at retraining,

1 reskilling people who have been unemployed through the
2 loss of the coal mines et cetera. What we found in that
3 area was that despite all the promises of opportunities
4 and new employment, education training, better housing
5 et cetera et cetera, people were still basically ending
6 up with -- if they come from unskilled jobs, they may do
7 some basic skills training programmes, they were ending
8 up in call centres or in the new Doncaster airport in
9 service industries, basically, or in construction. And
10 it seems to be all the skilled work ie tutors,
11 educators, people involved in the whole regeneration
12 business, were basically being imported from outside the
13 area because as you are saying with the Olympic boroughs
14 they are some of the most deprived boroughs in the
15 country with low levels of education, training skills.
16 I see the same thing happening again where basically the
17 local population that needs these opportunities are
18 going to be waiting while they are trained by people
19 from outside the area, employed by people from outside
20 the area. They are basically going to be funnelled into
21 service industries. You are admitting that the skills
22 are not there at the moment so these people are not
23 going to be able to access these opportunities and you
24 are going to have to import people to lead this
25 training, this education, new employment, housing,

1 whatever.

2 I have seen what actually happens in this situation
3 myself. I have been in a regeneration area and I just
4 see the same things happening. There has been endless
5 promises about training opportunities for local
6 residents and it all seems to be, I am afraid, the
7 service industry, construction. I have still yet to see
8 a massive opportunity for education and training. Some
9 of the courses that started have closed down again
10 through lack of funding. There was actually a whole
11 group of women moved into building, this was in a
12 newspaper in Stratford a few years ago, and it collapsed
13 through lack of funding. I was one of the people who
14 wanted to get into that, the training for opportunities,
15 and I could not do it because the funding was withdrawn
16 before I could even start the course. And that was
17 specifically aimed at women. Well, I am sorry, I have
18 not seen a replacement for it yet.

19 If women want to get into construction, which
20 apparently there is a real shortage and it is seen as
21 desirable, where is the opportunity? There is this
22 thing going on everywhere with: the local population
23 gets what is left, what they can manage to get hold of.
24 And you do get people coming in from other areas that
25 are more educated, more skilled. They are going to be

1 the people who can afford these new properties that are
2 being built. The local people cannot afford these
3 prices.

4 What we are talking about in Stratford, what is
5 going on already with the new housing that is being
6 built, the prices are totally beyond the reach of the
7 average person in the area. It is already happening.
8 One bedroom flats, £200,000. Sorry, but I am not
9 reassured by promises of regeneration and projection.

10 I am still in contact with people in Doncaster from
11 six years ago. The only people who have got permanent
12 jobs from it are people in the homelessness sector,
13 there is still a homeless problem in Doncaster, and
14 people who are still working for Learn Direct's basic
15 skills training. There is a very small percentage of
16 people that I knew who were ex-minors, lost their jobs
17 because all the local shops had closed down and the
18 local industry. They have not actually progressed that
19 far. There is still a big lack of decent housing. I am
20 really not that convinced, I am afraid.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr Armstrong.

22 MR ARMSTRONG: I do not want to repeat the point but
23 essentially this is -- the debate seems to be fixing on
24 this business of piecemeal verses wholesale. The
25 piecemeal development, the one big idea that gets the

1 hard sell and then the souffle falls flat after a few
2 years.

3 My point is that -- I come back to the point that
4 you made about the definition of affordable housing, in
5 that, as Clays Lane residents, we are the people that
6 these programmes should address. The pattern of the
7 large scale ideas that get injected into an area is the
8 reason why they need to be injected is because there is
9 a breakdown of a kind of industry that used to
10 predominate in that area, be it a primary or secondary
11 industry, that used to predominate. When a new big idea
12 comes along, essentially it is a new industry that comes
13 along. The local people are not up to speed on these
14 new industries at all. So they are going to be the last
15 people that are going to be drawn upon for the needs of
16 this new incoming big idea. And essentially the local
17 people are going to be tarred by the brush that they are
18 locals. Locals equals yokels, almost. They are not
19 going to be drawn upon.

20 So when it comes to the Olympics, the Olympics is
21 a wonderful idea in theory. It is a big idea that lasts
22 two weeks and if you include the Paralympics, a month.
23 But then beyond that there is little in the way that
24 I can see that the Olympics can contribute to the
25 sustainable development of the Lower Lea Valley. So

1 okay, you can use it as a lever as you put it, a lever
2 to effect regeneration, but it is one of those leavers
3 that will break, I am sorry, because it is not going to
4 be able to provide a sustainable model of regeneration
5 the way a piecemeal development, an accretive
6 development which employs local people, re-equipping
7 themselves and then recontributing to the skills base in
8 an area and then availing themselves of employment
9 opportunities. Who is going to come in and push the
10 energy and the skills into the mindset of the local
11 people that will enable them to tool up in time to
12 contribute to the Olympics and beyond? I cannot see it.

13 But the proof of the pudding is in the eating and we
14 are the pudding. Because in your analysis of what --
15 temporary until Thursday, analysis of what constitutes
16 affordable housing to finish my point -- we are not part
17 of the equation. We are residents on the site, smack
18 bang in the middle of the development, and yet we are
19 being pushed to another valley, the Thames Valley, in
20 one analysis.

21 If the definition of affordable housing is something
22 which is subject to administration by an RSL -- and
23 overseen by the Housing Corporation, then why are we not
24 allowed it remain on the site in a different guise?
25 Your arguments defeat themselves in the application.

1 I said this to Aaron Cahill who unfortunately is not at
2 this table, that if you were to argue otherwise we
3 should be the model. We should be the breastplate,
4 almost, that you portray to the rest of the world and
5 say "these are the people who were on the site. They
6 are in need of affordable housing, we gave them
7 affordable housing through this development, and here
8 they are as part of the development, contributing to
9 this development. We have transformed these people and
10 their lives and their situations". You are not able to
11 say that. Unless my being around this table enables me
12 to go away and say, "I am convinced that what is on this
13 table, what has been presented to me around this table,
14 will satisfy my doubts as to what you are able to
15 present," I am afraid I cannot buy it. The hard sell
16 will fail with me.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Sole.

18 MR SOLE: When you were talking about your strategy for
19 a balanced community you spoke exclusively about
20 families. When it existed, Clays Lane was a special
21 needs housing association dealing specifically for
22 single people and there are a great many people, single
23 people, that are housed within East London who are, as
24 it were, hidden simply as they are living in privately
25 let bedsits which for various larger economic reasons

1 might not be coming to the notice of the authorities.
2 And I just wondered how supplying or regularising the
3 situation for housing single people has figured in your
4 plan for making a stable community?

5 MR PRIOR: My point was not just about family housing. My
6 point was in order to make substantial amounts of
7 affordable housing happen we had to take that approach
8 but that is not to say by any means that this is
9 a project about family housing. For a balanced
10 community we must house all sorts of people. My point
11 was in the piecemeal approach the development we are
12 tending to see at the moment excludes the family housing
13 component so the need for single person housing, for
14 smaller housing units, larger housing units, is writ
15 large across this plan.

16 MR SANDISON: I understand that as part of the deal for
17 participating in our relocation, our rehousing, that the
18 London borough of Newnham of is seeking double the
19 number of units that they are actually using to house us
20 and actually thinking in terms of two or three bedroomed
21 units rather than replacing them with the type of
22 accommodation that we are being asked to vacate.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: That is attached to your statement, I think.
24 Can I park that one because that is more a matter
25 I would like to deal with on Thursday in terms of the

1 whole debate about housing, what is on offer and the
2 like.

3 MR SANDISON: It is just there was a statement made.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: There is a link but we need to return to
5 that, I think. Mr Cheyne.

6 MR CHEYNE: Referring to Mr Livingstone's point about
7 regeneration. I quote a member of staff in the LDA who
8 will remain nameless: "well, he is a politician is he
9 not?" If you do not mind my saying so, I am not sure
10 what the point is here. Inevitably somebody in this
11 position is going to have to find a way of justifying
12 a project of this kind and one of the big issues which
13 he and others have gone on about is making London into
14 I think the term is "world city" or "global city";
15 upgrading it to have a bigger presence in the world. So
16 I think this is the sort of project which fits very well
17 with ambitions of this kind.

18 The point I was making about the Olympics coming to
19 Stratford is that Stratford has a lot of elements which
20 are entirely desirable for the Olympics and it may well
21 be in trying to analyse other parts of London,
22 Stratford, the Lower Lea Valley, has the greatest
23 opportunities for a programme of this kind. I would not
24 necessarily disagree with that. My point is it is very
25 difficult to disentangle the motives for bringing the

1 Olympics to Stratford. Obviously the justification will
2 come out that this will deliver regeneration but the
3 reason why Stratford is chosen is because of the
4 opportunities that Stratford offers in terms of, for
5 example, transport links, available land, the fact there
6 is other investment in the area, all the kinds of things
7 which are discussed endlessly in these documents. So
8 the fact that there is some kind of coincidence between,
9 say, the ambitions of particular politicians or whatever
10 and the fact all of these things seem to meld together
11 in this particular place means precisely that it is very
12 difficult to figure out which of these is the
13 predominant motive and I think it would be very
14 difficult for me to assert that. I think that without
15 the facilities that Stratford has the Olympics would not
16 have come here. So I think that actually the
17 regeneration idea is tagged on to that original sort of
18 reason.

19 To move on to some of the other points --

20 THE CHAIRMAN: I apologise for stopping. I am aware we have
21 been going nearly two hours and it is very intensive for
22 the stenographer this afternoon. In fairness to the
23 friend at the end I am going to take a short break.
24 There are a number of things I want to come back to so
25 I will come back so you can continue to develop your

1 point. Mr Blacker will have the opportunity to respond.

2 We have parked some of the things you raised
3 previously about projections can be wrong, other
4 projects can go astray, future of the facilities. We
5 will come back to those once we come back and then we
6 will see if we can tie up in some way the overall case
7 and then we will start to move on to look at the more
8 detailed elements. But we will take 15 minutes. That
9 will give you the chance then to just pick out anything
10 that you want to use directly to ask Mr Prior and
11 Mr Blacker and others. Hopefully there is some tea and
12 coffee on the side for you and we will continue in 15
13 minutes.

14 (2.54 pm)

15 (A short break)

16 (3.10 pm)

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back. Mr Cheyne I was going to allow
18 you to continue then we will pick up some of the loose
19 ends we left along the way.

20 MR CHEYNE: There is one issue we have not discussed so far
21 which has been pointed out to me which is the whole
22 question of the fact that there was --

23 THE CHAIRMAN: If it is a new one, can I leave that just for
24 a moment? Tick some of the ones we have left behind.

25 MR CHEYNE: One of the issues that has been referred to is

1 the fact that the programme is supposed to be creating
2 diverse communities and of course we are a very diverse
3 community but we are being demolished. We will be worse
4 off as a result of this programme. The other thing
5 I was going to refer to is I have produced various
6 documents and I wanted to refer to some of them in terms
7 of considering the overall claims that are made for
8 these kind of projects. One of them is a new document
9 which you may not want to consider straightaway but it
10 might be good for people to read. It is entitled "the
11 role of megaevents at urban competitiveness and its
12 consequences on people". It is from Spain, dealing with
13 Barcelona. One of the problems in trying to assess
14 these kinds of programmes is, according to
15 PricewaterhouseCoopers, is that there are just very few
16 proper analyses done of the outcomes of Olympic games
17 projects.

18 Core have produced another document, number 87,
19 which deals with the negative impacts, particularly on
20 poor and marginalised people and they assert that:

21 "People lose their homes and become marginalised and
22 impoverished due to the preparations for the Olympic
23 games."

24 That is one of the contradictions of these kinds of
25 programmes, is that often these negative outcomes

1 sometimes result directly from the programme itself, as
2 in our case, sometimes just their spin-offs,
3 particularly in the case of Sydney where there were not
4 direct convictions but nonetheless people were evicted
5 and I have produced a variety of documents on that
6 subject.

7 This is not the original article, but it refers to
8 those things. It refers for example to -- document 76
9 which refers to the losers, such as the thousand or so
10 Vancouver residents who lost their homes to make way for
11 Expo 86 are dismissed as irrelevant. Dealing with
12 communities like ourselves we understand the way and
13 coming become to this business of how a programme like
14 this is run and what concern it has for the people in
15 its path, different kinds of programmes, and I would
16 suggest again piecemeal programmes, would be more gentle
17 and not result in the kind of damage that this
18 particular programme has resulted in this terms of our
19 community.

20 The other document which I think is particularly
21 relevant is the one from the industrial geographer
22 estimating the cost of benefits in hosting the Olympic
23 games. This is particularly looking ahead to what
24 Beijing could expect. In this document it says:

25 "To date there has been not been a study of an

1 Olympics or other large-scale sporting event that has
2 found empirical evidence of significant economic impacts
3 such as increases in household income."

4 There are a lot of other statements in here about
5 the way in which people justify these sort of games in
6 terms of their impact as global cities and the fact that
7 lots of claims are made which cannot be quantified.
8 Strangely enough you make this comment yourself. The
9 difficulty of quantifying Legacy benefits, and lot of
10 these benefits are left -- claims are made for these
11 things but it is difficult to quantify these things. As
12 a result, the claims are made, it is very difficult to
13 both challenge them or to assert specifically what they
14 have resulted in. I remember you actually made this
15 specific statement in your first piece of evidence.

16 To me, it is the case that a lot of -- going back to
17 the statement I started with, Mr Livingstone's
18 statement, it is difficult to be clear really what the
19 motivations are and how they tie in with larger, shall
20 we say, political ambitions when you are trying to put
21 together a programme of this kind. Obviously you are
22 going to present all of the different kinds of things
23 that you think will make it a desirable and attractive
24 proposal both to the people the large and to those
25 people who are going to fund it. I think there are

1 a lot of questions that have been asked about that.
2 I raised them in terms of documents and projections and
3 those kind of things. It is very difficult for people
4 in our position, because after all we have no experts
5 here, we have just been doing a little bit of work on
6 the internet in my case, rummaging through your
7 documents in order to figure out exactly what you are
8 saying, whether your figured add up and all the rest of
9 it.

10 Just on the basis of the kind of evidence I think
11 that I have presented and questions which we can ask
12 I think it is perfectly reasonable for people like us to
13 be very sceptical about this programme and to point to
14 the particular damage that you are doing to us, to our
15 community.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Who wants to respond on that? I know in
17 terms of evidence during the first week, probably
18 Mr Prior was it, in terms of -- we have looked at
19 previous events, Athens, Barcelona, Sydney, we have
20 learnt certain things. I am interested in that but
21 particularly in the context of what Mr Cheyne is saying
22 and the issues that concern him.

23 MR PRIOR: If I could speak to the general point. I think
24 your point is well made about what are the impacts of
25 these megaevents and how are they seen as contributors

1 to change within cities. At one extreme you have
2 Montreal still trying to pay off a debt that arose from
3 a badly planned Olympics. And then when you look at
4 other cities you see partial success or overall success
5 or whatever. My belief about what differs --
6 differentiates the London approach is that it is
7 an Olympics which has been conceived around a long-term
8 plan for change in an area. Most of the cities that we
9 have seen in the past have delivered Olympic games
10 against some intent of change and regeneration but have
11 in effect promoted their Olympics in a way that is very
12 much about their specific needs of their nation or their
13 city at the time. London's has always been predicated
14 on the fact that regeneration and change against all of
15 the policy structures we laid out at the beginning must
16 be the intent of the process.

17 So our approach has been not so much to say that --
18 the consequence of the Olympics are the dominant
19 elements here -- but to look at it in terms of what is
20 the outcome that you want and then, as it were, amend
21 the Olympic programme as much as you can to make that
22 outcome the most sustainable long-term regeneration
23 project for London.

24 Certainly talking to people in Barcelona about this,
25 they would be -- I think they would say to you, to

1 separate the Olympic project and your city projects.
2 The city projects, the project of change and
3 regeneration, is the most significant thing that will
4 come from the Olympics and Barcelona has had great
5 success on one hand, not such great success in other
6 areas. If you take the Olympic Village for the moment,
7 it is fully occupied, it is part of the city, it is
8 an area where, as you walk around that part of the city,
9 it strikes you quite quickly that there are
10 a significant number of disabled people living in that
11 area because the village was built to cope with the
12 requirements of the Paralympic games. So you see an
13 amendment to the normal mix in the community in response
14 to the facilities that came.

15 So much of our approach has been about learning
16 major lessons from regeneration projects in this
17 country, where they work in this country and applying
18 them to the Olympics and the Legacy consequences of the
19 Olympics and we use our project experience and the
20 project strength of other individuals on the team to
21 ensure that we are taking the Olympics forward in a way
22 that we think we can best use for that long-term
23 regeneration.

24 That has been I the approach all the way through.
25 You can go through the other Olympics and see why they

1 made certain decisions, why they did what they did.
2 Some started late, some did not plan their way out of
3 the situation, a lot of built venues that they had no
4 possible way of using post-games. We have not done
5 that. We have made bold views. We have said: an
6 80,000-seater will become a 25,000-seater because that
7 is the thing you can use it for afterwards. We have
8 said: our Olympic pool will be built for the scale of
9 the Olympics but must exist in Legacy at the size which
10 is suitable for ongoing use. And we have worked our way
11 all the way through those facilities and said "if you
12 cannot write that plan for it you must remove it because
13 you cannot leave those sort of things in" and that land
14 and infrastructure for regeneration is more important
15 than a lot of exciting buildings left that nobody has
16 use for in the long-term.

17 There have been a series of guidance and principles
18 about improving upon any other experience of Olympic
19 games and using our own experience of delivering
20 regeneration schemes in this country to get to the best
21 outcome. So that has been the way we have gone about
22 this project.

23 In my experience the Commonwealth Games in
24 Manchester, Manchester city centre, Sheffield,
25 Liverpool, big scale city regeneration projects where

1 the metric success in how you achieve those are pretty
2 well understood now.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: So do you see the London scheme as
4 significantly different to Barcelona, Sydney, whatever
5 has gone before in terms of the very strong regeneration
6 aspirations which stem from long established policies?

7 MR PRIOR: Yes. Very different from Athens, very different
8 from Sydney. Its closest games programme that you could
9 look at would probably be Barcelona and Barcelona has
10 had significant impacts in terms of changes. They
11 completely regenerated their waterfront, there were
12 issues of: our park was Barcelona's waterfront and beach
13 front. They looked carefully at sports facilities.
14 They undersized sports facilities some of which have
15 been increased in size post the games. They had
16 an enormous investment in infrastructure. So the
17 numbers for Barcelona are distorted by this huge
18 investment in roads and rail but then they had not -- we
19 know what the condition of Spain was post the Franco
20 years and that level of investment. That had to happen,
21 a lot of it was EU funded.

22 Each city had a different set of things to deal with
23 as it came to up but Barcelona went about it in
24 a different way. There is no denying that since
25 Barcelona held the Olympics that is a very different

1 world city than it was prior to the games itself.

2 But the London approach is much more advanced in
3 terms of where we are trying to go in terms of aligning
4 Olympics with the post-games world. If you talk to the
5 people in Sydney and you talk to people in Barcelona
6 they would acknowledge that straightaway. They feel
7 that we are years ahead of where they were at this stage
8 in knowing where we are going after the games. It is
9 a constant refrain we hear back from them. You are in
10 a position where Sydney were two years out from holding
11 the games. We know that, they have said it to us and
12 certainly that was well received by the IAC when they
13 came around.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Presumably the point you would stress is that
15 Legacy is an integral part of the overall design.

16 MR PRIOR: Yes. Legacy -- as the schemes get refined and
17 redesigned and worked on, it is all about Legacy. It is
18 all about knitting those two components of the games and
19 what follows together. So the exact dimensions and
20 locations of loop roads have to be where we want roads
21 post the games. The quantum of infrastructure we put
22 into this area -- what you need for the games is a very
23 odd structure, for instance, compared to what you need
24 in a residential community afterwards. The spike loads
25 in everyone going to the toilet in a stadium at half

1 time is very different to what you need in a residential
2 accommodation afterwards.

3 So all the work going on is to see what we can do
4 for the games, possibly reinforced with some temporary
5 elements but most importantly what is it we actually
6 need post the games. The sizing of CHP plants is to do
7 with what follows not the games' needs. We are planning
8 all those components through to make certain that the
9 switch out from games to Legacy is a seamless
10 transition. That ultimately is where the LDA, as my
11 client, will judge us and certainly where, in our
12 conversations with people like Treasury, those
13 conversations always go: how efficient is this
14 combination? That is why I think they backed holding
15 the games in Stratford.

16 MR BLACKER: If I go back to a point Julian raised before
17 the break. I do not want to break the flow on this
18 specific point. If you prefer to keep that one --

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Can I come back to that one and just keep the
20 flow of this one going because there are other people
21 who want to comment. Mr Armstrong?

22 MR CHEYNE: A number of points. One quick one is about the
23 swimming pool. Swimming pool projects had to be
24 reviewed in the light of the costs. As I understand it
25 the project has been scaled down because the original

1 budget predictions were incorrect. Is that correct?

2 MR PRIOR: I think we are looking at every single facility
3 in terms of what it costs, how we are going to deliver
4 it, where it fits in to the delivery programme. But the
5 core reviews are really about what you do with these
6 buildings afterwards. What is the difference between
7 the games scale and what happens afterwards. For
8 instance, the front door on the swimming pool for the
9 games mode is very different to where you may want to
10 want it in Legacy. The front door of that building
11 needs to be as close to Stratford and a public transport
12 hub in Legacy compared to where it needs to be in the
13 games, which is on the park side. So you re-work all of
14 these projects absolutely in terms of where are they
15 going to be in 2020 when these things are in everyday
16 operational use.

17 MR CHEYNE: Specifically that project has had to be scaled
18 back.

19 MR PRIOR: It is not scaling back, we are just reviewing the
20 project.

21 MR CHEYNE: But there was a cost overrun on this? People
22 were expecting -- I am only reporting on what the press
23 has said.

24 MR PRIOR: I watched the letters pages of various magazines
25 going backwards and forwards. We have an Olympic pool.

1 The designs are being looked at --

2 MR CHEYNE: But the original designs are being revised?

3 MR PRIOR: In the context of what I have just said.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: That is an element of any major scheme or

5 indeed smaller scheme, that one looks at it against

6 budget implications.

7 MR CHEYNE: I do not dispute that but it is still a case of:

8 we raised the issue of projections already. We have had

9 infrastructure projects that have had strange

10 projections on them in the past: the Channel Tunnel,

11 et cetera.

12 MR PRIOR: I would put that in more in the context of -- the

13 planning permission we have for example is for an

14 80,000-seater main stadium to be converted it a 60,000-

15 seater post-game. That was the position we were in when

16 the planning permissions came in. That type of work

17 that has gone on about what London wants to leave as its

18 legacy, what is the purpose of that stadium, has scaled

19 that down to a much smaller building but performing a

20 very different role in this community and this area. It

21 is in the nature of that type of review.

22 MR CHEYNE: I do not have a problem with and that it is

23 highly desirable. In fact, the same thing can be said

24 for other stadiums as to whether they will be needed,

25 for example, by local people or whether they will be

1 largely elite stadiums. I do not know but one of the
2 problems with other cities, I believe, is that once
3 stadiums have been completed later it is discovered that
4 the local needs, the needs of everyday people, are not
5 met by those stadiums. I do not know exactly how that
6 is going to apply here.

7 MR PRIOR: That is a core part of that business case review
8 that says: what are you building for the games and what
9 do you really need afterwards? If you look at the usage
10 in the Manchester velodrome, which is extremely high,
11 that involves both elite athletes and a wide range of
12 the population, then you look at a model like that and
13 say: that is the type of thing that works and you start
14 to amend your programme considerably.

15 MR CHEYNE: Coming back to Barcelona; you have not seen this
16 document but I want to make some comments from it. This
17 writer refers to the fact that there were lots of
18 evictions in Barcelona, that a lot of the jobs created
19 were temporary jobs and outside of the hotel and
20 catering industry actually there was very little, zero
21 impact. There were fewer jobs than were anticipated.
22 The level of economic activity declined after the
23 Olympics so there was a surge, then it fell away.

24 There were impacts on other tourist sites nearby,
25 that is although the games themselves attracted tourists

1 other places near Barcelona experienced a decline. And
2 that also impacted on local businesses because there
3 were incoming businesses that took businesses from local
4 businesses so they were not able to compete effectively
5 with companies that established themselves just for the
6 opportunity that the games presented.

7 And there was very high -- well, higher than
8 national inflation in Barcelona. So there were
9 a variety of kind of, I do not know if they were
10 anticipated or unanticipated, but these negative effects
11 accompanied the games which goes back really to the
12 whole problem of trying to measure impacts which I think
13 you agree is difficult.

14 MR PRIOR: Does the report talk about any of the upsides?

15 MR CHEYNE: I have to say this is almost certainly written
16 from a less favourable point of view but then it has to
17 be said that I think it is a fair point. I accept your
18 point but I think it is also fair to say that if I was
19 to take a sample of newspaper articles from any British
20 newspaper and I might come across maybe two negatives
21 ones as maybe against 50 positive ones because the trend
22 in the media and output organisations like yourselves is
23 to boost the games. So to find every now and again
24 somebody comes up with a critical comment does not
25 invalidate it and it is a necessary counter to the --

1 MR PRIOR: I agree. The negative consequences of events
2 like this have to be borne in mind and it is not just
3 the Olympics; it is world expos, it is world cups, it is
4 Commonwealth Games. Every year there is one of these
5 things going on somewhere in the world, nations games.
6 There is a growing body of evidence that says how you
7 handle them, how you make them work. We will be the
8 next city, as it were, in line.

9 But I think the UK in particular has an ability at
10 regeneration unlike anywhere else in the world in terms
11 of how we go about these type of projects. We are
12 learning the lessons and right at this early stage we
13 are thinking well ahead of the programme in terms of:
14 how do we make the best of it. I am sure there will be
15 downsides but there will be many upsides as well and
16 that is the problem we wrestle with.

17 MR CHEYNE: I have a bit of difficulty with that last
18 statement. If we look at the record in terms of major
19 construction projects it really is not good. Over and
20 over again there has been failure. The World Athletics
21 Championship never even happened. Britain gave up
22 before it could even build the thing. I cannot remember
23 which country took it up but I think -- I am not going
24 to say all these projects fail, I am not an expert, and
25 we do not have any experts on our side to be able to say

1 that but on the basis of what we know about the kind of
2 projects like the Dome and stuff like that, I am afraid
3 there is a very poor record. Maybe the Olympics will be
4 the exception which proves the rule, but it is not
5 automatically the case that I think we can say in
6 Britain we have a great record in terms of these kind of
7 projects and their projected costs, projected outcomes
8 and the rest of it.

9 MR PRIOR: All I would say is lots of people know about the
10 bad ones and tend not to talk about the good ones on
11 a regular basis. Yes, delivering projects like this is
12 extremely hard work and you have to get it absolutely
13 right hence the amount of forward planning that has been
14 going on, but we have had major successes. The
15 Commonwealth Games was a major success. The rebuilding
16 of central Manchester after the IRA bomb has been
17 a major success. We do have the changes in Glasgow that
18 went on, what happened in Leeds, what will happen on
19 Liverpool waterfront for the European City of Culture.
20 There are major, major changes. Look at Belfast at the
21 moment. These are places undergoing vibrant, joined-up,
22 significant change. Often they have a big event at the
23 centre of it as the catalyst but essentially they are
24 about whole-scale change around a whole series of
25 complex interrelated issues and I think it tends to be

1 the one-off icons where we get ourselves into trouble.
2 MR CHEYNE: Maybe so. It is interesting you mention these
3 other projects. You could say, possibly; compare the
4 project of Stratford City, which you think is going to
5 fold anyway, as being the kind of project to match the
6 sort of city centre projects you are talking about. So
7 we have already said there is such a project in
8 Stratford and that will have spin-offs which are in
9 themselves incalculable. If that project works properly
10 there will be other people who come in and invest in the
11 area, other people will build housing and the rest of
12 it. Even if the Olympics did not come and even taking
13 into account Gateway's predictions -- I do not know if
14 they were made at the time of Stratford City or prior to
15 that -- but those predictions would fulfil the idea that
16 there would be other events occurring surrounding that
17 project.

18 You said the preparation for these games, and you
19 talked as though that has been an effective programme,
20 part of our problem, frankly, is regarding our
21 relocation. I cannot really agree with you; there is no
22 way that we have been effectively prepared for it. When
23 we were first approached at the end of 2003 and in 2004
24 we were led to understand that planning was going to
25 start on looking for land for us to move to purpose-

1 built properties and all that kind of stuff --

2 THE CHAIRMAN: I do not want to get drawn in to that today.

3 MR CHEYNE: But the principle of our experience has not
4 actually borne that out. If I am looking at the
5 revisions which occurred to the site in terms of the
6 movement of facilities and so on around our site, again,
7 some of those things, it would seem to me, could have
8 been predicted. If it is already known that the land is
9 contaminated or that there are power lines, one has to
10 think: why was not that taken into account when you
11 first drew up those plans, because we pointed out a long
12 time ago that the whole village basically, the housing,
13 could have been built on Stratford City and later that
14 idea was adopted.

15 So I cannot really agree that our experience --
16 I cannot talk about other peoples' experience but our
17 experience bears out that idea.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: I will deal with that in terms of master-plan
19 design in later amendments. That is something I want to
20 touch upon so we will come back to that. Mr Blacker,
21 you are going to deal with the point raised before the
22 break.

23 MR BLACKER: Yes, which I think suggested the regeneration,
24 justification for the Olympics has come in after the
25 event of the Olympic bidding and the winning of that

1 bid. It is really just to say that the LDA, from when
2 it was founded in 2000, one of the first things it
3 undertook was looking at the priority areas where its
4 money should be invested. In London, core document 24,
5 which is the Arups report produced in 2001, analysed
6 areas. One of the six that were adopted then in terms
7 of our corporate plan in 2002 was the Stratford Royals
8 area. The agency also had single regeneration budget
9 programmes running in the Hackney-Wick area and the
10 Stratford-Lower Lea Valley areas running at that period
11 as well. The Lower Lea Valley Matrix Group, which was
12 set up by the LDA in 2002, involved all four boroughs,
13 central Government and the Regional Park Authority,
14 British Waterways, looking at this area as a major
15 priority for the agency. Then even when we took forward
16 direct spend on what has ultimately become the
17 Olympic -- called the Olympic project; it is still
18 referred to the as the Olympic and Lower Lea Valley
19 project as far as the LDA is concerned. In 2003 we got
20 our approvals to spend and between 2003 and 2005 we took
21 forward significant assembly work on major redevelopment
22 sites in the area; the dog track, Waterton Road,
23 Carpenter's Road site, the Parcelforce depot at West Ham
24 that had become redundant, Carlsberg-Tetley site and the
25 Three Mills site. There was very, very significant

1 spend and commitment to the area well before the outcome
2 of the Olympic bid was known.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Armstrong.

4 MR ARMSTRONG: Whilst it is commendable that the Legacy is
5 built into the stream of ideas that generate part of the
6 Legacy, are built into the design proposals, for example
7 I think that the national centre of athletics which is
8 currently at Crystal Palace is going to be based in the
9 new Olympic stadium after the games. I think that is
10 the case. So therefore a football team or something
11 like that will not be able to take over the stadium
12 which is the case in Manchester. It is a bit dubious.

13 Using previous Olympics as any kind of guide, one of
14 the things that distinguishes Barcelona in the
15 waterfront development is the fact although it is
16 a waterfront the degree of urbanisation that connects
17 the waterfront with the actual city as a whole is not
18 where the development really needed to take place,
19 whereas in our situation we have kind of like a gap due
20 to marsh lands and other things that occurs in the
21 urbanisation of the city. One of the weakest spots that
22 I have always pointed out whenever I have been present
23 at any debate on this area is the inability to knit
24 together the two completely different types of
25 urbanisation on the London side of the Lower Lea Valley.

1 It is highly urbanised. It dates back to the 19th
2 century in terms of industry. And there is
3 a well-developed street plan and those kind of things on
4 the Waltham Forest Essex side of the Lower Lea Valley.
5 That breaks down quite a bit. In some places there is
6 a street pattern and other places, West Ham, it is very,
7 very difficult to lock into a street pattern. None of
8 the development plans that you have tie in those -- have
9 the idea of cross-routes that knit together the urbanity
10 of one side of the valley to the other side of the
11 valley. None that does not exist at present anyway.

12 These are the real things that will enable the
13 Legacy to be sustained in terms of whether or not
14 housing is not going to become sink estates, or is not
15 going to be cut off from the central -- be part of the
16 city, as opposed to being an isolated development.

17 On top of that, whilst it is commendable that the
18 channel bit, the channel station is kind of like seen as
19 the progenitor of the Stratford land, the railways land
20 development, the real problem is knitting the Olympic
21 development and using that as a fulcrum for the kind of
22 urban regeneration or generation that needs to take
23 place in the Lower Lea Valley itself. That is probably
24 one of the toughest things that you are going to face,
25 and you are facing. I do not envy you with what you are

1 trying to do to bring this area into -- to knit it into
2 the overall street plan and urban plan of London itself.
3 I do not know if it is possible.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Let us just deal with the point, because it
5 is something that has been referred to in other evidence
6 that I have heard, particularly the words "linkages",
7 "knitting together" all spring to mind. Can we deal
8 with that, and then if it is not dealt with fully, deal
9 with the example.

10 MR PRIOR: I think your analysis of the area is spot on.
11 You know what you are talking about in terms of that
12 sort of edge city condition which the Lea Valley has
13 become to Hackney and Tower Hamlets, and the division it
14 causes in the urban frame heading across to West Ham,
15 Layton, et cetera.

16 In CD25, plan 14, and I hold it up, your point is
17 absolutely made. Which is if you look at those plans
18 you can see the sort of interstitial street structure
19 that runs down the west-hand side of the valley, and you
20 can see it running down the east side of the valley, and
21 then through the middle all we really have are huge
22 crossing points and major bits of infrastructure. These
23 are big roads, big railway lines. And frankly, if
24 you want to walk from Hackney Wick to Stratford and you
25 are pushing a pram, et cetera, you have

1 Carpenter's Lane, which is not the greatest way to get
2 between the two. So that is very much our starting
3 point; that is the urban context challenge that we have
4 to address.

5 I cannot agree with you we have not dealt with that
6 issue, because in the --

7 MR ARMSTRONG: I did not say that.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: It is the recognition. We are looking then
9 at how you are seeking to deal with it.

10 MR PRIOR: When we go to say plans like 21 in CD25, this is
11 the Legacy position post the games in the original
12 planning application drawings. What you will see is
13 major moves being made on that. Yes, we have created
14 this park space, and there has been a big debate about
15 whether this is about division or congregation. Is this
16 the heart of new communities, or something in between?
17 Our view was always we were extending communities in
18 from the edges to meet around an extraordinarily fine
19 new environment. You recover the River Lea, you put the
20 ecology back in, you bury those power lines which are
21 both a visual and a use blight. But in order it make
22 that work, you have to stitch everything back into the
23 communities from both sides. So your philosophy is
24 about the extension of communities.

25 Then as we have down the west hand side on the Lea

1 navigation, the bridges that are proposed down the
2 west side are, I think, a fundamental part of stitching
3 what we achieve in the Lee Valley back into Hackney and
4 Tower Hamlets. If you do not build those bridges -- and
5 that is a level of need for the games, because we have
6 to have emergency access from venues -- but that is
7 a density, say, compared to Chalk Farm or Dalston or
8 somewhere. It is the type of permeability you need in
9 a successful, healthy urban grain to make it work. In
10 the Lea Valley itself it is around the high 30s, low 40s
11 in new bridges that need to go in across those waterways
12 to stitch things together.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Are those pedestrian, vehicular, combination?

14 MR PRIOR: They are a combination of major traffic routes,
15 bus routes, cycle ways. Most of them are about cycling
16 and walking and local connections. We have tried to
17 keep the big infrastructure links to a minimum because
18 of the recognition that what we really want to encourage
19 here is a sense of individual permeability. Safe routes
20 to school, walking to the job, walking to the station,
21 et cetera.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Are you saying that one of the mechanisms for
23 stitching the area together and linking the east into
24 the Lee Valley and the west into the Lee Valley is the
25 green element of it?

1 MR PRIOR: Yes. Because our thoughts are -- take our
2 comparator say at Victoria Park, where a community lives
3 around a park. I do not think anyone would argue that
4 that park is a blight on that neighbourhood. It is
5 something people can walk in, but it is something that
6 the community meets in to some extent.

7 MR ARMSTRONG: But it was planned. It was planned.

8 MR PRIOR: As much as this is planned, as the great holding
9 element, as it were, of these elements. And unlike any
10 other park in London, it will have a river running
11 through it; it will be a major facet.

12 But I order to make that work, your point about
13 stitching right across, the North/South route from the
14 river Thames up to Hertfordshire is an easy one. That
15 is the great long park we hope to create from the Thames
16 all the way up to Hertfordshire, which is contained
17 within the OAPF documents. The big challenge is that
18 east-west linkage, and that is why we spent so much time
19 on: where are these connections, where are these routes,
20 where the buses running, where are people running, where
21 do schools sit in relation to that, where does the
22 weight of population sit?

23 You are right, it is a huge challenge, but
24 everywhere we have honed the Olympic infrastructure to
25 make this position work. Yes, they are tied together,

1 which is Mr Cheyne's point. It is an iterative process
2 between the two, but we think we have maximised the sort
3 of leverage from that investment in infrastructure to
4 make this place happen.

5 MR CHEYNE: Can I say, I think we have another statutory
6 objector who has arrived.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon. Come and sit at the table --
8 there is a space at the end.

9 MR CHEYNE: When you were talking about regeneration being
10 an objective of the LDA, I am not arguing against that.
11 I am quite sure the LDA has programmes.

12 In terms of previous plans, UDPs, which
13 I contributed to when they did a Newham UDP back in the
14 middle of the 1990s, in fact I was the person who
15 proposed that housing should be put on the north end of
16 the Stratford site in order to bring Clays Lane into
17 a more urban environment. The issues about regeneration
18 are absolutely plain, and I am not arguing against that.
19 But the question is trying to establish what the
20 motivation for bringing the Olympics to this particular
21 site are.

22 I think that whatever regeneration programmes people
23 might have thought about, there is a happy coincidence
24 you might say to justify an Olympic programme. The
25 problem here is that Stratford has lots of things to

1 offer the Olympics, without which the Olympics would not
2 come.

3 So to say that the Olympics is simply a regeneration
4 programme, I do not think is true. The Olympics comes
5 to Stratford for a variety of reasons which are to do
6 with the Olympics and not to do with Stratford. It may
7 also be there are things the Olympics can justify
8 themselves with in terms of regeneration programmes.
9 I am not arguing that that is not the case. The
10 question is then is, is this the best way to deliver
11 that regeneration, or can it be done in a more piecemeal
12 fashion? And whether the actual programme is going to
13 produce the desired results.

14 MR PRIOR: I think there were two points in there. One, is
15 the Olympics good for Stratford, and is Stratford good
16 for the Olympics? I think that is absolutely right.

17 I think there is a very happy coincidence in terms of
18 how those things happen, but that is why you can use the
19 Olympics as a driver of regeneration in this area and
20 could not use it elsewhere because it works.

21 MR CHEYNE: That is why we disagree, obviously.

22 MR PRIOR: But to say the two things rely on each other, of
23 course they do.

24 MR CHEYNE: Absolutely but we are talking here about --

25 MR PRIOR: Your second point is is this the right way to

1 then go about regeneration in this area? I happen to
2 think it is, but it is also a product of to some extent
3 holding the games and therefore what the consequences
4 are therefore of that.

5 MR CHEYNE: A couple of smaller points. You refer to power
6 lines. As I understand from Mr Jones's evidence,
7 I think it was, the power lines have to be removed under
8 the Stratford City programme in order for the elements
9 of the Stratford City programme to be built. So that is
10 not strictly speaking dependent on the Olympics.

11 MR JONES: The Stratford City planning permission does not
12 provide the planning permission to remove the
13 power lines. What it establishes is the benefits that
14 will come to the locality and actually delivering
15 Stratford City if the power lines were taken down. What
16 it does not do is provide the mechanism for doing that.
17 The impetus for doing that has come through the
18 power lines, planning applications and planning
19 permissions that has now been delivered, that arguably
20 would have not been delivered without the Olympic games
21 being a catalyst for getting that through.

22 MR CHEYNE: I think I have to quote you, because I do not
23 think I have that particular statement. If I remember
24 rightly, what you said was -- I think it was D1,
25 permission, or something like that -- which says that

1 certain elements of the Stratford City programme cannot
2 be built if the power lines have not been removed. It
3 is to do with the proximity to the power lines.

4 MR JONES: I would not disagree. I apologise if I conveyed
5 that message. But that does not include -- that does
6 not provide a planning permission for the power lines to
7 be undergrounded.

8 MR CHEYNE: That may be true, but it is still the case that
9 -- and I presume Newham would be very happy to have the
10 programme go ahead; they are backing Stratford City, and
11 in fact I produced a document showing the mayor was very
12 concerned about the interrelationship between these two
13 programmes -- then I am sure the planning permission for
14 undergrounding the power lines -- because a lot of your
15 work is about the likelihood of planning permission
16 being refused or granted. I would have thought the
17 chances of planning permission for undergrounding the
18 power lines to assist the Stratford City programme going
19 ahead, the chances of that permission being refused
20 would be very, very small -- frankly, non-existent.

21 MR JONES: But the planning permission for undergrounding
22 the power lines has come only following the confirmation
23 that London was going to host the games, and the
24 commitment then of the public agencies and the energy
25 providers to actually progress the undergrounding of

1 those power lines that. That may not have happened, and
2 certainly Stratford City were not coming forward with
3 proposals to underground those power lines themselves.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 438 of your proof:

5 "Two sets of high voltage power lines run along
6 approximately parallel routes from West Ham to Hackney.
7 Their presence would prevent the full implementation of
8 both the Olympic and Legacy development and
9 Stratford City development. It is a condition of the
10 Olympic and Legacy planning permission that a strategy
11 be submitted for the undergrounding of power lines in
12 the valley. Condition D1 of the planning permission for
13 Stratford City development also requires that no works
14 can commence within the vicinity of the power lines
15 until they have been placed underground or diverted away
16 from the site."

17 Is that the correct position?

18 MR JONES: That is the correct position. My point is that
19 effectively that condition associated with the
20 Stratford City development prevents the development
21 happening until the power lines are undergrounded. That
22 would not have happened -- or diverted. That was not
23 coming forward as part of the Stratford City proposals,
24 and has taken the intervention of the LDA and other
25 agencies to bring that forward.

1 MR CHEYNE: I would have thought that part of the problem
2 there was that as the Stratford City programme was kind
3 of, I do not know, just getting underway when the
4 Olympic programme suddenly appeared on the horizon, it
5 is very difficult to know who would have lodged what
6 application for what. If it is the case that
7 condition D1 required that this work had to be done, to
8 me it is slightly unlikely that these developers would
9 not have put forward a proposal for that and sought to
10 find a way of funding it.

11 All I am saying is this Stratford City programme had
12 the political backing of Newham, and they were very keen
13 on it happening, and I am pretty sure that -- along the
14 lines that you are saying, that you do not think that
15 your applications here would be refused, I would say
16 that the same thing could be applied here. And that the
17 fact that the Stratford City programme had not put
18 forward a planning application at that time could very
19 well have been a calculation on their part that somebody
20 else was going to do this work for them. It is just
21 impossible to know exactly how it happened.

22 MR PRIOR: Maybe the bigger point on the power lines are
23 that -- again, I will use this plan 21 again -- the
24 power line starts up here at the head house on the top
25 of Hackney Marshes, run down the valley, we have

1 a head house down at West Ham. The intent of the
2 Stratford application was just to remove the section of
3 power lines between Clays Lane and the Stratford
4 development. The point I was trying to make about the
5 scale of that environmental change and investment is the
6 fact that -- the intent and where we are now with
7 tunnelling machines on site is to take the whole lot out
8 all the way down to West Ham. It really goes back to my
9 point about -- and your point about incremental change
10 versus big scale. We had a developer as it were in play
11 at Stratford whose largest ambition was to take out
12 several hundred yards of power lines on their northern
13 boundary, in order, as you see in Mr Jones's evidence,
14 to make it even possible to deliver their scheme. The
15 differences of these large scale projects is that we can
16 look at a project costing many hundreds of millions of
17 pounds to take the whole lot through, and that had major
18 advances not only in the Olympic park, but as we see in
19 the OAPF documentation, the corridors running down the
20 valley in terms of the capacity of other sites to
21 deliver housing and other uses. I think that ties two
22 points together about scale and the intent of
23 environmental approval.

24 MR CHEYNE: You may be right. I have to point out that of
25 course various projects have been built -- Clays Lane

1 was built underneath those power lines, the motorway was
2 built underneath these power lines, and we have been
3 living underneath them and been asking for them to be
4 removed. I am very happy that they are going. I am not
5 going to disagree with the Olympics for achieving this
6 result.

7 The fact that we have been living there for a long
8 time and no-one has paid any attention, and actually in
9 your evidence you even refer to the possible health
10 risks, which are regularly dismissed by any organisation
11 involved in --

12 MR PRIOR: I did not put any value against this --

13 MR CHEYNE: No, you did not put a value. I just raise it.

14 No doubt it would be an argument which, if coming from
15 an organisation like yourselves, might carry more weight
16 than if I write a letter saying these are a health risk.

17 MR PRIOR: I think it is that qualitative issue. You quite
18 rightly point out that Clays Lane was built underneath
19 power lines. My point would be if we are talking about
20 the greater change in the East End of London, you would
21 into the see anyone do that in west London. You would
22 not string a set of power lines like that through west
23 London and expect people to live underneath it, where it
24 is certainly an environmental blight. And there is a
25 huge issue of quality I think here about what we are

1 trying to achieve in terms of the quantum leap in change
2 here which practically insists that things like that end
3 up being put underground.

4 MR CHEYNE: Absolutely. And it would be better if east
5 London was treated better. I have to point out simply
6 that we are not in our move going to be better off as
7 a result of this. So if we are an example of the
8 treatment of east Londonners, then I have to say we are
9 going to be financially worse off, we are going to lose
10 a lot of amenities, which was another point I wanted to
11 raise. Because when our site was described, you just
12 referred to 'no-one would say that Victoria Park
13 isolates people'. That is exactly the term that has
14 been used to describe Clays Lane. Clays Lane is
15 isolated by green space. Actually I regard that as
16 being an amenity, and highly desirable.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: That is something I specifically want to look
18 at on Thursday.

19 MR CHEYNE: I am just interested in the language used here,
20 because Mr Prior made the point that Victoria Park would
21 not be considered to be an isolating factor. But in the
22 case of Clays Lane, it is used in that way.

23 MR PRIOR: My point was --

24 THE CHAIRMAN: I got your point. I do not think we need
25 clarification. We have two who want to add to this, and

1 then I am just going to pause and just check through
2 other elements that we have not covered in terms of the
3 general case, so that we have not lost sight of
4 anything. Mr Sandison.

5 MR SANDISON: In fact I am glad you are closing in what
6 I wanted to talk about. I think the discussion about
7 the Olympics and the Lower Lea Valley regeneration
8 programme, all this focus on the Olympics is relevant
9 because of how it affects us. But I would like to go
10 back to the 27th November 2003, which was the first time
11 that EDAW and various others actually came to
12 Clays Lane, and the presentation that was made on that
13 day. At that point nobody was seriously anticipating
14 winning the Olympics. What you were there to discuss
15 was the Lower Lea Valley regeneration programme, and
16 plan B was very much if we win the Olympics, then this
17 whole programme is going to come forward 18 months.

18 MR PRIOR: We were running both in parallel with each other.

19 MR SANDISON: Yes, you were, but certainly in terms of the
20 presentation and the kind of emphasis you had placed on
21 it was that this was actually very much more about the
22 Lower Lea Valley regeneration programme. You probably
23 were not there, and in fact I did ask for a list of who
24 attended, because I actually talked to them. That
25 particular meeting degenerated into a riot simply

1 because of the approach that had been adopted by the
2 people representing. It was a standard corporate
3 presentation that actually made no allowance whatsoever
4 for the people who were actually going to be receiving
5 it.

6 That really exemplifies what we have been
7 experiencing, and we are feeling we are on the receiving
8 end of as far as our dealings with the institutions are
9 concerned. I think that needs to be considered.
10 Because in fact the maps that we were shown, there was
11 no sign of Clays Lane, these things that you are
12 actually using at the moment. And the implication was,
13 in fact the statement was, "Is this not a wonderful
14 thing? You will be gone by 2009." Well, no it was not,
15 and it still is not.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: I have that point. Mr Armstrong?

17 MR ARMSTRONG: A different point. Coming back to what you
18 said about the differences between this piecemeal and
19 wholesale, and the differences between knitting together
20 two parts of the urban or -- in different ways, edge,
21 and other things. Is it not the case that the way that
22 the Olympic development is planned, and situated, is at
23 odds with that knitting-together process? Is it not the
24 case that you are knitting together two different sides
25 of two different urban edges in spite of the Olympics,

1 and not because?

2 The reason why I say that is two things. You
3 yourself acknowledge, as you said, that having a large
4 stadia affects -- I am not going to paraphrase you
5 exactly -- but affects the nature of the urban grid, the
6 urban whole. I round it off to that. Is not the
7 Olympic development at odds with that whole knitting
8 together process that you wish to achieve?

9 MR PRIOR: I think my understanding of your point is if you
10 put these big structures into an urban area, how do you
11 actually make a real urban area work? I think there are
12 various models of that. For instance, if you take the
13 traditional northern football stadium embedded in
14 terraced housing, those elements were, "I happen to live
15 very close to a football stadium and, yes, once a week,
16 once a fortnight, we are swamped with people. Fine.
17 I live there, I enjoy that. That is a decision I have
18 made".

19 If you take for instance the new Arsenal stadium,
20 where they did not plan those two things together, they
21 planned a stadium and its operation, residential and
22 other components around it, if you take other examples
23 around the world, the Pacific Bell ballpark in
24 San Francisco, for instance, there are very many good
25 lessons -- the main stadium in Madrid -- about how you

1 can incorporate those things. The skill is
2 understanding, when you design that stadium, what
3 you want to put around it afterwards. The embedding of
4 major stadia in urban areas has in many ways be
5 successfully achieved in many cities, in London.

6 MR ARMSTRONG: That is because they are eccretive.

7 MR PRIOR: I would argue in many instances they have been
8 planned to do just that.

9 MR ARMSTRONG: I will argue against that. I just want to
10 make this point simply because you said that if Mr Prior
11 made his point, I could come back to it.

12 I give an example. Arsenal moved from Woolwich and
13 had themselves planned into Highbury, and on the basis
14 of the Gillespie road was converted into Arsenal and
15 adapted to accept large crowds on match days. Tottenham
16 Hotspur, for example, had about six different homes
17 before they located at White Hart Lane and now they are
18 at odds with the eccretive development that has taken
19 place in that area, and they find that they may need to
20 move. Arsene Wenger for example -- without diverging --
21 made the point just before the European Cup finals
22 recently that on the continent stadia are visible from
23 miles around, and in Britain, stadia are invisibile
24 until you are parked up in your coach outside. These
25 observations are critical to how somebody identifies not

1 only with a locality and a neighbourhood, but how people
2 outside and inside a neighbourhood identify with the
3 urban syntax around a development.

4 When it comes to the Olympics, if you were doing
5 what Arsenal are doing at the Ashburton Grove, where
6 they were forced to by the local council and by the GLA
7 as a whole, to -- they had a minimum number of housing
8 units which were affordable that had to be there in
9 order for the stadia to be developed, to be given the
10 planning permission. We are not seeing that. You are
11 not clear as to -- you are not able to come to this
12 table and say, "This is a minimum amount of housing
13 units that will be developed as a result of this". You
14 have given target figures, and you have given another
15 way of addressing it, is that you are saying that:
16 "well, we have made provision for", which is not the
17 same. Arsenal would not have got the development at
18 Ashburton Grove if they had framed their terms as
19 loosely as that.

20 We are not seeing like-for-like on this. The
21 Olympics is much bigger in terms of scale, in terms of
22 concept, to something say even like Ashburton Grove.
23 But if I could argue that the edge development, bringing
24 the edges together is a kind of escalation of the
25 eccretive process as a whole, the Olympics is a kind of

1 spanner in the works to that. It kind of obliterates
2 the edge development or distorts it in such a way that
3 it undermines what you are trying to achieve. I am sure
4 you have found that in your planning process. I am sure
5 you have encountered that problem.

6 MR PRIOR: I think the concerns are well made. I actually
7 have a very different view from you, which is what has
8 been achieved at the current Arsenal stadium, and what
9 will be achieved at the new Arsenal stadium about the
10 embedding facilities in a wider urban area is exactly
11 where we are going with the games. That is why we have
12 said that the diagrams and cartoons we have used to show
13 how we have structured this thing, how venues come in
14 and out, and how the urban form embraces those forms
15 post the games, has been our absolute intent from
16 day one. Because we do not want to be where Sydney are
17 at the moment, where a great cluster of Olympic
18 buildings were stuck together and there is no way
19 permeability, there is no way to embrace those into a
20 wider urban form. They have nailed the coffin lid on
21 that one already; it is going to be a very tough job to
22 do that. Whereas we have said: place your major
23 facilities in such a way that we can get a great intent
24 and weight of urban form in between those buildings to
25 embrace them, so that they are embedded in the urban

1 form and they form components of a successful urban
2 area.

3 Therefore, yes, we have stadiums that are partly in
4 the park, but they are partly in urban areas; we have
5 housing that overlooks parks, we have employment land
6 that overlooks the park. This is about creating a state
7 where we have positioned the Olympic facilities to
8 drive -- I think the point you are making is that you
9 must be -- we do not want a situation where we have an
10 out of town stadium with 5,000 car parking spaces around
11 it just sat in an island with lots of roads leading to
12 it. That is not the intent. The urban stadium model of
13 London and other cities is the intent of this process.
14 That is where we are going, and to be blunt, that is
15 what is described in the planning permissions. That is
16 what we have to deliver.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Can you deal with the point that was made in
18 relation to the number of affordable housing units that
19 have to be provided. The specific requirement in
20 relation to Ashburton Grove, something -- an aim here.

21 MR ARMSTRONG: It was imposed here. It has not been imposed
22 on you, so you are free to --

23 MR PRIOR: Let us remember at the time these commitments
24 were made, our ultimate client was the Mayor of London.
25 The LDA are an agent of the mayor, so therefore our

1 commitments on social and affordable housing are the
2 best and the highest of London's targets. Those
3 commitments are made. That is what we are to deliver
4 against. That is where those numbers come from. And it
5 will be higher, I would suggest, than most private
6 sector developments of an equivalent size, because of
7 who is driving that.

8 MR ARMSTRONG: I will come back to that on Thursday, because
9 that is where we talk about accommodation.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Quite happy to do that. I am conscious we
11 have sat for another hour or so, and in fairness to
12 other people around the table, and in particular the
13 stenographer, within the next 10 or 15 minutes I will
14 aim to take a break.

15 I am really just looking to see where we have got to
16 in terms of this first part of the issue, in terms of
17 the case for regeneration, and perhaps to recap and then
18 we can pick out any important elements that we have not
19 finally dealt with, and anything that we might have
20 missed. So far as the residents are concerned, that
21 essentially you have been making the case in terms of
22 the issue of the large scale main event regeneration, as
23 opposed to the smaller scale organic regeneration,
24 questioned whether the example of Stratford City
25 demonstrates that it was underway by itself in any event

1 in this particular area and that process would have
2 continued.

3 You have also questioned the statements about the
4 benefits of the games in terms of the position of the
5 LDA is to present their case. Of course they present it
6 with all the positive aspects, but we have to look at
7 the issue of jobs and homes, again, take account of the
8 loss from elsewhere, the overlap with Stratford City and
9 the unknown quantity of what would have happened without
10 the intervention of the Olympics.

11 We have also touched to some degree in terms of the
12 concerns on the local population, particularly
13 Clays Lane, in terms of what do these benefits actually
14 mean for local residents in terms of certainty about,
15 impact on housing, impact on rents and so on, which we
16 shall hear more about on Thursday. I suppose the big
17 question at the end is to how much of the regeneration
18 is actually attributable to the Olympics rather than the
19 spin-off from Stratford City or anywhere else.

20 That probably does not do justice to what we have
21 talked about over the last two to three hours, but
22 perhaps it helps to draw things together in terms of the
23 issues that we have looked at. Is there anything that
24 we need to add to that? Mr Cheyne, is there anything
25 you want to pick up on?

1 MR CHEYNE: I cannot think of anything in particular at
2 a moment. I was thinking of making a point about
3 something said earlier on. But no, I think I am
4 relatively content with what we have discussed so far.
5 I dare say that when we are looking at the Olympic
6 proposals, the next section, some of this stuff will
7 come back up again. So we will probably rehearse some
8 other issues, or go over some other issues which will
9 tie into that. So I am quite content with the
10 discussion so far.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: I would prefer for the discussion to flow,
12 rather than say: no, you cannot talk about that because
13 it appears later on. I know I have done it to some
14 degree, but I have attempted to let it flow as far as
15 possible. Do you want to make the point you left
16 behind?

17 MR CHEYNE: Yes. I wanted to refer to the point
18 Mr Tannis(?) Was making about the non-Olympic plans.
19 They were presented very much as being the kind of --
20 I do not know if I quite agree with him in terms of that
21 was the main programme, but it was very much that these
22 were the two programmes, and this was an absolutely
23 clear non-Olympic project which existed alongside the
24 Olympic project. What I was kind of surprised to
25 discover then was that according to your evidence in

1 374, you say that actually EDAW was only constructed to
2 draw up a regeneration strategy master plan in July 2004
3 if the bid was not successful.

4 So I am a bit puzzled by the fact we were told when
5 the Olympic team came at the end of 2003 -- and I think
6 I said it was December, but Ian has corrected me and
7 said it was the end of November -- and then a second
8 time in February. And the first thing actually that was
9 said was, "This estate is going to be demolished,
10 whatever happens". Actually we then tried to do some
11 research into that and another member of the community
12 actually got in touch with the LDA through Freedom of
13 Information, and asked for details of these plans and
14 was told there were none. And I also got in touch with
15 Newham Planning to ask them if they were aware of any of
16 these plans, and they said no, they were not aware of
17 these plans either.

18 So although we were presented with the idea there
19 was certainty about future demolition of Clays Lane,
20 there was no certainty. The actual plans do not seem to
21 have started for at least another six months, even the
22 planning for this. More than that, I am afraid
23 I personally interpreted this simply as a kind of
24 demoralising strategy. I am sure the LDA of course deny
25 such a thing, but the only conclusion that seemed to

1 arise out of this was: give up, you have had it.

2 Whatever.

3 When I tried to raise this with media organisations,
4 later on when I was raising questions about what was
5 going to happen to Clays Lane in the Olympics and
6 everything, the response was "Nothing to do with the
7 Olympics. You are going to get demolished anyway, so
8 you are not even being demolished on account of the
9 Olympics". This was actually a specific answer I got
10 because I e-mailed Steven Redgrave, because he was the
11 sports kind of lead person at that time. I do not know
12 if he still is. And his organisation said, "Do not
13 worry about it, you are going to be demolished anyway.
14 Nothing to do with the Olympics". Indeed, at that time
15 and until fairly recently whenever I have raised the
16 question of Clays Lane being demolished, a lot of people
17 were completely unaware that any housing was going to be
18 lost.

19 So I am afraid my interpretation of what happened at
20 the beginning, and why people, as Ian said, got very
21 upset, is because when we actually tried to examine this
22 issue we could not discover any evidence that this was
23 going to happen, and it all did seem to be pretty much
24 a scheme which had been dreamt up in order to divert
25 attention away from the fact it was an Olympic

1 demolition, and not another kind of demolition.

2 So these plans did not start to get worked up
3 until July 2004. I regard those original statements, I
4 am afraid, as being deceptive. And they certainly
5 created an extremely bad feeling amongst residents at
6 the time.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Blacker, Mr Prior? Can either of you shed
8 any light on that, as to whether there were any
9 proposals not associated with the Olympics in relation
10 to the possible demolition of Clays Lane?

11 MR BLACKER: I think when there was that round of
12 consultations that took place in the run-up to the
13 planning applications being submitted in January --
14 I have to check. I am trying to recall ...

15 THE CHAIRMAN: If it is not something you can deal with now,
16 if we take a break -- whether it can be clarified,
17 because I think it is something that is clearly very
18 important, as to whether there was anything specific
19 before the announcement of the Olympics being awarded,
20 as to whether there was any clear intention that as part
21 of some regeneration proposals for the Lower Lea Valley,
22 Clays Lane would be replaced.

23 MR BLACKER: We can check that.

24 MR SANDISON: It was just a final note. It might actually
25 shed some light note on why that was a rather extensive

1 correspondence, but actually very little in the way of
2 concrete meetings between yourself and my predecessor

3 MR BLACKER: John Lynn.

4 MR SANDISON: Yes.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: We will leave that one open for you to
6 explore. Mr Armstrong?

7 MR ARMSTRONG: Yes. I will try and be as brief as I can.

8 There was one other problem that was being mooted at the
9 time when we had our first and second round of
10 consultation meetings.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: When would that be?

12 MR ARMSTRONG: We are talking about 2004/2005. This was
13 that -- when we were first approached by the LDA on
14 Clays Lane, we were led to believe that the Olympic
15 village, for example, was going to be entirely on the
16 Clays Lane site.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: That I think I want to deal with specifically
18 in the next session, master plan design, later
19 amendments, because that does directly relate to that in
20 terms of the implications of the original master plan
21 design for Clays Lane, and then the announced amendments
22 as to how that affects Clays Lane. Can we come back to
23 that after the break? Certainly shall not lose that
24 one, because it is on the agenda, so we will have a look
25 at that. I think that --

1 MR CHEYNE: A brief point as well. Further to that, a point
2 I forgot to make was that it appeared that when the LDA
3 and others came to visit us, we were actually the last
4 community to be visited before the consultations started
5 in Stratford. And although we were the community most
6 affected, the one to be removed -- I am not saying there
7 were not others, because the original plan was of course
8 south of the Stratford site -- and I do not know exactly
9 where it is, but another site was going to be demolished
10 as well. But actually we were being told by the people
11 who came to visit us that they had already been to
12 places like Leytonstone and places like that, and we
13 could not figure out why we would be the last people to
14 be visited when we were the ones to be the most affected
15 in that area. Again, that created a feeling of
16 abandonment, that people were not really coming and
17 discussing these issues.

18 I would refer in that respect also to a statement
19 made by Mr Winterbottom later on, when he said he wanted
20 to discuss all these things with us as early as
21 possible. I know that letter was written after what we
22 are talking about here, but nonetheless if that
23 principle, that attitude applied later, it should have
24 applied earlier, and it should have applied to the fact
25 that Clays Lane should have actually really been the

1 first community to be visited. But the Stratford
2 consultations which I attended started the week after
3 they came. If I remember rightly, the meeting was on
4 the Friday at the end of one week, and at the beginning
5 of the next week they were starting general community
6 consultations.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Cheyne has had the final word of the
8 session again, so we take that as an opportune moment to
9 break. We will adjourn for 15 minutes again, and then
10 we will come back to look specifically at the second
11 item, the Olympic proposals, and work through the design
12 and the planning process, and the direct implications
13 for Clays Lane. So I will see you all again in
14 15 minutes.

15 (4.25 pm)

16 (A short break)

17 (4.45 pm)

18 THE CHAIRMAN: We will go on to look at the Olympic and
19 Legacy proposals.

20 The way that I have structured it is as per the
21 agenda, but I will say a little bit more, that we may
22 need to deal with specific elements in terms of original
23 master plan design, allow that to be questioned, as I
24 think there are specific elements relating to that, and
25 then go on to the later amendment, unless you think it

1 will be more useful to deal with the two together. But
2 I will be guided on that, and particularly the factors
3 that influence the layout and siting of the village in
4 the general Clays Lane area. And in terms of the
5 amendments and the drawing of the village closer to
6 Stratford City, and within Stratford City itself, why it
7 was not possible to retain Clays Lane as an entity.

8 I also want to look at potential for flexibility in
9 terms of the siting of the ancillary areas, move on then
10 to the ground contamination issue, and that will I think
11 be hopefully the way that we can work our way through
12 this particular topic. The relationship with
13 Stratford City has already been covered to some degree
14 in the background, although there may be a need to
15 overlap.

16 Timetable -- what I have in mind is the timetable
17 for relocation: how critical the timetable is, and as
18 necessary, consideration of alternative sites. I know,
19 Mr Prior, in your supplementary proof there is some
20 explanation of the three initial sites and how the one
21 that we are looking at emerged.

22 So whether we deal with that at the end of it, or at
23 the very beginning in terms of master plan design,
24 because it might feed into the evolution of that.

25 Mr Cheyne?

1 MR CHEYNE: I know this is going back to the previous
2 session, but a very small point just to say we were
3 discussing about the power lines. And one point
4 I wanted to raise was -- Mr Prior was saying that the
5 comprehensive idea gets rid of the power lines as
6 a whole. It is not plain how the power lines would have
7 been dealt with if it had just been a small programme,
8 as was pointed out. However, I would have thought one
9 of the points that could be made is once a bit of the
10 power line has been taken out, there would almost
11 certainly have been pressure to remove the rest of the
12 power lines. So one of the things about this kind of
13 incremental programme is that however much it may be
14 that be you can say that there are elements to the
15 programme which would not be done all at the same time,
16 it is certain that one increment leads to another
17 increment, and so inevitably once someone had taken out
18 some, other people, other communities would start
19 campaigning to get their programmes up and running as
20 well.

21 So I think it is not necessarily the case you can
22 say getting rid of the power lines still just depends
23 on. Once a bit of it has gone, the rest of it would
24 also go over a period of time.

25 MR PRIOR: My response would be that I think it has proved

1 extremely difficult in most areas of the country to get
2 power lines undergrounded as part of significant
3 schemes, and hence I think Mr Jones's alluding to the
4 point that whilst it was in part of the Stratford
5 applications, we had some doubts about their ability to
6 do. It is a very expensive operation, and the
7 consequences of things like head-houses, et cetera, make
8 these things very difficult to do. So I happen to take
9 the different view, which is I think if this approach
10 was not taken, it would not have happened.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: I have both your comments. I do not think we
12 can take that any further. Mr Blacker?

13 MR BLACKER: On that specific point, and from direct
14 experience at English Partnerships, 1996/1997, we
15 undergrounded a stretch of power lines from
16 Barking Reach in Dagenham, which was a very difficult
17 project to persuade National Grid to do that. They were
18 worried about precedent setting, in the hope then that
19 the knock on of that would be developers and other
20 developers would come forward and make the contributions
21 that would allow that to happen. No further
22 undergrounding of power lines actually happened in that
23 area after we did that small bit of undergrounding.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Inconclusive, is it not? I take both points.
25 Let us move on, and I will turn to Mr Prior to start

1 this one in terms of master plan design, and to decide
2 whether you want to take it in terms of the alternatives
3 leading into the master plan as the starting point. Is
4 that the best way of dealing with it?

5 MR PRIOR: Probably. I have a logical approach. When we
6 were appointed to look at the Olympics in the
7 Lee Valley, we were actually looking at the whole
8 Lea Valley, not just the northern end of the lower
9 Lea Valley. Therefore there were a whole range of sites
10 and options studied for different components of the
11 games. Could you disaggregate the components of the
12 games, could you bring them together? What would be the
13 best way of handling that?

14 Quite quickly we came down to, in terms of how you
15 would put the games together, and in terms of a winning
16 bid, the view that all the major facilities had to be
17 pretty close together. And when you play in issues such
18 as security and transport for Olympic family and Olympic
19 officials, you start to see the need to aggregate
20 components together.

21 Secondly, when you look at the need to deliver the
22 greater majority of your spectators by public transport,
23 Stratford, which goes back I think to Mr Cheyne's point
24 about the sort of serendipitous coming together of these
25 two ambitions, is Stratford became the obvious place

1 where the games could be used as a regeneration tool.
2 But Stratford gave us, with West Ham, the transport
3 infrastructure to make this project happen.

4 Specifically in terms of how that was laid out then
5 was the points I have talked about, about how you laid
6 out your venues in such a way that you could make
7 decisions about bits which you kept, those you took
8 away, and their relationship to an emerging urban form.

9 The village of course played a fundamental part in
10 that, and what we talk about in my evidence in my
11 rebuttal to Mr Cheyne is on page 14, table 5.6. It was
12 just an extract from the environmental impact
13 assessment, which talks about the three options which we
14 really had on the table towards the end of the process.
15 That was Stratford City in Clays Lane, which we know
16 about, the north part of Fish Island, and West Ham,
17 which is the Parcelforce site adjacent to West Ham
18 station.

19 There are advantages and disadvantages noted here.
20 Just in terms of the really big considerations, it is
21 undoubtedly an advantage to have your Olympic
22 facilities, particularly your Olympic village, as close
23 as possible to your major Olympic venues. That has both
24 major advantages in terms of the athletes' experience of
25 games, how they got to venues, how they travel around,

1 but extremely importantly are issues of security and
2 containment in the Olympic village. After Munich, of
3 course, the Olympic village is seen as the most
4 vulnerable element in all of these developments.

5 And secondly, the recognition that the transport of
6 athletes, which all takes place effectively on buses or
7 private vehicles, generates huge amounts of transport
8 movements. And you need to, as it were, lessen that
9 travel distance between where your Olympic village is
10 and where your major facilities are, and you need to
11 create the network in which those things operate. So in
12 simple terms, our plan has an Olympic village close in
13 to the majority of the major facilities, linked to those
14 facilities by a loop road. And the location of the
15 Olympic park is essentially determined by the scale of
16 land availability and its proximity, importantly, to
17 transport systems. So what you have is a whole series
18 of interlink components start to come together which
19 start to coalesce your Olympic plan into one area.

20 Every city does it in a different way. Every city
21 makes different judgments. Every city has existing
22 sports facilities that they can use, so everyone's plan
23 is distorted around their existing infrastructure.

24 In terms of the Olympic village, let me start with
25 the two we did not run with in the end. The major thing

1 weighing against West Ham was its distance from the
2 Olympic precinct, the transport link and the amount of
3 vehicles that would have to be on the move the entire
4 time to get our Olympic athletes. And Hedley Walker has
5 given me a note on that, which is in the region of
6 something like 350 buses constantly in movement to keep
7 our Olympic family, as it were, connected to the main
8 Olympic park, on top of that which would be needed to
9 circulate people around the wider Olympic venues.

10 We were concerned about, in Legacy terms, our
11 ability to deliver an intense amount of development, and
12 its relation back to the urban area around it. Yes, it
13 would have required lots of infrastructure and bridges
14 back over the Jubilee Line, but importantly the amount
15 of capacity being requested of the Olympic village, at
16 the density we thought we could deliver in that
17 location, we thought fitted ill with what we had at
18 West Ham. Certainly there are proposals for West Ham in
19 terms of housing, and there are SPGs in place in terms
20 of delivering housing there, but it was at odds with
21 what we thought the shape of the Olympic village should
22 be.

23 When we go to Fish Island, a couple of issues again.
24 In this location we had much better connectivity with
25 the Olympic park. Again, I will just turn to this

1 plan 21, essentially talking in this area through here.
2 But because of the relatively poor nature of transport
3 connections in that area, the amount of housing density
4 you could deliver, the amount of stories of height would
5 suggest that we would be taking up a very large surface
6 area of development in order to get this thing in. So
7 we would be able to build at less density, at densities
8 well below that which we would be able to deliver at
9 Stratford. So Mr Cheyne's point about land
10 availability, which he has raised earlier to do with
11 Fish Island, was as much to do not just with ownership
12 of land, but the actual sheer extent of land you would
13 need to make the village work in that location with the
14 transport miles and the back of house, et cetera.

15 There was also issues of its proximity with the A12,
16 and frankly putting that much high density housing close
17 into the A12 we did not think was a good Legacy
18 position. And subsequently, as we have seen through the
19 OAPF, this area in working with the borough is
20 essentially to remain as an industrial and workplace
21 area in Legacy, with the housing described in that
22 region as being essentially live/work along the
23 boundaries of the canal system; i.e., well in board from
24 the motorway system.

25 It has to be said there are also perceived security

1 risks with the A12 that close to the back of the
2 Olympic village, and our ability to control vehicle
3 movements up and down there.

4 Ultimately we come back to Stratford City, and
5 Clays Lane. It became obvious to us that the delivery
6 of Stratford, a major regeneration project, set in train
7 a whole element of infrastructure investment and
8 transport investment in particular that we could see us
9 being able to add a considerable amount of high density
10 housing to a profile that met the Olympic requirements
11 for athlete and official housing. It was obvious that
12 that which was described in the Stratford planning
13 applications, and importantly there was a description of
14 a community that had been designed not for the Olympics
15 but for Legacy, that actually the Olympic requirement
16 dovetailed pretty neatly with that. So what was being
17 described at Stratford gave a sort of progenitor of what
18 the Olympic village could be, and responded to a huge
19 piece of work that had been going on between Stratford
20 and the local authorities about housing in this area.

21 So transport infrastructure, the nature of density,
22 the nature of using the leverage of the major investment
23 at Stratford gave us this as our preferred location, and
24 by far was a location that was closest into the
25 Olympic park, within the security cordon, and sat

1 happily within the network that we described. And that
2 is why we ended up, as it were, at Stratford with this
3 scheme.

4 Maybe I should stop at that point.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: I will ask you supplementary question. So
6 far as identifying that particular location as the most
7 desirable position for the Olympic village, what factors
8 relate to the need to demolish Clays Lane? So it is the
9 relationship of Clays Lane, the existing Clays Lane with
10 the master plan proposals.

11 MR PRIOR: Having got the general location and the
12 structural interrelationships with the Olympic park, you
13 can imagine that the design team, the fact that we were
14 impacting on Clays Lane became a major issue. That
15 would undoubtedly be an area where you would give due
16 consideration, more than due consideration to how you
17 would either incorporate that into what you are doing
18 with the Olympic village, building as the Olympic
19 village, or could the Olympic village -- can you
20 incorporate Clays Lane into the Olympic village, or does
21 Clays Lane in effect have to go in order to be able to
22 deliver the Olympic village?

23 I think a number of elements come into play here.
24 Both the nature of the existing building stock, the
25 suitability of its use for incorporation in the village,

1 or close to the village, and whether in the wider
2 concept of a regeneration area, whether we could expect
3 to deliver more housing or a different form of housing
4 or a better form of housing here as part of a more
5 comprehensive scope. All of those components came
6 together to suggest to us that the demolition of
7 Clays Lane, setting aside the obvious social impacts and
8 issues of that, from a broader regeneration development
9 point of view became worthy of consideration in terms
10 of, "this is where we locate the Olympic village".

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Were there any other factors in terms of
12 communications, the need to create an access around the
13 Olympic park, security, any other factors? I think if
14 we can have all of these out and then we can deal with
15 them.

16 MR PRIOR: The word "Olympic village" is a wholly inadequate
17 description of what this thing is. This is a town
18 occupied by 17,500 people during the games, and then
19 about a third of that for the Paralympic Games. It has
20 a series of measures that go with it which are unlike
21 any other town. You have a level of occupation which is
22 fully two or three times that you would expect to find
23 in a residential area of this nature for the games. So
24 in effect everything is operating way over capacity in
25 terms of what you would normally build it for. So

1 simple things like the IOC set down a specification on
2 the amount of fresh water supply per athlete. That,
3 when you put all those people in those buildings, is way
4 in excess of what you put into a normal building. Their
5 expectations on lifting capacity, moving people up and
6 down between floors, is excessive compared to where you
7 would be in terms of a normal residential community.
8 IT infrastructure, power supply -- you name it, it is
9 absolutely huge.

10 We then have maximum and minimum standards for
11 individual athletes. We have strange anomalies like
12 very tall people who have to be fitted into standard
13 sized accommodation, we have huge amounts of storage
14 facilities, we have games and teams managers. Then we
15 have the unusual combination of how do you put teams
16 into certain buildings so that they are altogether near
17 their coaches and near their officials? So there is
18 another overlay of organisation issues. There is also
19 a fundamental driver, which is the Paralympic Games,
20 which is the standards for fitting out any building
21 under DDA standards for any form of disability. But
22 when you take the Paralympics on board it says basically
23 that you should be heading towards a world-best standard
24 in how you provide these buildings. That of course
25 leads to space challenges in terms of door width,

1 turn-around space in bathrooms --

2 THE CHAIRMAN: We are getting very detailed in relation to
3 the question I asked about, the factors that influenced
4 the decision that Clays Lane needed to be replaced.
5 I was asking whether there were other factors such as
6 access roads, security; those sort of major scale
7 elements.

8 MR PRIOR: Within the complexity of the village, my point
9 about these people compressed into this small space is
10 that the next big land-hungry element around this is the
11 support infrastructure for the village. Because you
12 have moved people into a core area, in order to make the
13 village work you have to have in effect the support
14 infrastructure that is almost akin to a large hotel
15 around it. So the service infrastructure, the ability
16 to feed all these athletes three times a day at these
17 mass sittings.

18 That demands of you huge amounts of space in order
19 to feed facilities into that. That on the Olympic plans
20 is coloured pink in terms of that background
21 infrastructure, and if you look at plan 22 in CD25 we
22 see in effect the entire village embraced by a cordon of
23 support facilities. Around that is the Olympic loop
24 road, which is both our secure circulation system to
25 move athletes in and out of the village and take them to

1 events, but also to provide the logistical routes into
2 the village so you can service this thing day and night.
3 And importantly, the placement of the loop road in such
4 a way that can service it at night, and that in effect
5 the back-of-house facilities sit between the village and
6 the service points. So there is, as it were, a doughnut
7 of loop roads and security areas, service facilities,
8 and the village is contained in the middle of that.

9 There are other hungry things like the transport
10 mouth where you have your athletes constantly boarding
11 buses to go to either training events or to their main
12 events, and the efficiency of that is absolutely
13 critical. We have had games like Atlanta, where
14 athletes never actually got to their events because the
15 transport system did not work.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: So what you are saying is it is not a simple
17 decision of being able to isolate Clays Lane from this;
18 that if you leave Clays Lane standing, then it means
19 amendments to the ancillary areas, and also the loop
20 road, the security, and the like?

21 MR PRIOR: Yes.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: It is an integral part of the design.

23 MR PRIOR: I delve into detail here, but it is an incredibly
24 complex element within which there are
25 interrelationships between big infrastructure components

1 that are common to most Olympic villages and the way
2 they work.

3 I will say one more point on that. For instance,
4 the relationship between accommodation, where the
5 athletes eat, and where the transport mall is and its
6 relationship to the transport system is in effect
7 a simple diagram which is actually very difficult to
8 make work in an area like this.

9 So we have a very complex element of city, a huge
10 piece of city that we have to build, and it is very hard
11 to manipulate the components of it to, as it were, fit
12 it into a complex site.

13 MR ARMSTRONG: In essence you have placed yourself in
14 a quandry. I do not envy you. First of all, I take the
15 point, it is a city within a city, or a town within
16 a town. Suppose the equivalent would be the
17 construction from scratch of an Ivy League university in
18 the heart of a big American city or town. But coming
19 back to the thrust of the question, as a Clays Lane
20 resident from 2004 onwards, we always knew -- and
21 I certainly knew -- that we were going to be moved
22 anyway, irrespective of the Olympics. The whole deal
23 was that we were going to be moved. The Olympic Legacy
24 and the non-Olympic Legacy were that we were going to be
25 moved. So it is very difficult for you to argue to us

1 convincingly that the plans that you have are addressing
2 us in a way differently to how we would have been
3 addressed had there not been an Olympics. In fact, it
4 is impossible.

5 That is the first point. The second point, I was
6 quite happy with the detail that you were going into,
7 because it brought one thing home to me. I am not
8 digressing. In 1972, for example, two-thirds of the
9 American sprint team missed the start of the gun for the
10 gun for the 100 metres final because they were tied up
11 in the Olympic village; they could not get a bus to the
12 stadium. The reason why I mention that is because in
13 the original Olympic plans that were submitted to us,
14 and that we saw at Clays Lane, hardly any of the Olympic
15 development took place inside the Stratford land. And
16 then that was changed, but piecemeal. And in effect you
17 have fallen between stools, because any planner, any
18 architect would be able to tell you, we are talking
19 big scale here. That the Olympic stadium should be in
20 between the Stratford International development and the
21 London Underground and combined mainline railway
22 station, because you have effectively a quarter of
23 a mile of fallow land which is going to be
24 pedestrianised, walkways and all of that, all of which
25 would duly serve people the business of getting from one

1 station to the other and transporting somebody, ordinary
2 people through an Olympic complex, at minimal risk of
3 integrating that movement with the Olympic traffic, the
4 athletic traffic, because they would be on different
5 levels.

6 But you have not done that, and the reason you have
7 not done that is because had you no means of doing that
8 unless you made this CPO in the first place. So you are
9 arguing against yourself, because your optimum
10 way forward you have not taken, and you have not taken
11 that because you did not have a means to take it. The
12 land was owned by somebody else. So you cannot come
13 before us and say that "we are adopting an optimum
14 strategy", when the optimum strategy is staring you in
15 the face and you could not adopt it because you did not
16 have the means to do it.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: I will take Miss Morton next before I come
18 back.

19 MS MORTON: I just wanted to refer to the changes in the
20 master plan that have happened that have come to our
21 attention only recently. A big problem in this whole
22 process has been the lack of information that has been
23 given to us. As statutory objectors to the CPO we were
24 given proofs of evidence, and we discovered that the
25 site that we are on was no longer going to be the

1 Olympic site, but for amenities, if I am correct in
2 thinking that way. Again, that information was not
3 given to us.

4 I also wanted to ask how that would therefore affect
5 the site preparation and remediation that would need to
6 be done. We have been given a timescale of until
7 2007 -- July 2007, I believe -- but surely now if the
8 building works that are going to happen are going to be
9 less than what they would have been under an Olympic
10 village site, does not that change our circumstances?
11 Should not we be aware of that?

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Prior, if you can deal with the first
13 element, which is the change to the design. We want to
14 focus on in terms of this part of the discussion is the
15 matter plan designs and amendments, then we will pick up
16 that issue about timetabling and ground contamination as
17 one element in due course.

18 MR PRIOR: Shall I deal with Mr Armstrong's point first.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: As well, please.

20 MR PRIOR: Mr Armstrong, I do disagree with you, I am
21 afraid. The location for the Olympic stadium is the
22 right place for it, and I disagree that the site between
23 the two stations is the right place for it. The travel
24 distances and walk distances that you need to handle the
25 crowd -- you do not want your major facilities sitting

1 on top of your major transport interchanges. You need
2 to put into these crowd flow calculations anything
3 between 15 and 25 minute walks to take the surge out of
4 the crowd so we can handle the huge number of people
5 that are coming in.

6 There are two points here. One, in order to take
7 people into the Olympic park, they have to go through an
8 airport scanner. That requires huge areas of
9 processing; we have to move thousands of people through
10 those entrances, and you need room to do that. So you
11 need to move your stadiums away from your transport
12 hubs. They made a serious mistake at Sydney where they
13 put the station in the middle of the Olympic park, and
14 had a huge job trying to manage that as a security
15 issue. If you talk to the Sydney people, they barely
16 got away with it.

17 The second point, the stadium in a Legacy position,
18 if you think again, if you want to move people to
19 a major sports venue, there is no harm in having them
20 walk a certain distance. Firstly, it again takes that
21 stretch out of the crowd movement, it does not create
22 bottlenecks at stations, it is what the police and the
23 marshals want; they want some stretch. And secondly,
24 you have to ask yourself whether a major stadium
25 facility which is used at best a few times a week should

1 be occupying major land where enhanced development
2 densities can be achieved because you are near major
3 railheads. So actually the location of the stadium, in
4 particular, and the swimming pool were all to do with
5 their performance during the games but, importantly,
6 where they were sitting in Legacy.

7 So I disagree with you on that basis, and we looked
8 at that very hard in terms of where we put that thing.

9 Turning to the issue on the village, we have moved
10 the village inboard to Stratford, and I will come back
11 to the reasons for that. But in terms of whether
12 Clays Lane is occupied by Olympic housing or is occupied
13 by support to Olympic housing, I am afraid in my mind
14 I have to see those two as conjoined. You cannot do one
15 without the other. We have in effect to service the
16 village and equip the village with all the facilities
17 that make it work, or you do not have an Olympic
18 village. The specification on how much space we put
19 around these things and how we supply the village is as
20 important as the number of rooms we have. So the two
21 things move together. I am afraid I cannot see those
22 things as two separate elements. They move together
23 with each other.

24 In terms of quality of remediation, we can come on
25 to it, but all I will say at this point is that that is

1 about the world that follows after the games. You
2 remediate for a community to follow. That is what we
3 have to do. This is about the future.

4 On the point of why we moved the village inboard to
5 Stratford, that was not an option available to us in the
6 early part of the planning of the Stratford games. Your
7 point about the stadium sort of touched on that point:
8 why did you not put it on Stratford? Actually we did
9 not put it on Stratford because it was the wrong place
10 for it, for the stadium.

11 MR ARMSTRONG: That is your argument.

12 MR PRIOR: That is my argument for the stadium. It is
13 a different kettle of fish when you come around to the
14 village, where actually we always thought that bringing
15 the village inboard to Stratford would be a better
16 position. Mr Blacker has touched on our confidences
17 about in effect Stratford being able to deliver the
18 project. At the time of the first documents coming
19 forward we were standing outboard of the Stratford
20 applications, so there was some overlap because there
21 was some expectation about their ability to deliver the
22 rest of the residential accommodation to the south.
23 When it became apparent that that may not be the case,
24 we brought the village inboard, but it is fair to say
25 that the joined-up working that has gone on with the

1 Stratford team since then around the development of this
2 housing, particularly in terms of this issue between
3 Olympic use and its full-time Legacy use as a community,
4 has actually brought those schemes very closely
5 together.

6 What I am trying to say is that coming inboard to
7 Stratford, as far as we are concerned it is the right
8 solution, and inhabits more of the Stratford land.

9 I could then go on to more detail in terms of
10 power lines, delivery, and the rest --

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Before you do that, I will ask you
12 a question. One of the points raised by residents,
13 particularly Mr Cheyne in his statement, was this issue
14 about siting at the time of the consultation and the
15 planning application; residents of Clays Lane were
16 saying: move it into Stratford. But there seemed to be
17 a substantial impediment which meant that you could not.
18 Are you saying that that was the case? At that time it
19 was not opportune, there was an impediment, but it was
20 recognised as being a better or a preferred solution,
21 and that in time that opportunity arose to get to
22 a position where you wanted to be.

23 MR PRIOR: Mr Blacker may want to come in on this. What you
24 will see is that there is -- it was moved partly into
25 Stratford, and there was an overlap with that. And we

1 felt at the time that that was both a reasonable balance
2 between that which was the development of Stratford and
3 the future development of this area in terms of the
4 extension of the housing areas, but you can see the
5 advantages of bringing it further inboard. But there
6 was a position taken in effect that we were somewhere
7 between the two. We had brought the village inboard, we
8 were making use of as much of Stratford as we could, but
9 we could see the long-term regeneration benefits of
10 Stratford having a residential quarter in its own right
11 to get going with. So again there is this sort of
12 balance between what the public sector does in
13 regeneration terms, and what the private sector does.

14 Now if at this point, when these plans were put
15 together, we are expecting Stratford to be able to
16 deliver on that residential programme, provide much
17 needed housing in the area, then this struck us as the
18 right position to take. As the scheme went on, and as
19 we have seen further reiterations of that, it became
20 apparent that we would be better off bringing the things
21 inboard into Stratford. What it did not do in effect
22 was remove the need for the Clays Lane land. It did not
23 clear that position because of all these other
24 components I have talked about that must be seen in the
25 context of the village.

1 MR ARMSTRONG: Can I come back to that?

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Please do.

3 MR ARMSTRONG: You are arguing against yourself. I can take
4 the point that flow patterns and movement patterns mean
5 that you need to maximise the distance, but we are
6 talking about one month, six years time, and for
7 a period of one month in six years time you are going to
8 have this necessary inconvenience to movement patterns.
9 There is nothing wrong with having a flow pattern which
10 detours outside of the Stratford City development from
11 both locations, Stratford international, and from
12 Stratford mainline, and then comes back to the stadium
13 complex. And then at the end of the games you seal it
14 off; you have a flight of stairs or whatever you have
15 that links the two.

16 You cannot say, "Well, we are trying to knit
17 together sides of the urban whole, and do edge-knitting
18 and things like that" and you make the Olympics the
19 thing that takes precedence, i.e. the anomaly, as it
20 were, and the long-term suffers because of it.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: So what you are saying is you design for the
22 long-term, and that any inconvenience should be for that
23 one month period for the event.

24 MR ARMSTRONG: That is right. This business of scanning,
25 that can happen if you have a half mile detour that

1 comes out and comes back in.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: I think we have the point. Let Mr Prior deal
3 with it.

4 MR PRIOR: You are absolutely right. You could quite
5 happily conceive of flows that are unusual for an
6 Olympics which you would then ignore in Legacy, and you
7 would carry on. And I think we agree about that.

8 My point is we have put the stadium in the right place,
9 and let me give an example of what you are describing.

10 The site of the aquatic centre, the swimming pool,
11 is such that that is the right place for it in Legacy.
12 That is as close as we could get to a major mainline
13 station with a facility of that scale and in a position
14 where I could put the front door of that building
15 essentially right in the edge of the Stratford
16 development. However, for the games I cannot have the
17 main entrance in that location; I cannot handle the
18 crowd flow. So in the games the crowd go into the
19 Olympic park, they go through your description of
20 a temporary routing, and they re-enter the swimming pool
21 facilities from the west side.

22 So your point is made in terms of the aquatic
23 centre -- we have done just that. We have put it in the
24 right place for the Legacy, we have adjusted the crowd
25 flows for the games so we can make it work for the

1 games, but it is most certainly in the right place for
2 Legacy. My argument to you is bringing the stadium
3 closer to Stratford will both not work -- we would have
4 to take people a long long way away to bring them
5 back -- but secondly, it is absolutely the wrong place
6 for it in Legacy. You should not build a stadium of
7 that scale on the Stratford rail lands that close to all
8 that transport infrastructure. It has four million
9 square foot of commercial space on it at the moment, and
10 the biggest shopping centre in the UK about to be built
11 on it. That is the sort of thing you use that land; you
12 do not put a stadium on it.

13 MR ARMSTRONG: The last part of your point is a slightly
14 separate argument. I will just say why. Originally it
15 was hoped that trains would stop at Stratford
16 International on the way to the channel, and the way
17 coming back. Then it comes that they are not able to
18 stop there because the Channel company that owns it,
19 then owns the trains, says the land is too contaminated.
20 They have to go all the way through, go to St Pancras,
21 then we have a shuttle service that goes back out. This
22 has been in the major media. This is fact.

23 So the four million square metres of accommodation
24 is being revised as we speak, and that is what half of
25 the arguments are about, who gets to develop what and

1 who is part of the new consortium that is being built up
2 now? We are both informed about that.

3 You are arguing against yourself in so much as if
4 what I have suggested works for the aquatic centre, it
5 can work for other things. The whole reason why the
6 aquatic centre is there is because that is all you could
7 get on that site under the original Chelmsfield
8 ownership. And the whole reason why the CPO is being
9 debated now is because you wanted more control over that
10 site. It is not because of, well, optimum Legacy, and
11 optimum considerations in those respects.

12 And this brings me back to what I am talking about
13 with regards Clays Lane. Ian's predecessor, John Lynne,
14 made a potent point when he argued that okay, you need
15 to have these Olympics, you need the Paralympic games
16 and all of these things, and assuming we are not against
17 that, why cannot Clays Lane residents be temporarily
18 moved away and then moved back as part of the overall
19 development plan? You know, you get your city within
20 a city; you get everything. But on the one hand you
21 say: well, there is going to be a 50 per cent affordable
22 housing element, and yet we are not part of that
23 affordable housing element.

24 There is nothing that you have said in your planning
25 proposals in the master planning, there is nothing

1 suggested by the changes and the amendments that you
2 have had to make that negate that option. There is
3 nothing that you suggest in your comments and reasons
4 for your master planning adjustments and master plan as
5 it exists before me now, and everybody can see, that
6 says that one stream of amendments can take precedence
7 over another stream.

8 The fact of the matter is that the whole reason why
9 you have planned in this way is because you were only
10 able to plan in this way. It is not because you were
11 dealing with optimums; it is because of political and
12 commercial considerations. So we as residents are
13 incidental on all of that. We did not even come into
14 it, because there is no reason why, for example, if, as
15 you put it, the kind of development you need for an
16 Olympic village involves huge amount of density increase
17 over and above what you would find in an urbanity in
18 this location, there is no reason why you do not step up
19 the urbanity in that area, the densities in that area,
20 just in that area. If Stratford City is going to take
21 over from Olympic city, then why cannot Clays Lane
22 residents be part of that city? There is nothing you
23 have suggested -- there is nothing, none of the detailed
24 reasons that make a lot of sense negate our presence.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: A lot of issues being raised there, but can

1 we focus on the one directly related to Clays Lane. It
2 might be a repeat of an answer you have given earlier,
3 but the point that has been made very strongly about the
4 need to take out Clays Lane.

5 MR PRIOR: I will start where I started, in that we have
6 always considered the impact on Clays Lane extremely
7 seriously. That was a major issue for us in terms of
8 planning it, but the multiple times I went through this
9 with the team, the multiple times we looked at it,
10 I could not see a way of making this village happen with
11 the peculiarities that go with delivering an Olympic
12 village, with all the baggage that goes with it in terms
13 of infrastructure, back-of-house facilities, et cetera,
14 and make Clays Lane work within that.

15 MR ARMSTRONG: I am not arguing for that at all. My first
16 point is we always knew we were going to go, because we
17 were not on any Legacy. So there is no reason why we
18 cannot go and come back.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Let us deal with that point specifically.
20 Was that ever considered?

21 MR PRIOR: This is back to new buildings in this location.

22 MR ARMSTRONG: Yes.

23 MR PRIOR: I think -- the point about who is going to live
24 where and when I think is for others, because I have not
25 been involved in those debates. The provision of, as it

1 were, the opportunity for that in terms of provision of
2 social housing, affordable housing, et cetera, that is
3 in these plans. So in terms of the nature of housing
4 provision and access to housing provision, the Olympic
5 village and the extensions of the Olympic village in
6 Legacy deal with those issues. I said that in my
7 evidence in response to Mr Cheyne.

8 How the sequencing of relocation of residents of
9 Clays Lane happens is for somebody else to talk to.
10 Maybe on Thursday.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Let us draw some others into the discussion.

12 MR CHEYNE: I am afraid there are so many issues here it is
13 difficult to know where to begin. Mr Prior just said
14 they considered the issue of the removal of Clays Lane.
15 Actually, they did not. In terms of the statement here
16 from table 5.6 it says:

17 "... disadvantage requires the demolition of
18 Clays Lane estate, with the consequent community
19 disruption."

20 I do not call it "disruption", it is demolition.
21 "Destruction", not "disruption". The only thing which
22 has not been discussed in these disadvantage categories
23 is that demolition.

24 Mr Prior goes through all of the other things about
25 the impossibility of adjusting the limited transport

1 facilities in terms of Fish Island, the distance from
2 the Olympic precinct in terms of West Ham, and all these
3 kind of things. But he does not in this section once
4 address the issue of what will happen to the residents
5 of Clays Lane.

6 I asked for information on all this kind of stuff
7 from the LDA. I did not even get this chart. The
8 information I asked for, which I specifically asked in
9 terms of Clays Lane's demolition:

10 "Documents relating to the location of the athletes'
11 village, (inaudible) ... selection of Clays Lane estate
12 as part of the site."

13 It completely fails to do that; it just deals with
14 the broad issue.

15 One of the issues they have raised is that the site
16 is near, for example, Stratford stations. Well
17 actually, Clays Lane is quite a long way away from the
18 Stratford regional stations in terms of the other sites.
19 It is not particularly close.

20 I just do not think that this issue was taken
21 seriously, and when I consider the way in which our
22 relocation has been handled, I cannot see how you can
23 possibly say this, because the lack of preparation in
24 terms of our removal is, I think, quite staggering.

25 There are so many different issues here. Lord Coe

1 in his evidence talked about the possibilities of
2 putting things in different places. He agreed he could
3 have put different facilities in different places. That
4 would have meant that space could have been left for
5 Clays Lane residents. There are vacant pieces of land.
6 It may be that people would object to them being used,
7 but there are vacant pieces of land -- for example, just
8 south of Hackney marshes. Facilities could have been
9 put on that land. Nothing has been put there. In the
10 revisions various elements were moved into this site,
11 for example the broadcast centre, which is next door to
12 our site. That did not have to be put there. That land
13 could have been left vacant, the original facilities
14 could have been left where they were, and that land
15 could have been made available for the back-of-house
16 facilities.

17 In terms of the information we have been provided
18 with, we keep on being told there has been no change in
19 what is happening. In terms of housing obviously there
20 has been a change, and the housing was what we were
21 always told we were making way for. Now we are told:
22 okay, the village includes all these other facilities.
23 Fine; I am not arguing that it does not. It was not
24 something we were ever particularly informed about. But
25 actually the site does not just included the housing.

1 It is not a very large plot, but it includes a bit of
2 a road, and includes tennis courts, and it includes
3 back-of-house facilities for tennis courts. And the
4 issue of planning will come up in regard to that.

5 I think that the information we have had is
6 inaccurate and has been glossed over in order to make
7 out that nothing fundamental has changed. I just find
8 myself really staggered by the whole -- this whole
9 argument. And we did say -- I said specifically, and
10 I think Araceli can vouch for this -- at the meeting on
11 14th February I said, and I also raised this in
12 objections to the planning application: the bulk of the
13 housing or the housing as a whole could be stuck on
14 Stratford City. And actually we were told at that time:
15 well, there is railway line in the way; you cannot get
16 around that problem. This was the answer that was
17 given.

18 Frankly we just laughed, because if you can build
19 land bridges, but you cannot build a bridge over
20 a railway line which is going to be secure, that is just
21 funny. Of course now there is no problem. So when we
22 consider problems which are also related to the other
23 sort of issues, rail corridors, and barrier to linkage
24 with Plaistow area, for example, regarding West Ham --
25 you are building enormous connecting routes. These

1 things can be overcome. When you consider the West Ham
2 site, essentially what it comes down to is: this is too
3 far from the Olympic precinct.

4 We are talking how far these athletes are going to
5 be required to walk, whatever, to get to this site.
6 I have lived in my present house for over 11 years; I
7 have been on the site for more than 15 years. I am
8 having to make way for somebody because they cannot be
9 arsed to walk a little bit further for a couple of
10 weeks. 20 minutes I think is the distance, the IOC
11 says.

12 The idea that a plan could not have been devised
13 which excused Clays Lane from demolition I think is
14 absolutely astounding, when we consider the expertise,
15 the funds and the time which has supposedly gone into
16 this project. The idea that we automatically have to
17 go. Facilities have been moved into the area -- they
18 did not have to be moved into that area. There is other
19 land available. The configurations of the actual
20 buildings themselves could have been changed so that the
21 floor plans are slightly different, so that people do
22 not have to move, and not only they do not have to move,
23 but they do not have to move in circumstances which are
24 going to leave them worse off and not in connection with
25 the community which they are presently in.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Before you respond on that, that in terms of
2 the amendments to the master plan, with some of the
3 village that the residential element, the housing moving
4 into Stratford City, that clearly frees up some of the
5 land. It seems as though other uses are proposed to be
6 moved in to replace that. So rather than occupying
7 a smaller area which might have potential in some sense
8 to release Clays Lane from the site, that other things
9 have been moved in. Can you as part of your answer to
10 Mr Cheyne cover that background as well please, as to
11 what led to that?

12 MR PRIOR: Apologies if I do not get it all first time.
13 I think one point you made was about the increase in
14 density within the Stratford site, and the changing of
15 housing blocks in order to make it possible to move the
16 entire village inboard to Stratford. You will see in
17 the options that were appended to my rebuttal proof
18 reports from late last year and January of this year,
19 that we looked at all those types of options. I said in
20 my evidence in those reports that what we really came to
21 was -- let me give you a starting point. The bid book
22 said that no athlete would live above 8 storeys. There
23 was a limit in the vertical height we would place
24 athletes. That was in the bid book that set some
25 parameters about the scale and size of the village. We

1 certainly went back and challenged on that, and
2 convinced the authorities of our ability to provide
3 lifts and security and whatever for that. So we were
4 able, as it were, to occupy more of the built volume
5 that was permitted within the scale of development.
6 That was the first gain, as it were, by moving into
7 Stratford; we dealt with two issues there, both scale
8 and occupation.

9 The second point, which is a more fundamental one,
10 I think, is sitting back and then looking at the
11 Stratford development, the question we asked ourselves
12 is, here we have a piece of city that has been designed
13 for the next hundred years by a skilled group of
14 architects and developers who know what they are doing,
15 in a long term discussion with a local authority. And
16 here we have an Olympic village. It would be a very
17 strange world if those two things fitted absolutely
18 perfectly together. Would we be better off, as it were,
19 forcing the issue at Stratford and increasing density,
20 and increasing loading into that urban area for the next
21 hundred years because of the requirements of the Olympic
22 village, or would we be better off accepting the fact
23 that Stratford could only cope with part of the capacity
24 of the Olympic village? A significant part of it, but
25 not all of it. These two things were not designed to go

1 hand in glove with each other.

2 So where we got to was that we could put
3 a significant part of the Olympic village into
4 Stratford, but certainly not all of it. And I do not
5 think we should, as it were, intensify the Stratford
6 residential quarter beyond a position that it was
7 designed to handle, or could be designed to handle with
8 all the local parameters around it, just to deliver the
9 Olympic village. And there is still 60,000 or
10 600,000 square feet of space which is still outside the
11 envelope created by the planning application. So from
12 my point of view that was a judgment about the future
13 success of this community in the long-term, that we do
14 not overbuild Stratford in order to make the
15 Olympic village work.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Presumably the residents would say, even at
17 the expense of still having to demolish Clays Lane.

18 MR PRIOR: Even at the expense of having to demolish
19 Clays Lane, which again was factored into those debates
20 at the time. Which had to do also with an anticipation
21 of having established the structure at Stratford,
22 established the need for restructures of roads,
23 establish the need for the back-of-house facility to the
24 games and what that could provide us, and our ability to
25 build out from the structure we could create both with

1 Stratford, and the Olympic development appended to it,
2 that on balance the wider regeneration case was better
3 suited by keeping Stratford essentially as it had been
4 designed with all the agreements that went with it, and
5 then appending parts of the Olympic village to that and
6 then setting up the position for the next 10, 15,
7 20 years of residential development going north up the
8 valley. So that was the decision we made, and that was
9 the logic for it. It will not win me any friends around
10 this table, but that was the process we went through to
11 get to the position we are now.

12 MR CHEYNE: The issue of floor space is a relatively minor
13 one. It was just one point that I raise. The issue
14 I raised of a variety of different possibilities that
15 there is other land available, that facilities be moved
16 into the site, that the original plan apparently had not
17 thought out or the planners had not thought out some of
18 the particular implications of their decisions in terms
19 of, for example, contamination, which we are going to
20 deal with later on, and power lines. That we had
21 already proposed that something could be moved from one
22 part of the site to another, and it was later done. To
23 me this is not -- I mean, I am an amateur, and we do not
24 have the resources here, we do not have surveyors who
25 can make the kind of representations which we would be

1 able to if we had other kinds of assistance. So I am,
2 as an amateur, coming up with a point that we suggested
3 moving -- I suggested moving the village a long time
4 ago. Part of the village, the housing.

5 And it was not done, and the argument that was put
6 forward was frankly bizarre.

7 MR PRIOR: I am sorry, I do not know what the argument was
8 that was --

9 MR CHEYNE: The railway line.

10 MR PRIOR: But the railway line has always been buried in
11 this process, so I am not quite certain --

12 MR CHEYNE: I can only say what he said. He said, when we
13 asked him: why can you not put the housing on the east
14 part of Stratford City? He said: oh, there is a railway
15 line that imposes an insuperable security problem, and
16 that is why we could not do it. We said: well, can you
17 not build some kind of land bridge or secure walkway
18 underneath the railway line, however you are going to do
19 it? He fell silent. He did not have an answer to that.

20 MR PRIOR: The point was, that proposal has always been in
21 the plans, or the planning permission, the covering up
22 of the railway line. So they have always been in there.

23 MR CHEYNE: I cannot explain why he came up with this
24 argument. This is the argument he came up with, and we
25 proposed that the housing could be there. It was

1 objected to.

2 MR PRIOR: Ultimately the point is though, you made the
3 proposition, and we have also looked at the proposition
4 that we have moved inboard to Stratford. And I made the
5 point earlier about we have done that, we have brought
6 the housing inboard to a greater part of the Stratford
7 planning application, made use of this place that they
8 have designed and tested and run through the mill, as it
9 were.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Presumably the idea of suggesting that it
11 moves into Stratford is so that Clays Lane can stay? So
12 what you are saying is, "Thank you very much for moving
13 it in. But now what you have done? You have brought
14 something else in, and we are still faced with it".
15 That is the point.

16 MR PRIOR: I take the point.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: So the next question is, why have other
18 things been brought in? What is the need to bring those
19 in?

20 MR PRIOR: A bit of history here, which is explained in my
21 proof about the nature of the change of the plans. Some
22 of the criteria around what we have to deliver as part
23 of the Olympic games were changing in the background, in
24 terms of what we put in for our planning permission.
25 And I think I say in my evidence about the demands of

1 IOC and the supporting federations in terms of wider
2 needs for the park. So there were amendments being made
3 to the park post those planning applications, to deal
4 with some of those changes. There were also frankly
5 more and more detailed work going on about the realities
6 of delivering some of these elements to the park and how
7 you actually make it work from an operational point of
8 view.

9 To give you one example, part of the back-of-house
10 facilities on the original plans were built on top of
11 the Paralympic tennis venues. Our view was save space
12 by building the Paralympic tennis courts, stick the
13 back-of-house facilities on top, and, as it were, clear
14 all those buildings off and you build a Paralympic
15 tennis facility.

16 It has become very apparent in terms of doing the
17 logistics and planning of this that this is not
18 possible. You need to separate those two things. There
19 is not enough time to turn around some of those
20 components in order to release that. So the original
21 back-of-house facilities are a huge area, for the
22 village was situated on top of another facility.

23 And it is elements such as that, refinements of the
24 transport requirements, planning, the number of coaches,
25 where they are going to different venues; part of that

1 is in response to what we now know about the programming
2 of games and events. So what you tend to get is the
3 need for space as in all these things starts to grow
4 around the nature of the project, as we moved from being
5 in effect, and as we are at the moment, moving from
6 a bidding city putting in a planning application, to
7 a host city which now has a very different level of
8 engagement with supporting federations and the IOC. And
9 also in terms of a very large project like this, where
10 we now start getting into the very real detail of how
11 you are actually going to deliver this thing and make it
12 happen.

13 So there is not, as it were, a stable position early
14 on in this project where you can say we have drawn
15 a line under the plan and that is absolutely what we
16 have to live with in the long-term, and the planning
17 permissions and applications we went to, which Mr Jones
18 may speak to in more detail, basically establish
19 parameters which we could work with, because we knew
20 this was likely to be the case.

21 MR CHEYNE: As the inspector said, stuff has been moved in,
22 so we still have not had an explanation of for example,
23 why the broadcasting facilities have to be located here.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Let us deal with that one now.

25 MR PRIOR: I thought we were talking specifically about

1 Clays Lane back-of-house.

2 MR CHEYNE: I am. The issue here is the broadcasting
3 facilities are partly located on what is now park
4 village, from what I can work out from this map. They
5 are right next door to the village, which means they
6 would be quite suitable for back-of-house facilities.
7 They have come in from another site. They could have
8 been left there, but they have been brought into this
9 site. So compaction of this site by moving housing out
10 of Clays Lane has given you room to put the housing in
11 here. You have stuck the back-of-house facilities where
12 we are. You could have done something differently, left
13 that there, and said: we have enough room for Clays Lane
14 still to be here, and we can put those bits of
15 facilities here -- facilities you have here would
16 actually fit into where broadcasting facilities are.

17 MR PRIOR: I take the point. The first point is
18 back-of-house facilities are very specific to the
19 element which they are serving. So back-of-house
20 facilities for villages are what is required to make the
21 village work. It is food preparation, the 8,000 workers
22 who come in every day and have to be processed. You
23 cannot just move areas of back-of-house around the area.
24 There is a specific requirement for each of those
25 allocations. And when you look at the way the bid books

1 are put together and the evaluation is done, it is done
2 element by element by element. There are efficiencies
3 in back-of-house by combining certain sports venues
4 together you get an ability to share those. I think
5 I have said elsewhere that there is an efficiency factor
6 of about 30 per cent where you can layer those things up
7 but it has to be sports with sports and not sports with
8 a village or something like that.

9 So the first point is back-of-house is related to
10 venue. Yes, you can see efficiencies in it but, believe
11 me, we have run this and run this and run this and this
12 is where we end up in terms of total volume and we need
13 to have flexibility in how we deliver this alongside the
14 village.

15 The second point is: why can we move things around
16 and why have we moved things around? Bringing the
17 broadcast facilities inboard to the main Olympic park
18 responded to several issues in effect: one, that the
19 location down in Pudding Mill Lane was seen unfavourably
20 as a location for the broadcast facilities, and also its
21 relationship to the transport facilities that went with
22 it. Undoubtedly releasing that site also reduced the
23 number of businesses that would have to be relocated by
24 not putting this facility on Pudding Mill Lane.

25 The issue about its location has much to do with

1 operation and security issues as much as anything. All
2 I would really like to say on this issue is the A11 link
3 road into Stratford is not a road that can be secured in
4 any meaningful manner and when we look at things like
5 bomb blast radiuses et cetera, this is a very poor place
6 to put the IPC/MPC. I am talking Stratford High Street,
7 the A11.

8 Therefore the relocation of the broadcast facilities
9 inboard to the Olympic park and its separation from what
10 we would call the "dirty transport system" of the games,
11 which is primarily the journalists, those two had to be
12 (a) separated and (b) inboard to a more secure location,
13 a location where we could handle its presence.

14 MR CHEYNE: We were told the railway line poses an
15 insuperable security problem and that was overcome so
16 I am a bit sceptical whether the A11 poses such
17 a security problem.

18 MR PRIOR: Can I just finish the point. That is not to say
19 within this that is the only final fix for where this
20 venue is fixed. I said in my evidence we expect
21 elements of this to change because we are working hard
22 in terms of the Legacy efficiencies of where we put some
23 of these buildings but there are some principles
24 established about bringing things, as it were, inboard
25 to the security cordons and inboard to areas where we

1 can control certain events. You may have your views
2 about railway lines and roads --

3 MR CHEYNE: No, I do not; other people do.

4 MR PRIOR: When it comes to this subject area I listen to
5 those who deal with that on a daily basis and I respond
6 accordingly.

7 MR CHEYNE: What concerns me here is going back to the
8 original point I was making about the lack of any
9 specific analysis here under the disadvantages section
10 you actually do not deal with it. And it has to do with
11 my perception, and I think other people's perception, of
12 the fact that the demolition of Clays Lane does not seem
13 to be really much of a problem. You seem to think
14 getting rid of Clays Lane is not a major hassle and it
15 should be incorporated quite happily into the project
16 rather than thinking about how to avoid demolition.

17 The fact that you decided to move these facilities
18 here, instead of thinking: maybe we can find a way of
19 not demolishing Clays Lane because we have found a way
20 of moving some of the housing? That does not seem to
21 have happened. What you seem to have thought is: okay
22 we have a bit more space, let us stick something else in
23 there. I know you have come up with another analysis of
24 that.

25 However, there are other pieces of land. As I said

1 before, there is quite a large piece of land just south
2 of Hackney marshes which has not been used. That could
3 have been used as a carpark. You could have used the
4 fields which are now being used as a carpark for
5 something else. Other choices could have been made.

6 How you work out these facilities, these are
7 strategic choices you have made. The para Olympics,
8 tennis, I think that was located somewhere else earlier.
9 It has been moved here. Why does Paralympic tennis have
10 to be in Stratford? The whole idea was people were
11 going to use particular things which related to games
12 facilities which are outside of London. I cannot
13 remember exactly but rowing is ... exactly. So tennis
14 courts would seem to be quite logical things to put in
15 Wimbledon, in which case again you have freed up some
16 space.

17 MR PRIOR: Two points. You are absolutely right, there are
18 a series of both local and strategic interrelationships
19 between all these components. No-one is saying this is
20 easy. There are choices that have to be made about
21 where we put things. There are choices about
22 a permanent occupation of land/the temporary occupation
23 of land. The temporary occupation of East Marsh is
24 temporary occupation for some coach parking with the
25 immediate replacement of that sports facility. There

1 are a different series of planning and operational
2 regimes to do with how you use land. And, importantly,
3 there is, in terms of East Marsh, the preservation of
4 green space post the gains that you want to make that
5 are still in place.

6 And, yes, your point about "Could we move things in
7 and out of the park to respond to other pressures", yes
8 that has happened, as you have seen from here and may
9 continue to happen. But if I take something like
10 Paralympic tennis, which I suppose is an interesting
11 example, Paralympic tennis is played on clay; you do
12 not play Paralympic tennis on grass and you cannot go
13 to Wimbledon. Paralympic tennis is part of the
14 Paralympic games. Now, the organisation of the
15 Paralympic games is predicated on two sites. You are
16 either in the Olympic park or you are at ExCel. Crowd
17 numbers for the Paralympics tend to be much less.
18 Also, dominated by school children coming in coach
19 parties and you cannot ship school children all over
20 London going to see the Paralympic games. So the
21 planning on the Paralympic games is based on two hubs
22 very close to each other, all the venues within there,
23 and the entire competition takes place within those
24 locations.

25 So as we start to move elements in or out of the

1 park we have to remember both the need for the games and
2 its impact on Legacy and regeneration, but also as
3 another sort of side issue and consideration what it
4 does to the Paralympic games. Paralympic tennis is
5 just one of those. This building here will house a huge
6 number of venues and a huge amount of Paralympic games
7 will take place in here but it is a very short travel
8 distance for those athletes who are less capable of
9 making those travel distances, that is why we have gone
10 to that strategy.

11 MR CHEYNE: But is there a desire to avoid the demolition of
12 Clays Lane or is it considered to be not really such
13 a big issue? To come back to the lack of analysis in
14 your document, it does not seem to have been a big
15 issue. When we are coming to thinking about the
16 opportunities and new facilities, as I have said, there
17 is other land. You have said you want to preserve open
18 space in the long-term. Absolutely, but none of the
19 proposals I am suggesting would alter that. If, for
20 example, you were to take the land south of Hackney
21 marshes or even a part of Hackney marshes, that is
22 a temporary venture and that has already been agreed
23 regarding other projects. So there is no reason why
24 Paralympic tennis cannot be put there. It would still
25 free up land.

1 If we think about the objectives of the Clays Lane
2 and Stratford City site in terms of the Legacy, the
3 objective is to create housing. You already have
4 housing there. You are going to demolish housing to
5 create new housing. So you already have a community
6 living there which has to be moved to make way for
7 a project. The people living there lose the amenities
8 they have, the community they have, they are scattered
9 and another community is set up in that place. The
10 people who have been moved could have been left there,
11 if this project had been devised differently, and they
12 would still have those amenities. But they will not.

13 So when we are thinking about the analysis of the
14 disadvantages here which has not been included in any
15 part of this section of your evidence, and as far as
16 I am aware is not included anywhere -- and when I asked
17 the LDA for documents they came up with absolutely
18 nothing -- we are stuck with the fact it appears it just
19 does not really matter if Clays Lane is demolished; it
20 is not a high priority.

21 MR PRIOR: I have said it and I will say it again --

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Before you say it again, perhaps I can ask it
23 slightly a different way in maybe a way only an
24 inspector would ask it. Let us look at the scenario.
25 If the Compulsory Purchase Order were to be confirmed

1 with the exclusion of Clays Lane, what implications
2 would that have in terms of the design of the Olympic
3 park?

4 MR PRIOR: We would have a major element of housing to be
5 repositioned. It would have to be contiguous with the
6 Olympic village as is. As I said before, putting
7 another 600,000 square foot of residential space into
8 Stratford would be a major problem in terms of the
9 long-term success of that place that has had extensive
10 design work done on it. That is the first one.

11 Secondly, we would have to relook at the way the
12 transport system is run around the Olympic park and
13 I think the consideration would have to be that the
14 security implications of having that element embedded,
15 as it were, within the Olympic park would be very
16 significant.

17 The security planning for the Olympics basically --
18 just imagine this is like air site at an airport. This
19 is absolutely locked down. There is no way in and no
20 way out unless you go through scanners. That
21 conditionally exists for many, many months before the
22 games. This will be a secure construction site, much in
23 the way that T5 is, and this whole project area will be
24 locked down as part of the construction process.

25 The question I cannot answer is what is the nature

1 of Clays Lane itself? How is it isolated? How is it,
2 as it were, wrapped up away from the Olympic structures
3 and, in effect, how soon would people have to move out
4 of that set of buildings in order to make it possible to
5 live with the rest of the Olympic village?

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Are you saying it would not be possible to
7 isolate the Clays Lane site for the continued existence
8 of Clays Lane that it would need other lands to provide
9 for it being excluded, ie in terms of accessibility and
10 the like?

11 MR PRIOR: I have to say I have not thought through this
12 scenario but I would have to say that in terms of
13 consideration the isolation and the separation of access
14 and the security regime that would have to go in place
15 around it, particularly bearing in mind that this is up
16 alongside the Olympic village which is the most
17 sensitive component of the Olympic games, that I think
18 we would struggle in terms of the retention of it and
19 the isolation of it within this area.

20 The other point is of course a significant area at
21 the back-of-house would have to be found a new home for.
22 As you can see under the plans that have been emerging,
23 that we are now looking at land to the east of the
24 railway lines on Chobham Farm. The needs for
25 back-of-house facilities are extensive.

1 The effect of retaining Clays Lane I think has one
2 other really substantial effect. Maybe I can go to
3 a diagram in my rebuttal evidence. I suppose it is this
4 one here is the best example. This is plan 3 which
5 shows the road running North/South is the Olympic loop
6 road. The difference between the Olympic loop road and,
7 as it were, the Olympic park has an element of capacity
8 in it between the sports facilities and the
9 back-of-house facilities that support it. The Olympic
10 loop road were to push out, what is actually quite
11 a substantial distance, I would be very worried that our
12 capacity to deliver facilities within inboard of that
13 would start to really challenge the north east corner of
14 the Olympic park.

15 Now, there are other ways of placing venues within
16 that distribution up there but the fix has always been
17 the North/South line of the Olympic park road. To some
18 extent that is to do with this distance but also the
19 capacity of the back-of-house facilities in this area
20 here.

21 The final point I will add is that if Clays Lane was
22 retained we would have to have, as it were, a cordon
23 sanitaire around it which in effect would probably push
24 back into this residential development here much more
25 substantially.

1 I do not want to make this sound harder than it
2 really is but I really do think that the retention of
3 Clays Lane both as a physical impediment of the planning
4 the village is one thing, which is very difficult to
5 deal with, and I think the retention of Clays Lane as an
6 operational and security issue within the park would
7 also be a very serious issue.

8 MR CHEYNE: First of all the road was in a different
9 position, so the road has been moved on to our site. So
10 you have moved the loop road which means you are now
11 justifying security problems in terms of the transport
12 problems, in terms of the adjustments you have made.
13 Originally you conceived different transport
14 arrangements.

15 MR PRIOR: But I have also explained that we are constantly
16 working on --

17 MR CHEYNE: I understand but the point I am getting at is we
18 are the people on the receiving end of this programme
19 and obviously if you are talking about, "Can Clays Lane
20 be retained in the light of your plans or the original
21 plans?" we come back to the original intention which is:
22 can an original plan be devised which does not involve
23 the demolition of a community which will eventually be
24 replaced by another community because the Legacy
25 objective is to have housing there. Therefore,

1 effectively you are removing us from the Legacy.

2 MR PRIOR: But the point is the intent is to replace with
3 housing.

4 MR CHEYNE: Fine, other people. Why should this particular
5 group of people lose their place for the sake of another
6 community? More than that, when that is actually the
7 intention, and was always the intention, and in fact was
8 the original intention of the planning plans from MOZ1
9 which was that Stratford City was to be built in order
10 to bring Clays Lane further into the planning, into the
11 housing mix? Therefore, you are removing us from that
12 intention, the community that is there now. In fact,
13 you are not even putting housing there in the meantime,
14 you are going to put other facilities there so the
15 housing intention is more or less demolished anyway for
16 the Olympic period. Then you are going to bring in
17 other facilities in altering the plan which also makes
18 it harder for you to fulfil the intention of leaving
19 Clays Lane there. We are now talking about: how can
20 this be made possible in the light of these alterations?
21 Well of course the alterations make it harder because
22 you have actually brought in facilities which make it
23 hard for Clays Lane to be retained. The question is the
24 original plan, was it devised -- or I am saying should
25 have been devised -- with the intention of leaving

1 Clays Lane there that fitted with the Legacy intentions?
2 It fitted with the original planning intentions because
3 that is what the original planning intentions of
4 Stratford City were; there was never any intention in
5 the original MOZ1 plans to demolish Clays Lane. So it
6 fits in with the planning. You said the whole intention
7 of this regeneration was to fit in with previous
8 planning advice and intentions. Actually the Olympic
9 programme goes against those intentions regarding
10 Clays Lane.

11 The point is, why was a plan not devised and
12 assessed in this document, which it was not, to see how
13 that could happen and requiring, possibly as I say, the
14 use of other pieces of land, open space or the removal
15 of facilities to another site so that that could happen?
16 It seems to me you have defeated the intentions of the
17 original planning policies and the intentions of the
18 Legacy by this policy.

19 MR PRIOR: Planning colleagues may want to respond.

20 One thing I would say is I think somebody has used
21 to phrase of having your cake and eating it. But to
22 some extent the movement of the village into Stratford
23 has not made it possible it keep Clays Lane but has
24 unburdened the Clays Lane site with residential
25 development. So what you are saying to me is I have

1 made amendments that have made it impossible to keep
2 Clays Lane but in actual fact I have also made
3 amendments that have taken some fixed things, like
4 buildings, off Clays Lane.

5 What I am trying to say is in the great bringing
6 together of all these planning and urban objectives, it
7 is a complicated interrelationship between what we have
8 at Stratford, what we have on the Clays Lane site, and
9 what follows.

10 I still stand by the point that it would be,
11 I think, virtually impossible to do this without
12 removing the Clays Lane site.

13 MR CHEYNE: You are misrepresenting me. What I said was the
14 original intention of the plan -- this is the point.
15 What was the original intention of the plan? It was to
16 replace one community with another, so that does not
17 seem to me to conform to the purposes of the planning
18 permissions that were given. There was no intention to
19 demolish Clays Lane and remove the community there and
20 put another community there. Nor do I think it fits in
21 with the Legacy objectives because there was already
22 housing there. So effectively you are removing the
23 Legacy from the people who are living there.

24 The modifications to your plan actually further go
25 against those objectives because you have replaced them

1 with non-housing objectives.

2 Insofar as the changes which you have made freed up
3 some space, instead of using them to fulfil those
4 original objectives, you have used them to do something
5 different. The original plans, I would suggest, should
6 have been devised in such a way as to leave Clays Lane
7 in place.

8 So at each stage it seems to me the programme has
9 been posited around the idea that it does not really
10 matter. To go back to the point here: you did not
11 analyse this, and it was the only thing that was not
12 analysed. All of the other kind of physical problems,
13 in terms of transport problems, availability of land and
14 so on, are analysed. The only one you have not analysed
15 is the demolition of Clays Lane.

16 So it seems to me you have not actually taken this
17 into account. I would have thought that an original
18 plan, looking at other land that was available -- not
19 talking about the modifications but the original plan --
20 could have been to move facilities into other locations
21 nearby which might very well have meant using open
22 space, but you have done that and you have been given
23 the freedom to do that by the change in the law. So you
24 do not even have to worry about replacing that open
25 space because the law has been modified so that the

1 Olympic bid is that the Olympic designers do not have to
2 take that into account. So there is open space; there
3 are other pieces of land which could have been used, as
4 Lord Coe says and as you acknowledge. Certain sporting
5 facilities could have been put somewhere else so that
6 the park could have been configured slightly
7 differently.

8 So Clays Lane could have been taken out.
9 Temple Mills, as a frontage, would have remained and
10 there is no reason why a security fence could not have
11 been built around it in such a way that Clays Lane was
12 not incorporated into that and access would have been
13 through Temple Mills Lane without any security
14 implications, so far as I can see, as to why a bus route
15 cannot come into Clays Lane and head off. I do not see
16 there is per se a security problem there.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: I take it, trying to summarise what you are
18 saying is, that if from the outset the retention of
19 Clays Lane had been a priority or an essential component
20 that the flexibility in terms of design or the design
21 brief would have managed to design around it?

22 MR CHEYNE: Absolutely.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Can you give an answer as brief as my
24 summary? Probably not.

25 MR PRIOR: When we started the design and planning of this

1 work we identified the constraints, identified the
2 opportunities you normally do. Clays Lane was certainly
3 in there as a major issue and I still stand by the point
4 that everything we looked at suggests that we cannot
5 keep Clays Lane as part of this planning process.
6 Beyond no doubt, the impact of removing residential
7 accommodation to deliver the Olympic games was seen from
8 day one as being a very serious issue, and I can say on
9 behalf of Gareth and Tony Winterbottom at the time that
10 they questioned me very hard at the time about why we
11 would need to do this. I cannot speak to the analysis
12 which is in my proven terms of "Why does it not go
13 through that", because by the time we got to that stage
14 we already knew that, so that was the position we took
15 in terms of our assessment. We are going to disagree on
16 this, Mr Cheyne.

17 MR CHEYNE: We will do more than that because I also have to
18 point out when I have asked for documents, asking these
19 questions about whether or not cost benefit analyses was
20 done and what the impacts would be, there are no
21 documents. The LDA apparently does not have them.

22 To go back to earlier points about the preparation
23 for our removal, it just did not happen. This would all
24 make more sense to me if I discovered that during the
25 period the end of 2003 and when the games were won in

1 2005 that there had been substantial work done,
2 researching land for us, researching building systems,
3 people have been coming back to us and telling us about
4 these things. We did not get any of that and I have
5 asked questions about it. Like, for example, the sort
6 of documents that show what work has been done and
7 identifying land for purpose-built housing for projects
8 from the time this work began. No answer.

9 As far as I can make out no work was done.
10 Essentially the project of identifying land or looking
11 at our relocation only started in any substantial
12 manner -- I am completely at a loss because I had
13 nothing to go on here -- in around about October. Prior
14 to that I asked questions, and emailed the LDA at one
15 time when the problems in park village started happening
16 and the students were being moved out of there, I tried
17 to contact the LDA to find out what was going on. I was
18 assured everything was being done but actually not much
19 seems to have been being done.

20 There are a whole variety of issues concerning the
21 way our relocation has been handled which suggests to me
22 the LDA was actually in a bit of a mess when it realised
23 it had won the games, it actually did not know what to
24 do. It had the fluid survey, which we will go into next
25 time, which stated very clearly there was a substantial,

1 very substantial demand for community moves, and yet no
2 work seemed to be done on that. So the research had
3 been done, the information was there, but the
4 preparation had not been done.

5 So when you say you have taken all this stuff into
6 account and you were concerned about the impact on
7 Clays Lane residents I do not think it is true.

8 I cannot see any evidence in anything that has been
9 presented, any documentation or anything said to me that
10 that is the case.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think we can take that point any
12 further at present but it is something I think we will
13 return to on Thursday afternoon because it is part of
14 that process. Mr Sandison?

15 MR SANDISON: Talking about the usage at the site for
16 back-of-house and for the ... although it has been
17 mentioned that the use in the Olympic Legacy is -- is it
18 intended to be used for residential purposes?

19 MR PRIOR: Yes.

20 MR SANDISON: Fine. That is my question.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr Armstrong?

22 MR ARMSTRONG: Just to touch on what I feel is at the heart
23 of this.

24 In effect, before you realised that you needed to
25 issue a CPO, you were in a box and that constrained your

1 planning options. Julian's point is entirely separate
2 from mine but it seems that it is a slight of hand as to
3 whether a road is one place or another place or whether
4 ancillary facilities are one place or another place in
5 real planning terms if you control the dice, as it were,
6 if you control all of the parameters that pertain to
7 that. So being in a box and then suddenly having the
8 lid of the box removed in planning terms meant that you
9 were freer around the decisions you had already made.
10 But one key decision had not been made and that is as to
11 whether or not it was viable to keep Clays Lane in fact
12 as a community in the location. I argue for it in
13 a different way.

14 MR PRIOR: I get the point. What I go back to is that we
15 have made the assessment of the retention of Clays Lane
16 within the Olympic village area. We had --

17 MR ARMSTRONG: We have never seen that.

18 MR PRIOR: I know you have not but it is part of an ongoing
19 design process as we went through the different levels
20 of design. We looked at that. We cannot see how we
21 could make it with Clays Lane in place and we made the
22 decision at that point to assume we could remove
23 Clays Lane, noting all the consequences that came with
24 that, had a discussion about those consequences and
25 moved on in terms of the design work.

1 Your point at that point is that having made that
2 decision I can move the bits around as I see fit because
3 I have, as it were, removed that issue from what I am
4 designing.

5 To an extent you right, there is some flexibility in
6 this but what I am saying is it is not as flexible as
7 you might think because there are relationships between
8 all these components that limit that. So, yes, you can
9 move a road a little way over here and a little way over
10 there, but the reality is the growth land requirement
11 and the organisational relationships between those
12 components leads you to this position.

13 MR ARMSTRONG: You say that you made studies as to the
14 viability of Clays Lane. Are you able to present them
15 between now and Thursday or Thursday?

16 MR PRIOR: I do not think so actually. I think these were
17 very much diagramming out the relationship of components
18 of the park. Whether we captured that because we were
19 moving very quickly through those processes. This would
20 have been -- I suppose it is such a -- it seems such an
21 obvious issue to us in terms of how you would design
22 this area that it was like it was to some extent in the
23 need to remove businesses and roads and infrastructure
24 in order to create the great weight of what you have to
25 deliver for the games.

1 Could I go back to a pile of drawings at this stage?

2 I do not know.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: I am going to take Mr Cheyne then I will
4 review progress, so you do not think you will be kept in
5 the building against your will all night until we have
6 finished.

7 MR CHEYNE: A couple of points. To come back to the point
8 of Legacy. I asked the question of the LDA:

9 "Documents relating to the application of Olympic
10 and Legacy to the residents of Clays Lane. Item 16:
11 This request is unclear."

12 I mean, I do not know what is unclear about it,
13 I would have thought it was absolutely plain. I wanted
14 to know how Clays Lane fitted into the legacy and how it
15 fitted into the great design of this park and why we
16 should be excluded from it in terms of the way in which
17 these plans were drawn up?

18 To go back to the point here, which is that there is
19 no analysis here -- you may have done an analysis,
20 I cannot say whether you did an analysis, but you have
21 not referred to it here.

22 When I consider the specifics of what has happened
23 to us and the lack of preparation for our move, maybe
24 other people are going to deny there is lack of
25 preparation but I have to say from my perspective

1 I cannot see how it can be said the kind of preparation
2 which we were expecting in terms of purpose-built
3 housing and so on which we would go back to the first
4 time we were approached, I do have a problem with
5 understanding how any of this features in the thinking
6 which has gone into this.

7 I can only say that this answer here and the lack of
8 understanding which appears to exist about how we fit
9 into this programme makes me think that actually this
10 analysis was not done. There was no cost benefit
11 analysis and I am just left very confused as to why it
12 was thought that this was a desirable option and why
13 this was a centrepiece of the plan was not to figure out
14 ways of moving elements around so that existing
15 communities -- which is constantly referred to in other
16 bits of evidence, talking about the benefits which are
17 going to come to existing and future communities, and
18 yet this existing community is going to be wiped out.

19 MR PRIOR: I think I have been through most of those issues
20 in terms of how we approached this. I said that we did
21 not go to this position lightly. We have looked at the
22 options and I have also said that in terms of making the
23 Olympics work, in terms of delivering the Olympics, that
24 there is some element of flexibility about how certain
25 components are placed on the ground and how they are

1 laid out but that flexibility is to do with the
2 relationships of sub-components that aggregate up to
3 these quite powerful elements. I have explained my
4 reasons why I think we need this site as part of that.

5 MR CHEYNE: The final point I make. I do not know a great
6 deal about this but we have been hearing also there was
7 an original plan put forward by Mr Lawrence which was
8 apparently worked on over a period of time. I have been
9 told up to three years. This plan would have meant
10 Clays Lane was completely outside of the proposed --
11 well it would not have been demolished anyway.

12 Again, we do not have any documentation on
13 alternatives about why those plans were not accepted.
14 I have asked for reasons as to why Clays Lane was chosen
15 and I would have thought that would include information
16 about a large master plan of that kind. I have not
17 received any information of that kind. All I have is
18 the rather specific information in your chart about the
19 three sites and even that information was not
20 forthcoming when I asked the LDA. But I have not had
21 any information about the alternative idea that was put
22 forward by Mr Lawrence which was much further south as I
23 understand it.

24 MR PRIOR: I have seen Mr Lawrence's evidence recently.

25 Mr Lawrence essentially placed the Olympic facilities

1 north of the Stratford box and, if I remember rightly,
2 involved bridges over the M11 link road onto the area on
3 to the north east marsh. I think his main stadium
4 proposals were to the north. There are alternative
5 schemes in Mr Lawrence's plan.

6 I have not looked at them in detail in terms of how
7 they impact on Clays Lane. All I will say is they will
8 not work as an Olympic plan. They are conceived on
9 a magnificent scale but what I have looked at would mean
10 they were just not suitable for purpose. I was sent
11 those drawings very soon after we were commissioned for
12 the project and I am afraid we parked them very quickly.
13 They did not bear any relationship to the way we feel
14 the project had to be laid down.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Presumably they were very early sketch ideas?

16 MR PRIOR: As I understand it Mr Lawrence was commissioned
17 as part of an effort from Newham to help attract the
18 Olympics to Lea Valley and Stratford. That is when they
19 were looking at Stratford essentially as a platform for
20 that, not the Stratford development we see to date.

21 Talking off the top of my head, but I believe
22 Mr Lawrence's work was part of the justifying argument
23 to look at Stratford and then his information was fed
24 into the Arups report which then formed part of the
25 evaluation as to choosing the Lea Valley ground we have

1 already covered. I think at that point it got lost in
2 that system. As far as we were concerned it did not
3 form any part of the evolution of ideas but it was sent
4 on to me and our evaluation of it was that it did not
5 have anything to contribute to what we thought were the
6 real measures of olympics, because to some extent
7 Mr Lawrence did not have an Olympic client to work to.
8 He had people coming from a slightly different direction
9 therefore I think his work was, as you would expect,
10 slightly more speculative in terms of where it was
11 going. I really cannot say much more about it than
12 that.

13 MR CHEYNE: I have not had any information about it.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: It is almost 6.30. I do not want to stop the
15 discussion at an inconvenient point or unnecessarily but
16 it appeared to me as though we were beginning to draw it
17 together in terms of the Olympic proposals, the master
18 plan design and later amendments and I think we have
19 drawn in the relationship with Stratford City.

20 What there was also to look at was the issue of
21 contamination and effect of that in terms of the
22 timetable.

23 So I think in terms of the agenda we have set for
24 today that the principal element that we have got left
25 is the contamination and timetable issue. I am content

1 to carry on today if you want me to? We will take
2 a short break and come back and see if we can wrap that
3 element up or if you are saying to me, "We have had
4 enough for one day we would rather defer that to the
5 start of Thursday", then obviously I would consider
6 that. But I had hoped, in setting the timetable, that
7 we might deal with today and Thursday as discrete
8 elements. But if the clock beats us, so be it.

9 Mr Prior?

10 MR PRIOR: Just a point. I cannot be here on Thursday as
11 I have a university exam board I am running. So if any
12 of those elements require me to provide answers then
13 I thought I would just raise that.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: That excludes you completely on Thursday?

15 MR PRIOR: Completely from Thursday and Friday.

16 MR CHEYNE: I agree we have covered Stratford City to some
17 extent but I am not sure we have dealt with that
18 completely, so I would like to say I think there will be
19 further issues to discuss regarding Stratford City and
20 the understanding of its -- both because the other side
21 have been talking a lot about the problems with
22 Stratford City, which raises questions as to why
23 although they may have a different reason for
24 approaching this, as to why they have, you might say,
25 put all their eggs in one basket in putting the village

1 there. Not that I have a problem in them putting it
2 there. It sort of raises a question as to why they have
3 done that. But I think also just the general issue of
4 the scale of the Stratford City project. Because
5 although to some extent the elements at times tries to
6 play it down and other times plays it up, so to me we
7 get a rather mixed picture. Sometimes there is a lot of
8 emphasis on it and then other times it is barely
9 mentioned.

10 MR PRIOR: I think Mr Blacker can probably deal with that.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you want to deal with that today?

12 MR CHEYNE: I think it is up to other people. It is 6.30.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: I am prepared to sit for another half hour,
14 45 minutes if that helps us to draw this particular
15 issue to a close.

16 MR ARMSTRONG: Is it the case you are unavailable
17 completely? How many more sessions have we got?

18 THE CHAIRMAN: The agenda was set for this afternoon and
19 Thursday afternoon as the principal topics.

20 MR ARMSTRONG: I thought there were three sessions this
21 week?

22 THE CHAIRMAN: To continue Friday as required. I think that
23 was initially envisaged it might be in terms of wrapping
24 up, summarising of the cases. But I was going to decide
25 on that on Thursday, once I knew what progress we had

1 made.

2 MR CHEYNE: I do not know whether it is a good idea to
3 continue with all of this stuff now? Is Mr Prior going
4 to be available Friday?

5 MR PRIOR: I am afraid I have an exam panel for two days,
6 Thursday and Friday, that I need to be at.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: If we break for five minutes and sit for
8 another 45 minutes. We have strayed a little bit but if
9 there are matters you want to deal with this afternoon
10 which would affect Mr Prior, we can deal with Legacy and
11 leave the element that Mr Blacker is able to deal with
12 in terms of the relationship with Stratford City. Let
13 us take five minutes and think about how to handle it
14 then we will come back for half an hour, 45 minutes.

15 (6.30 pm)

16 (A short break)

17 (6.45 pm)

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for coming back once again. Let us
19 decide which element we are going to deal with. Some
20 points on Legacy, Mr Cheyne? Is that going to be the
21 most useful?

22 MR CHEYNE: I am afraid I do not know how much progress we
23 are going to make here. We have already overrun and
24 I am beginning to feel the effects of that, I have to
25 say.

1 To my mind we have six possible elements which we
2 are still going to have to deal with in some way or
3 other which all relate to the general issue of the
4 purchase order and the master plan and so on, which
5 I would say are planning issues which we have not dealt
6 with at all: The need for planning permissions and the
7 legal issues that arise from that; contamination, which
8 also relates to timetable but that is a separate issue
9 itself; legacy, which we have touched on but we have
10 other questions to raise about the general issue of
11 Legacy; timetable, which as I say is related to
12 contamination but has separate implications as well;
13 open space, which we have not dealt with at all; and
14 transport issues. There are one or two points which may
15 need to be raised about the evidence provided about
16 transport.

17 I think the idea that we are going to make
18 substantial progress on this now, I do not think we
19 will. I personally would say our original understanding
20 was it would be a three day programme and I think to
21 continue now may not be particularly --

22 THE CHAIRMAN: The only issue I have is the availability of
23 Mr Prior.

24 MR CHEYNE: I understand that but, in a sense, I do not wish
25 to be unkind to the LDA but we have known that this has

1 been programmed for a long time. I am not trying to be
2 critical but we have asked for revisions to the
3 timetable and the LDA, when Mr Sandison and I attended,
4 were very unsympathetic and made no suggestions that
5 maybe we should be accommodated. I understand Mr Prior
6 may not be available but maybe somebody else could fill
7 in for him?

8 MR PRIOR: I think Mr Jones and Mr Blacker can cover most of
9 the issues.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: If that can be dealt with in that way that
11 gives us the greatest flexibility.

12 MR CHEYNE: If it is necessary and Mr Prior has to be there
13 we have to find time for -- because there will be
14 submissions at a later time and I am not sure we are
15 going to get all of this done by the end of Friday.
16 Because I think there may be a lot more material coming
17 up than possibly anticipated.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: We will take it as it comes.

19 MR CHEYNE: For me, I have to say, as I say we have already
20 overrun and I would appreciate closing now, I am afraid.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: I am happy to do that. Mr Sandison, did you
22 want to comment?

23 MR SANDISON: My feeling is on the basis Mr Prior is
24 offering us assertions but not very much evidence to
25 support this claim that our case has been extensively

1 examined and considered, there is not really a great
2 deal of point -- I think the other people who are here
3 are just as capable of answering the questions that we
4 are going to be putting anyway.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Had you been represented by a barrister or
6 a solicitor they may well have said, "I will leave that
7 matter to submissions" in terms of not bringing forward
8 information to convince us. That is essentially what
9 both of you have said. On the basis that you are
10 satisfied -- that was no implied criticism, Mr Prior.

11 MR PRIOR: No, I took it in the spirit it was intended.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: You have probably heard it said before as
13 most people on this side of the table will have done in
14 other instances, no doubt. I hear it frequently at
15 inquiries so it is nothing new and generally nothing
16 personal.

17 Mr Armstrong, anything you wanted to raise directly
18 with Mr Prior on the basis he is not going to be
19 available later this week?

20 MR ARMSTRONG: It is difficult to do that because Mr Prior
21 is not able to present critical information to enable
22 him to back up his claim that our situation has been
23 extensively --

24 THE CHAIRMAN: It is the same general point. Okay.

25 MR ARMSTRONG: I respect Mr Prior has had his work cut out

1 even to get to this point, so I look forward to the next
2 hearing.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: I am happy to adjourn for the day because
4 I was in two minds and I was looking to adjourn at no
5 later than 6.30. It did seem an opportune moment but
6 then being faced with the issue of non-availability but
7 we have resolved that.

8 So we will adjourn for the day and come back on
9 Thursday where we will deal with the issues of legacy,
10 contamination, timetable, open space, transport issues,
11 planning issues, and see how far we get. Then if we
12 have made sufficient progress we can then move on to the
13 second of the key issues: the residents' perspective.
14 If we do not make sufficient progress then that will be
15 on the following day.

16 Is 1 o'clock the best time to start on Thursday?

17 MR CHEYNE: Because we have a break on Wednesday that is
18 fine. If we are moving on into Friday as well I would
19 be very reluctant to continue beyond 6 o'clock because
20 that means you get home and have a bit of a rest for the
21 evening.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you want to start earlier on Thursday?

23 MR CHEYNE: 1 o'clock is fine, but I do not want to go
24 beyond -- tonight we extended a bit but I am saying
25 today it is okay because we have a break. On Thursday

1 I would appreciate closure at 6.00; and then coming back
2 on Friday.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: We will look to sit no later than 6.00 on
4 that basis on Thursday and come back on Friday.

5 MR WALKER: Would it be possible to give any indication of
6 programme? I have a number of very pressing matters
7 that need to be dealt with that you are aware.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Indeed. Is it helpful to take you at
9 1 o'clock on Thursday.

10 MR WALKER: I was wondering if you could give me a slot.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: On the basis of your indication there are one
12 or two matters, can we take him first. Yes, we will
13 deal with you at 1 o'clock, if that is all right.
14 Mr Blacker?

15 MR BLACKER: Mr Armstrong asked us to come back with
16 affordable housing, liaising with housing colleagues.
17 The best one put forward is in the London plan, Core
18 Document 16, page 61. I think that is what we would be
19 happy to put forward as a reasonable definition of
20 affordable housing. It is social housing, intermediate
21 housing, bullet points.

22 The second thing is I think two breaks ago there was
23 the issue you asked us to come back and clarify the
24 meeting in November and the emerging non-olympic plan.
25 Again, we would be in a position on Thursday to -- none

1 of us here were actually at the meeting in November, but
2 we know who was there and have a reasonable idea what
3 was developing. But I think we can give a definitive
4 position on Thursday.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: That would be helpful. Thank you. Has
6 everybody been reasonably content with the way this
7 afternoon has been structured and gone? Can we continue
8 to use it as a model for Thursday? Is that acceptable?
9 Grateful for that.

10 Thank you all very much. I know for many of you it
11 has been a new experience in terms of a session like
12 this but I have been very grateful for the way you have
13 conducted yourselves this afternoon. It has been
14 extremely useful to me. It has been very informative
15 and I think has allowed us to focus on some of the key
16 issues and hopefully you have had the opportunity to ask
17 the questions that you wanted to. At least you have
18 tomorrow to just review the position so if there is
19 anything that we have left behind then hopefully we can
20 pick that up on Thursday or at a later session.

21 MR ARMSTRONG: Can I make one request? If there is anything
22 at all that you are able -- obviously Mr Prior is not
23 going to be available on Thursday but if there is
24 anything that you are able to dredge up that would
25 suggest accommodating Clays Lane in your overall

1 strategies I would be extremely grateful to see it by
2 the next session.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Anything further before
4 I adjourn?

5 Thank you all for your attendance. The Inquiry is
6 now adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock which
7 is an entirely different session. So I am back tomorrow
8 even if you are not. Thank you all very much.

9 (6.55 pm)

10 (Hearing adjourned until 10.00 am the following day)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I N D E X

1		
2		
2	Round table discussion	1
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

