

CASINO ADVISORY PANEL

Prof. PROF STEPHEN CROW Chairman
James Froomberg, Chris Collison
Neil Mundy, Deep Sagar

LONDON (GREENWICH) 30/08/2006

PROF PROF STEPHEN CROW: This is a little briefing for the press. First of all let me say how glad I am to be here. I'm sorry we're not actually in Greenwich, we thought we'd be half way between Greenwich and Brent but as you know Brent had other ideas, so we're half way between Greenwich and nowhere. I'm sorry that our timetable only allows 10 minutes to talk to the press, but I hope during that time to cover all the questions that you might want to ask. First of all I'd like to say something about the silly story that's going around, and the silly story is that I've somehow commended the developers at the Dome for starting before they got any sort of approval. What I have said is that I shall take that into account and I shall tell you, shortly after Christmas, whether I've taken that into account favourably or unfavourably and indeed how much weight I've attached to that particular point, whether it's important or not. But what I'm going to do is first of all a short piece of background, then a few things about the Casino Advisory Panel and its processes, then I'm going to say something about the examination in public and then I'll try and anticipate a few questions and with any luck we'll get all that done in 10 minutes. First of all the background, Parliament last year decided that three new types of casino should be allowed in Britain, and by Britain we mean Scotland, Wales and England, and of these, one regional casino, so called, will be permitted along with eight large and eight small casinos. The definitions are in The Gambling Act 2005, which I thoroughly recommend all serious students of what we're doing to study section 175, but briefly a regional casino is as big as anything in Europe, large casinos will be as big as anything currently in Britain and the term small casino speaks for itself. Now our panel, we are constituted as an independent advisory body which is not beholden to any local authority, any casino developer, or operator, nor is it subject to any political pressures or any political interference with our work. We were appointed by Richard Cable, the Minister Of State in the Department of Culture, Media and Sport in September last year after an open competition and interview by a board including two independent members, and should it worry you John Prescott had no part in our appointment. And the panel is proceeding on the basis that it's consulting widely and seeking out evidence which we are appraising in the light of all our professional experience, and we've got a lot, before coming to its decisions and every member of the panel, all five of us, are committed to the seven Nolan Principles of public life. We're assisted by a secretariat which is based in the DCMS office but is funded separately from and it's under my direction. Can I just say a few words about how grateful I am for all their hard work, and I do mean hard work. A lot of which, I must say, has been made harder by answering lots of queries from the press. Now I don't begrudge you asking questions of course, but do please realise that if you don't get an immediate answer that's probably because one of your colleagues is already on the phone. The criteria on which we're operating, they're laid down by the Secretary of State and they're to ensure that the locations that we choose satisfy the need for the best possible test of social impact, which may require a range of locations and subject to that the Secretary of State has also asked us to include areas in need of regeneration, as measured by unemployment and other social deprivation data, which are likely to benefit in these terms from a new casino. And we've also got to ensure that the areas selected are willing to license a new casino and of course we also pay attention to any government policy in other respects. And just to make things clear, we in the panel well understand the social issues related to gambling, including problem gambling, and one thing that we're looking out for in the proposals is how these problems can be minimised and where they're best minimised. We take into account all evidence submitted and I've said that and of course not everything submitted is necessarily favourable to the proposals. We're committed to the principles of openness and transparency and all the relevant documentation is, or will be, put on our website. Processes, we're due to report with our recommendations to Tessa Jowell, the Secretary of State, by December of this year, it will then be her job to make decisions based on our advice, and of course she doesn't

have to follow our advice, that's called democracy. Our programme of work, in broad terms, is, well, by the end of January this year, scoping and research, end of March we ask for formal proposals, the end of Summer, well I hope not now at the end of summer to be quite frank but that's what it says in my note, then end of summer the examination and evaluation of proposals, and by the end of December, as I've said, consideration of all the evidence and writing our report, and it is a big job. Now the examination in public, we've time only for the proposals for the regional casino to be examined in public, it's a time consuming process and we only have time for the regional ones I'm afraid. The main purpose of the EIP, as we call it an examination in public, is to provide an opportunity for the discussion and testing, in public, and before the panel, of selected matters. These matters have been selected by the panel following its consideration of proposals, representations made, responses received by the panel to specific questions put to the authorities and generally what it considers it needs to hear about in order to select the area for recommendation. And we are having a session of the examination of the locality of each of the proposals for the regional casino, and the EIP takes the form and structure of a, so called, round table. I don't know why we call it a round table discussion, as you can see, but we do. It's not a public meeting, it's an examination held in public, a few centuries ago it would have been called an inquisition, but we have changed our methods a little since then. We've a good number of questions that we want to ask and we want to hear what other people have to say as well. So we've invited along people who can give us a good range of views on the subjects and the subject of a casino in the borough of the people on my right, your left. And all the papers submitted in evidence ahead of the EIP are available on our website. Now, one or two questions. Have we looked round casinos? Well we haven't been swanning around the world at public expense I can tell you that, what I have done, I happened to be in Dortmund on a university field trip earlier this year and we looked at the second largest in Europe, which is the Casino Hohensyburg, which is near Dortmund, and we got a fair bit of information from that, and a couple of members of the panel, with the Secretariat, also went to have a look at Star City, in Birmingham, which is the largest currently in Britain. Another question that people were asking a few days ago and they seem to have stopped somehow, the press only just seem to have one question per day, I don't know why, lack of imagination possibly. What role has John Prescott played in our process I hear you thinking? 'None', as I said we were appointed by the Secretary of State of Culture, Media and Sport, John Prescott was, of course, responsible for turning a plain policy including PPS6, which does actually mention casinos, and if you want to know what that is I strongly recommend you rush along to the stationary office and buy a copy. What do I think about Brent pulling out? Well it gave us yesterday to do something else. Why are we looking at Greenwich first? Because they were second until Brent pulled out. And then we find we're going to Wales on Friday and then we're starting a tour, beginning in Glasgow and then going down into the north east and the north of England and then we're finishing in the north of England, it's all a matter of logistics, nothing more. Are there any preferred areas for selection of the casino? Isn't Greenwich a 'done deal' for the regional casino? The answer to that question is 'No'. I don't know if I can spell out no, it's N O. We've made no such decision and in fact we've made no decision at all until we've considered everything, including today's proceedings and those for the rest of the week and next week. ...? I've no idea, yes we've taken all those into account and not necessarily in favour ...?. What does the panel think about the bid we're looking at today? Well I'll tell you, we might have to wait till after Christmas. Conflict of interest, well, we've obviously declared what interest we have. I'm looking at my watch, I really want to start on time, I've never had a congregation listen to me so intently before so I am very grateful to you, thank you very much.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Good morning ladies and gentlemen, or for people who were here earlier good morning again. This is a non-statutory examination in public of a proposal by Greenwich Council to be permitted by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport to issue a casino premises licence for a regional casino within their area. My name is PROF STEPHEN CROW and I'm appointed by the Secretary of State to chair the Casino Advisory Panel which is holding this examination. Can everybody hear me by the way? Well I haven't said anything important yet, so don't worry. Should I speak up a bit? I think that's probably a lesson for everybody, 'Will you please speak up'. The other members of the panel, starting on my, start on

the left I think, is Mr Deep Sagar on extreme left, Mr. James Froomberg on my right, on extreme right, Mr. Chris Collison and Mr. Neil Mundy. I won't waste time repeating everybody's qualifications, if anybody wants to know them they're on the Panel's website or ask any member of the Secretariat. Mr. Collison has asked me to mention that he has, it might be regarded as some sort of interest in the proposals, he tells me that whilst engaged as a part-time consultant fulfilling the role of Interim Head Of Planning And Transportation with the London Borough of Waltham Forest, he represented that Council on the co-ordinating group of the joint planning team for the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic games. The London Borough of Greenwich are also represented on that co-ordinating group and at no time has the co-ordinating group considered any issue related to casinos. Mr. Froomberg also tells me that he was once a partner of KPMG and in 1995 and 1996 he was involved in early business planning for the Dome, and in 2001 while the Director Of Corporate Development at Wembley PLC, he entered business dealings with Anschutz, the developer of the Dome, in connection with their earlier consideration of an arena development at Wembley, not the Dome, Wembley, and both these relationships are historic. He's now Commercial Director of British Waterways, and is a participant in the proposed development at Wood Wharf, adjacent to Canary Wharf, which, as you know, is not far from the Dome, and, they're a joint venture company, and he's also, his company, British Waterways, is involved in the regeneration of Bow Back Rivers, which I expect everybody local knows where that is. Now, to my immediate left is the Panel Secretary, Miss Valerie Curtis, and beside her is an Assistant in the Secretariat, Kate Rounce. I hope you've already met another Assistant to the Secretariat, Mr Gavin Fleming, at the door. A few points of procedure please, do please remain seated as you're speaking, if you wish to speak please raise your nameplate, like that, and then I, or somebody, will call upon you to speak, soon I hope, certainly whenever it's convenient. Will you please introduce yourself on every occasion if you speak, because we are making a recording of the proceedings and the recording is being done over in that far corner of the room. I'm pleased to see so many members of the public present. I don't need to tell you that I hope you'll appreciate that this is not a public meeting but an examination of the proposal, held in public and if I may be schoolmasterly for a while, both my mother and father were teachers actually, please behave as if you were in court, or before the headmaster. And also no smoking of course, and please turn off your mobile phones. Yes, it's terribly embarrassing if they go off when not expecting it. As for the press, no filming or television during the proceedings please, no sound recording and no flash photography please. I think I should mention that the whole panel visited the Greenwich Peninsula yesterday evening, we had a look at the Dome, we weren't able to get inside the security fence, nor did we try for fairly obvious reasons. I think all of us at one time have seen it on another occasions, we got a taxi and looked round the Greenwich Peninsula and its relationship with the other parts of Greenwich. So although you didn't know it, thank you for your hospitality, there wasn't any like it, but thanks very much, we did go and see it. Are there any queries about the process? Yes, the gentleman in the middle.

MAN 1: ...? My point is that I think ...?

PROF STEPHEN CROW: No, well I do take your point, and if we'd known that there was only one proposal for London we'd have gone into Greenwich if we'd possibly could. And I think I mentioned earlier that we met here because it was halfway between Greenwich and Brent, Brent have pulled out and that leaves us halfway between Greenwich and nowhere in particular. So, yes, I take your point we would have liked to have come into Greenwich. We've had that problem actually with at least one other place, there just wasn't other accommodation available. I know that Greenwich Council asked when the ...? Friday, on the grounds that we'd been judicially challenged by another Authority, and I gather that you were quite reasonably concerned that if the proceedings had to be laid off for some months then those that come later would obviously be at an advantage vis a vis you. Suffice it to say that, if that challenge were successful, needless to say we don't think it will be, and if the whole thing gets put off, or if, for any reason, you know, you do feel that you've been put at a disadvantage, then I think it should go without saying, and it does, that we will of course consult you to see how that disadvantage could sensibly be remedied. So I hope that is alright with you. The agenda today will follow the list of issues that have been circulated. May I apologise for the short notice we've given everybody, we did want to get, the whole procedure has been

apparently a long one but in fact not, but thank you very much for all your hard work and forbearance. I'll now ask the Secretary to tell us what to do in an emergency, please.

SECRETARY: Yes. On hearing the continuous fire alarm, please leave the room through the rear exit at the back of the room there, and make your way out of the hotel via the main reception. The marshalling area is by the Marlborough Hotel, on the corner of Great Russell Street.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you. As to timing, we'll take a break during the morning, 10.30, 11ish, depending on how the discussion's going. We'll break for lunch, when did we say Miss Gerald?

MISS GERALD: 12.30

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Half past 12 till half past one. And I hope to finish not past 3 or 4 o'clock, but, quite clearly, I'm not going to bang the gong when there's perhaps some sensible and good things to be said. That's all from me for the moment. I did promise the proposing Authority, as all proposing Authorities that they can just make a short statement of what's it's all about, in their view, I think, for the benefit of the public, so you know what's going on, so may I call upon Greenwich to do that, please.

PETER BROOKS: Well thank you very much Mr Chairman. I hope everyone can hear me perfectly well. Good morning to everyone, I'm Councillor Peter Brooks and I'm the Deputy Leader of Greenwich Council, with the portfolio for regeneration, which is why I'm here today. Can I first thank the panel for the opportunity to make a few introductory comments on behalf of Greenwich Council. Now, Mr Chairman, I do thank you for your comments on the judicial review, and I would like to make a very short statement on that if that's ok, myself. Before commencing, I wish to draw your attention to our letter of Friday the 25th of August, and, of course, your reply of the 29th of August, 2006. The correspondence referred to the application for judicial review, made by the London Borough of Havering on the 24th of August. In our letter, we raised with our concern that the event that Havering were given leave to pursue the judicial review. It would be highly likely that the EIPs would not proceed to the timetable. We ask you to consider postponing the EIP as we believe that this could place us in a considerable disadvantage if we were the only applicant to proceed. We note your response to the process with the EIP, but we would record our continuing concerns. Having made the comment, I would like now to make a few introductory remarks about our applications. You did receive a great deal of information from us, setting out our details of the bid to locate Britain's first regional casino in Greenwich. I will therefore take just a few moments, about 8 or 9 minutes, I guess, to outline the key points to our bid. First I would like to set the content. Greenwich is a borough undergoing huge transformation. Our borough moved from a place with over 150,000 manufacturing jobs, mainly along our 8 miles of waterfront, which makes us the longest riparian borough within Greenwich, just for the record, sorry, within London, to less than 5000 manufacturing jobs and our waterfront decline, contaminated and lying derelict for nearly two decades. We are now seeing major regeneration of the waterfront Greenwich, it is a strategically significant site in terms of London, the Thames Gateway and 2012 Olympics which we are obviously very proud of. Greenwich has not benefited from development corporations and this regeneration has been led and fought for by the Greenwich Council. The O2, previously known as the Dome, is located on the Greenwich Peninsula as you saw yourself last evening, the Peninsula is benefiting from new transport infrastructure, 10,000 new homes, new jobs, new schools, higher education institutions, health facilities, parks and open spaces. The O2 on the part of the Peninsula will be developed as an entertainment district and the casino, if granted, will be located in the O2 bringing an investment of £600,000,000 to Greenwich. Mr Chairman, secondly, I'd like to summarise the additional benefits that the casino will bring to the regeneration and this part of London and the Thames Gateway. With a casino the O2 will accelerate the pace of regeneration and transform our tourism and entertainment offer from an event based, to a leisure destination. It would, and will bring a 320 bed world class hotel and a second 400 to 500 bed hotel exhibition space, a theatre, a wider range of outlets in the entertainment district. This in turn will boost tourism, increase overnight stay, which I have a passion to do, for Greenwich to increase overnight stay and stimulate the development of the water based transport. It will provide an entertainment and leisure offer to complement our existing World Heritage site in Greenwich which includes the Royal Observatory, Greenwich Park, National Maritime Museum, the Cutty Sark, the Painted Hall, the Old Royal Naval College and as well, in the rest of the borough, Eltham Palace and the Royal

Arsenal, all of course we are very proud of within Greenwich. Without the casino, the hotels, exhibition space, theatre and the further development of this entertainment district, Mr. Chairman, will not proceed, we have to say that. Whilst we might hope to attract a hotel in the future this is uncertain for us and the pace of development of the Peninsula will be slowed. We'd not like to lose some of the opportunities and synergies between the skills needed in the entertainment district and the culture and media institutions in Greenwich. We estimate that with a casino there will be in order of 4600 jobs and a gross value added contribution to the London economy of £187,000,000. Thirdly I'd like to emphasise on why Greenwich would be an excellent national pilot for the single regeneration casino licence. There are several factors I'd like to put before you. There is no casino located in or near Greenwich, we believe that this will allow the social and economic impacts of the regional casino to be more clearly monitored and evaluated. We are aware of the concerns of the problems of gambling and we are committed to sorting that problem out with the multi-agency panel to tackle the issues of problem gambling which will continue this evaluation on the impact of a casino, as a casino emerges. We can assemble a wide range of baseline dates in terms of employment and tourism against which to measure progress. We are used to working in partnership on multi-agency basis and implement and evaluate projects, we're not averse to this, we've been doing this for some time in Greenwich and the team that's with us today know how to do it. We have systems in place to deliver the employment skills and business benefits for our local people and local economy. Mr. Chairman we have a thing called GLAB, Greenwich Local Labour and Business, which has been a great success and it's a model, is recognised as successful, we can demonstrate success in our work in the Millennium year and since. We are currently using it in partnership with the AEG in a development of the O2 arena and entertainment district, it is being used in partnerships by the five Olympic boroughs, the GLA, the LDA, Learning Skills Council, Job Centre Plus to deliver the employment and business legacy for the 2012 Olympic Games. We have a strong track record and wide experience in negotiation and delivery of a 106 benefit, and would provide valuable insights into any successor's licence. As a council we have much experience of pilot status for a range of government initiatives, we are used to, and very willing, to share our knowledge and experience with others. As a pilot there will be much interest and attention to the development and implementation of the project, including by the media. We have much experience of operating in this environment and have a communications and media capacity. Mr. Chairman, lastly I'd like to suggest that the widest variety of benefits are likely to arise from developing a casino in a capital city in a development which will provide Europe's largest leisure entertainment complex and that therefore provides the ideal location for a pilot. Greenwich is a strategically significant site within London and the Thames Gateway. Mr. Chairman thank you for listening to me, as you'll appreciate I've tried to be brief and will very much welcome the opportunity for myself and colleagues to expand on our application, thank you.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you very much Councillor Brooks. I think you've all heard now this is the proposal that is going to be examined further. Just before we go on there is a preliminary point that's just worrying us a bit. Now, you know the remit of the panel is to look at local authority areas, or at the most broad locations, and of course your proposal appears to focus, exclusively perhaps, on the Millennium Dome. What we'd like to know is, some clarification of how you see your selection of this specific site affecting your handling of other applications for licences in other parts of your borough?

PETER BROOKS: Thank you for that Mr. Chairman. The Council would handle applications for a casino premises licence strictly in accordance with the Gambling Act of 2005, and in particular would invite competing applications as required by Schedule 9 of the Act. Any application would be considered by the Council's licence committee which is independent of the Council's cabinet, includes members of all parties represented on the Council and operates strictly in accordance with the relevant law and the Council's code of practice on licensing. The code stresses that the Council must make licence decisions openly and transparently and impartially, with sound judgement and for justifiable reason. While councils will take into account opposing views which are often strongly held by those involved, they would not favour any person, company, group or locality, nor put themselves in a position where they appear to do so. Councillors are required to undertake training on appointments and frequent refresher training. The Council has focussed on the O2 area because it has been approached by a potential casino operator regarding

development of the O2, but should Greenwich be selected as the local authority area which would host the regional casino the Council would consider applications from other casino operators as a way of securing the greatest benefit to the area and demonstrating that it has achieved this.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: I'd like to follow that up, I'm going to ask Mr. Froomberg to do so please.

JAMES FROOMBERG: We're trying to square that statement with one of your earlier submissions to us which advised us that the proposed operator, Kerzner International, is contractually obligated to AEG to build out the casino. If Greenwich was awarded the licence, I just wondered how you could square what you just said and what you advised us before.

PETER BROOKS: Thank you for that Mr. Chairman. It wouldn't actually be us doing that, we, as a local authority, as a planning authority and a licence authority it's really, without being too blunt about it, it's not our concern. We would actually look at every application that will come in, in its merit, as we do for every single application that comes into our local authority for any building or licensing of any acts. So it wouldn't be for us to make that decision.

JAMES FROOMBERG: I hear everything you say and don't disagree with a word of it, but how practical, in the event, would what you say be in terms of it working out?

PETER BROOKS: I can only, obviously, try and assure you that we would have to look, and I think it would be right for us to look, at any application that came in. There are, of course, there is a developer there on site, and it is AEG and I know that there is a partnership between Kerzner, within the local authority we have to not take that into account for obvious reasons. We have to take each one as it comes in, as a fresh application.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Does anybody want to comment on that answer, by the way, round the table. If not I'll move on. Beginning with the issues that we circulated. You've told us a bit about why you think it's the best test, because you haven't already got one. Greenwich is one borough amongst many and part of the whole Metropolitan area, if you could put yourself in the position of some people some years on trying to work out what the impact of a casino had been, would you find it easier as part of a very big place like London, or a little place, like somewhere else.

PETER BROOKS: Thank you for that Mr. Chairman and I will ask the Chief Exec to come in, in a moment to expand a bit further. We do actually pride ourselves on Greenwich being one of the big players.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: There's no borough like it.

PETER BROOKS: As far as I'm concerned Mr. Chairman there's certainly not another borough like Greenwich, as a soundbite. There are reasons.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: I was born in West Ham by the way.

PETER BROOKS: I'm sorry but we do have a West Ham supporter sitting behind me as well. But there are a range of reasons why Greenwich would provide a good test of the impact. As is said earlier on we are used to taking big developers on, if that's the right terminology, and we would be able to be a piloting authority if that's what we could do. So I will ask Mary Ney, our Chief Exec, to forward more information.

MARY NEY: Thank you Pete, thank you Chairman. Perhaps I could make a few points to respond to your queries on that, first of all we think Greenwich is quite representative of the capital city in terms of its demography and its diversity and we did provide you with some information on that on page 2 of our original submission which provides you with some comparative data for Greenwich and London and the country. And we're also a borough which contains huge contrasts which reflects the huge contrasts that you find in London. Contrasts in terms of areas of affluence and wealth and areas of deprivation, we are 41st out of 354 local authorities in terms of deprivation. We're also a borough which has huge contrasts in terms of our heritage with our World Heritage site and across the borough a whole range of listed buildings and cultural heritage, but also contrasted with new developments, new iconic buildings across our waterfront. So we do represent a lot of what you would find across the whole of London. I think the other point we make about Greenwich is that Greenwich is at a moment in its history where it is very strategically significant, not only to London but to the whole country. It's strategically significant in the context of the regeneration of the Thames Gateway, we're at a pivotal point where the take off and the regeneration of the ...? I think I am, in a sense that, about how Greenwich sits in, I'll make it briefer. I just think it's important to make the context point that you were making about Greenwich in London and why it's strategically significant. There is its role in the Thames Gateway, it's

strategically significant in terms of London's tourism, and particularly London's tourism strategy on dispersal and the role of the Greenwich World Heritage Site as a tourism hub for East London. We're strategically significant in terms of the 2012 Olympics and the work towards that with eight of the events taking place in our borough and we think we're strategically significant at this point in time in terms of access, transportation infrastructure and cross river transportation and links which are developing at the moment. So all those, I think, serve to place Greenwich in a particular way. In terms of testing the impact I think there are about seven key points that we make, first of all we do have no casino in or near Greenwich at the moment, and therefore we feel that we would be able to set up a good performance and monitoring framework to evaluate the impact of that. We do have a lot of baseline data on employment and tourism, they've been two key strands of our regeneration strategy, not only for us but for our wider partners in our part of London. We do have a very systematic framework and scheme in place, which Councillor Brooks referred to, which is called GLAB, our local labour and business scheme, which has got a track record, and we do think that by applying the methodology of GLAB, which reaches right into the most deprived parts of our community, to skill people up to ensure that they are delivered through to the jobs that are coming forward with the regeneration that's taking place. And that we would be able to produce a really good benchmark for what can be delivered from a casino because of that experience we've got. We're already working with the developers on the Peninsula and we have a base there for GLAB to actually ensure that we're matching up the skills we're giving people with the jobs that are going to be there. And they are also jobs that fit within the wider developments that are going on with the Peninsula with 2012 etcetera, so there is a lot of synergy. We also have a track record of working with developers and delivering Section 106 agreements since 1997.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Stick to social impact.

MARY NEY: Yes, this is about social impact because our focus

PROF STEPHEN CROW: I'll certainly be asking you about section 106 agreements later on.

MARY NEY: Right, I'll just say that the social impact bit is just to say that our focus of our section 106 agreements, and we've negotiated 200 since 1997, is about delivering local benefits for local people in terms of affordable homes, access into jobs, community facilities.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you. Does anybody else want to say anything about, yes you. Sorry I can't read your name plate at this distance. Are yes, you did some work for Havering some time ago.

KARINA BERZINS: Yes I did, I did indeed.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: And you thought that all we'd done was nonsense.

KARINA BERZINS: No that's not true. But I do, following on from what you were saying.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: And who are you representing today?

KARINA BERZINS: London East Research Institution, not unit unfortunately, it's institute. As the proposal stands, which is a casino add on to the existing O2 leisure facility, how would you separate the social and economic impact of the casino from the existing facility?

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Can you answer that Miss Ney?

MARY NEY: Yes, I think what we have tried to set out in the bid documents, is the additional facilities and developments that we will get on the back of a casino, and I think that is what will separate it, we will be able to measure the increase in tourism and overnight stays, for instance, into the borough. We will be able to separate out people who are actually coming for one off events from those who are coming for our whole tourism offer, which the borough can provide beyond obviously the Peninsula but the whole of Greenwich and as part of London.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Has that question been answered? I won't ask what you think of the answer, you can tell us if you want. The gentleman at the back with the blue shirt. Again I'm sorry I can't read at that distance.

ANDREW BARRY: Thank you Chairman. Andrew Barry, personnel from the Mayor's office, the Greater London Authority. Just on the question that you specifically raised, I won't repeat all that's been said by Greenwich about the area being a national and regional priority for regeneration, nor about the social conditions there, I think that that's well understood. There are three additional points I'd like to make to answer your question about why this will be a good test of social impact. The first is that it forms part of the Thames Gateway, which has to be one of the most studied parts of London, there is an enormous amount of information about present conditions, and about

conditions that have existed both in the wider Thames Gateway area, East London and Greenwich specifically, probably over the last 30 to 40 years. It's a very well researched and very well understood area, there's a lot of baseline information around that would help facilitate making informed judgements. The second is that London is unique in having now a very well developed system of regional governance, in the Greater London Authority Group you not only have the core Greater London authority itself with the Mayor and The Assembly, but the Greater London Authority Group brings together the bodies that are responsible for transport, in Transport for London, economic development in the form of the London Developments Agency, policing in the form of the Metropolitan Police Authority, and possibly of slightly less relevance to the matters that we are discussing this morning, also fire and emergency planning for the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Why does that make Greenwich a good place for testing social impact?

ANDREW BARRY: That makes London a good place for testing social impact, because you have a number of the organisations, as I was about to say, that are centrally involved with many of the issues around social impact, coming together in one organisation. And that mean that you can have joined up monitoring and joined up policy making.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: So you would have said the same for Brent yesterday?

ANDREW BARRY: Indeed. The third point that I would make, again this is something that's been touched on by the representatives from Greenwich, is that this is an area where there are very well developed policies and programmes for regeneration and national, regional and local scale, and those impacts are being monitored extremely closely and it's an area that will be very closely studied over the next 10, 20, 30 years, whatever the outcome of this morning's proceedings. It will be a very well studied area and there will be people with a very high calibre and a very high reputation in monitoring these sort of developments, will be looking at this area very closely. Thank you.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you. You haven't really had anybody attacking you, have you? So I'm not going to ask you to respond. If somebody does say something that really upsets you I'll give you a chance to say something. The lady who.

JUDITH SALOMON: Judith Salliman from London First.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: London First, you don't seem to have a label.

JUDITH SALOMON: No, I believe it's on its way.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Judith?

JUDITH SALOMON: Salliman.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Judith Salliman from London First, I remember seeing the name on the invitation list.

JUDITH SALOMON: I just want to support what's been said by the GLA about why London is the best place to pilot this, I do think we shouldn't underestimate the importance of our regional governance structures and the ability to bring together the right people to monitor the impact. I also think it's very important that there are no casinos in Greenwich at the moment, in terms of monitoring social impact and in London casinos are very concentrated within the Westminster area and a bit of Kensington and Chelsea and Camden. This gives a better opportunity to monitor the impact of a new regional casino. It also means that London probably scores highest for unsatisfied demand if you're looking at the PPS 6 tests, which will be important and we'll probably come onto later. I also think London provides a better opportunity to test the national and international impact, and so the ability of the regional casino to attract tourism, and particularly international tourism. Thank you.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Miss Salliman, I'm going to ask you this question, but I think it probably applies to almost anybody, and that is, doesn't the sheer size of London make it difficult?

JUDITH SALOMON: In what way would the sheer size of London make it difficult?

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Well, if I was going to do a social survey, I'd choose Piddle Hinton in Dorset.

JUDITH SALOMON: Wouldn't that distort the results of your survey, if you're starting from a very low base? I think the sheer size of London probably helps, and the fact that you do have a developed leisure/ entertainment market.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: I've nothing for Piddle Hinton in Dorset, I just like the name, I should mention. It's a lovely place, do go and visit it. Thanks very much.

ANDREW BARRY: Chairman, there's one thing I would add to that if I may. The converse of your argument also applies, that there's virtually no circumstance, virtually no community that you will find in the United Kingdom that you do not find in London, which, I wouldn't like to say anything at all about little Piddle Hinton, but I suspect it's probably not true of there.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thanks for that. Yes, gentleman over there.

ROBERT WHITTAKER: I'm Robert Whittaker, and I'm from the Government Office for London, and I'm representing Liz Meeke today.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Yes, thank you.

ROBERT WHITTAKER: I was going to make a very similar point to that that Andrew just made, really, which is that in terms of testing social impact, ...? which is reinforced by what both the Leader and the Chief Executive of the Council have been saying about, you know, the key strategic positioning that Greenwich enjoys in London, and for that reason I think it's an argument in favour of testing the proposal in London, rather than necessarily anywhere else.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thanks for that. No-one wants to say anything more about type of area? Yes, oh I do beg your pardon, and thanks for telling me. Sir.

JOHN ALLEN: Thank you Chairman. My name is John Allen, I'm Director of Planning, London Thames Gateway Development Corporation. The point we make about this particular issue is, within London itself, I mean, certainly our view is that the Thames Gateway area is a particularly good area for testing social impact, given the particular issues there are about unemployment and worklessness and other issues that need to be addressed in the London Thames Gateway area. Of course as the development corporation, the particular site at Greenwich is actually outside our operational area, although we're all part of a larger London Thames Gateway area, quite clearly. And, of course as a development corporation we are ...? specifically, as you know, because it is located within our area.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: You would tell us to that effect wouldn't you.

JOHN ALLEN: Indeed that's right, but at the same time ...? for any particular reason, then we are supportive of proposals that would have beneficial impact on our area as all of us would wish, obviously Greenwich would have some beneficial effects.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you. Let's move on then to social impact. There's a particular question which Greenwich Council themselves have answered, and I don't want to ask them to go over it again, but I did want to know other people's views on it and it's this, to what extent, do we think round the table, that the employment opportunities, are they going to be offered, and I'm going to investigate it shortly, some numbers, but lets say re-employment opportunities. To what extent would they benefit unemployed people? We've heard about the, in GLAB you call it, and I've read about that of course, but I mean the London labour market, one must admit it's a very peculiar thing, one can go to a hotel in, I haven't been to a hotel in Greenwich, I'm sorry, but I've been to one just across the water, and there we were in one of the most deprived communities of London and where do the staff come from? Portugal, now I've nothing against people coming from Portugal, but why wasn't it Londoners? Someone just tell me a few things that I ought to know about that. I mean do you all really think that if we have this proposed development that lots and lots of jobs would go to local people? Yeah I'll ask him to follow up later. Mr? And you're from?

STEPHEN NELSON: STEPHEN Nelson from the Greenwich, Bexley and Lewisham chamber of commerce.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you.

STEPHEN NELSON: I think almost certainly it will benefit the local work force. We work alongside GLAB and the British Enterprise Board and other agencies and developers to try and maintain that local business actually will get a good share of the development and from that we will be employing as new businesses grow, local labour will be employed. And even if it is overseas labour to some extent they're still going to be living in the area and contributing to the local economy. So it's not ...? if they are imported labour.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: If I could just ask for a little further clarification on this point. We noted that earlier from previous development on the Greenwich Peninsula that 40% of jobs had gone to local people from Greenwich, and we also note that in the future it's predicted that that figure will

be nearer 50%, and I just wondered whether someone could perhaps try and explain to us why there is any confidence that the figure will rise from 40% local take to 50%. Thank you

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Yes, you were going to answer that

JOHN ALLEN: Well I'm not, I'm just going to make a comment on it, the fact that we've been through this procedure before certainly means that we would hope to get better. We've had the experience before with the Millennium Dome development and other developments, so I think, you know, we've had the practice, GLAB is in place and has been working in the borough for some years now, with a good element of success, so I think we can hope to see improvement.

STEPHEN NELSON: If I may, Mr Chairman, thank you very much. I need to try and assure you that what we have, the GLAB, which I've mentioned a few times now, 'cause we are very proud of it, of course, it will work, it has worked, and it will continue to work. We will continue to strive to make sure that people within the area, that live within the borough will be offered opportunities to work, and training. And it's not just giving people jobs, it's about training as well, and businesses.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Casino jobs, of course, are quite specialised aren't they?

STEPHEN NELSON: Absolutely. We have already been in discussion with Greenwich University, who have indicated that they would be available to do some of the training. We have other facilities and training schemes within the borough, such as colleges and other universities, which are known around the world, of course. At this moment in time they don't train casino operators, for the reasons I've said earlier, we don't have a casino within the borough, but of course, Mr Chairman, if granted the casino within our borough then the training would take place. The jobs would be guaranteed for local people.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: The thought crossing my mind as you're speaking is, would the timing work out? I mean, if you've got to train people so that on the day the casino were to open you'd have the people there, you'd have to start before, wouldn't you?

STEPHEN NELSON: Absolutely, and hopefully just after Christmas you'll be telling us, Mr Chairman, that we can start training our people, hopefully.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: You wanted to ask a question.

MAN 1: I'm very interested in the GLAB activities, and could you tell me a little bit about the unit within the Council that actually co-ordinates the activity, just to get a feel for how it works, because it does seem to be an important model.

JOHN ALLEN: Certainly, Mr Chairman. I'll just come closer to the mike in case I'm one of those people who couldn't be heard. I mean, basically, GLAB was set up in 1996, and it was used extensively for the Dome area. Can everyone hear me?

PROF STEPHEN CROW: I don't think so. I can't.

JOHN ALLEN: If we had a trainee from GLAB here then we could sort this out Mr Chairman. But I guess I'll have to shout. I'll carry on. As I say, in 1996 GLAB was set up by the Council. It is a department within the Council, the people that run GLAB are employed by Greenwich Council, and we have had many people over the years come in to see the good practices that we actually do for GLAB. It's a pilot that many other councils have looked up and are experimenting with, we are happy to let people know what we're doing, because we do think it's a great opportunity for local people that have been deprived of jobs and so forth, so it's something that we're really pleased with. I mean, since then we've placed over 7000 people within jobs, since '96, and 44% of them are from the BME groups as well, so we have a good track record, and we do have examples. I wouldn't mention people's names here today, of course, but the examples of people that would come forward to say the practice, that it happens.

MAN 1: ...? in the GLAB process, in actually administering it

JOHN ALLEN: Yeah, I haven't got the exact figures here, but it's about 25, 30 people

MAN 1: 25, 30 people, so it's ...?. The other thing is, what would you describe as the success factors in terms of achieving those results? What is the, what are the key factors which you think stick out in terms of achieving this, above other activities in other regions.

WOMAN 1: I think the key feature is that GLAB works by starting with the individual, and looking at the skills that the individual needs, in parallel with working with developers, employers in the borough who are actually wanting to recruit people, so there is a matching process, we don't just train people in the hope that opportunities will be available, we try to put people on a pathway where we know that they will get an interview, because an employer is flagging up the need for

specific roles, and so, for instance, that happened in the Millennium year, where we trained a lot of people in hospitality skills. 40% of the people who worked in the Dome in the Millennium year came from Greenwich, and they all went on, with the benefit of GLAB, after that first year, into employment, from the skills that they'd already got. We're working now, for instance, with the developers who are operating on the Peninsula, to actually match up the jobs that they know they want to fill, that the contractors are wanting to fill, and bringing people through the system. We can reach back into the borough, we work through, within the borough we're developing, and we're halfway through this programme, 21 children's centres, and one of the priorities for the children's centres is lone parents, parents who are wanting to get back into training, to get back into employment, so we're able to support them, not only with childcare, but also to support them with that process of getting back into training, getting back into work, going through the interview process and that initial period into employment. So we've got a number of outlets that we can use, so that we can tailor make those packages, and there's obviously a big synergy with the sorts of hospitality and leisure industry skills, so they're going to be needed throughout this proposal, not just the casino, and also in 2012. There are also a large range of construction jobs, and I think you did ask a question to us earlier, about the nature of the construction jobs, and their permanency or not, and I think one of the features of Greenwich is that we are going to be a building site for the next 20 years, you know, there is a big roll out, a big development programme across the whole of the borough, as regeneration proposals continue, including on the Peninsula, and therefore the people that we're skilling up now straight into jobs and interviews with developers have got that knowledge that there is an ongoing programme that they could be part of.

BOB SCOTT: Bob Scott from the Greenwich Peninsula Partnership. Can I just put an added sort of single dimension to this. GLAB is something that really came into its own during the Millennium year, and as the Chief Executive of the Greenwich Millennium Trust, I saw it at work. And I think the really interesting thing about GLAB from a private sector point of view is that the borough offers the private sector GLAB to work with, and, frankly, the private sector begins by thinking they could do it themselves thank you very much. They then discover that actually working with GLAB is a great deal more efficient and more satisfactory than setting up their own system, and I saw this work with the New Millennium Experience company, and I've seen it work with the Meridian Delta Limited Company as well, on the Peninsula now. GLAB has a track record and a conscience, as it were, for Greenwich, which is really very important and remarkable, and the private sector has to discover it for itself, but when it does, it uses GLAB with enormous enthusiasm.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Yes. Following on from that, it's my understanding that construction's already started, at least in some part. Can you tell me about those types of jobs, and where the opportunities have been given to locals in Greenwich, and so on and so forth?

KARINA BERZINS: Yes Chairman, yes, there is construction of different sorts going on on the Peninsula, and within the Dome, and we have an arrangement in place with the developers to supply workers to the timetable that they've got for different skills. I think the other important thing to mention about GLAB is that it also works to ensure that some of the supply chain contracts are available to local businesses, so it's not just about individual employment, but so that some of the smaller contracts can be, so that local businesses are able to compete.

PROF STEPHEN CROW:: Because you do say, on page 22, in your answer, that, even at the London level, we assume that Kent, together with the rest of the UK and Eastern Europe will represent a significant source of labour supply. I understand the GLAB programme's very successful but I suppose coming at it from the other angle what kind of proportion of Eastern European workers do you envisage working here? Is there something that ought to be taken into account, as well as GLAB, in your view?

KARINA BERZINS: Some of the proportions of workers and views and things like that, I understand GLAB is a very successful programme, but that's just one programme. I guess I just wanted a little more information about your views on that.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: So you really think that perhaps there won't be 40%.

KARINA BERZINS: Perhaps not, no.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Because we will get people from overseas, other parts of Britain, other parts of London. Is that your view?

KARINA BERZINS: If construction's already started, possibly some of these jobs may not have gone through the GLAB system, as you mentioned earlier, the training, of course there's a certain timeframe here, I just would like some more clarification on that.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Your heart's not really with Greenwich is it?

KARINA BERZINS: My heart's with London, I absolutely think that, particularly some of the comments earlier, I think London is the best test case. I have some concerns about Greenwich, yes.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Can you answer those concerns? Or will you please do your best to answer those concerns.

KARINA BERZINS: I think we can best answer it by pointing to the track record and the way that GLAB works to ensure that local people are getting the benefit of the job opportunities. And that's why being on site from the start so that before the developers are letting their contracts we are actually establishing a base on site, working alongside them so that we know what their programmes are and what the skills and we are ahead in matching and bringing people through the system to meet the skills that they need. Our experience is that that does work and that that will deliver this sort of level of benefit for local people.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: So, in a nutshell are you saying that you want your local people to get the edge on people from other parts of London and the world?

KARINA BERZINS: Absolutely.

CHRIS COLLISON: Can I just pursue this a little bit further, thank you very much, I think the information that we've now received is very useful in explaining why you think the figure in the past that was achieved, the 40% local take, will increase to 50%. So that's, if you like, a proportion of the numerical side of jobs, I just wondered whether if you could say a few things, from a Greenwich Council point of view, about the quality of the jobs and the type of jobs that you think will be generated by a casino development and why those, perhaps in terms of the hours of the jobs or the skill levels, why you think that they would be particularly important to be opportunities that are created within the Greenwich community.

PETER BROOKS: Thank you Mr. Chairman and Chris Collison. Perhaps I ought to start by saying that Greenwich is the second biggest employer in London in its own borough, so we do recognise the importance of employment and recognise that employment should, and will be, good employment. We believe that people should all have a chance of having a job. Many of us, perhaps in this room, may have been at some time disadvantaged by the fact that they are a certain colour, and they cannot get a job. We make sure that within Greenwich Council that's not the case, we want diversity across all of the applications that we get within GLAB and within our own borough, and we're very proud of that, of course. So I think it's fair to say that job opportunities will not necessarily be the types of job that other people don't want, it'll be the types of job that people do want, where they'll be able to have a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, which I think is only right, and to make sure that they're not disadvantaged by colour, creed or anything else, Mr Chairman.

CHRIS COLLISON: I was just thinking in terms of two things, really. One, the hours of operation of casinos and possibly that those hours offer opportunities for employment for sectors of the community that might otherwise not be able to work. And also I was thinking in terms of, you know, the skill levels, and the types of jobs that would be created within a casino development. You know, how they fit, perhaps, with local need, and local requirements within local communities. Thank you.

PETER BROOKS: Yeah, thank you for that again. I think we could probably demonstrate that we would be able to work with a casino company to make sure that exactly what you said would actually happen. We would want to make sure that, if there are shift working patterns, then people would be able to benefit, local people would be able to benefit exactly from those types of jobs. Again, we would make sure, through any legal agreement, that that would be the case, such as when we sign any agreement when it goes through, if it goes through a planning process, that would be in firm place. So a developer would not be able to get out of that type of employment issue. We would make sure that that's tied up.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you. Can we have the response from the other people at the table? Mr Nelson?

STEPHEN NELSON: Just a quick point on the effectiveness of GLAB, I mean, the fact is that other authorities in other boroughs come to Greenwich to see how GLAB operates. I think that that fact alone shows that it is leading its field and is more likely to be successful in giving business, or giving work opportunities to the local labour force than anything else.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Yes. The chap ...?

REVEREND MALCOLM TORRY: I'll explain what happened. I was alerted to the fact that a document had appeared on the Culture Department's web site, which made it look as if we were unreservedly in favour of the casino application from Greenwich. A year previously, our trustees had published a paper, which I've got copies of if people haven't seen any, it is now on the Casino Advisory Panel's web site, and AEG had imperfectly summarised our views, and not cleared their summary with us. I objected on behalf of the chaplaincy to that. They immediately apologised and promised as soon as possible to put our paper on the web site, and that's what's happened. So as far as we were concerned, that's all there was to it. The press saw it differently.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Remind me what you were going to say anyway

REVEREND MALCOLM TORRY: What I was going to say was that I've been in the Greenwich community for ten years now, and can also testify to the brilliant work that GLAB has done. Numerous people whom I know have benefitted from its employment opportunities and its training, and one thing which has not been sufficiently emphasised, I think, is that the training that was offered during the year 2000 to those in the Dome meant that they were immediately snapped up afterwards by employers who went to the Dome at the end of the year to recruit new employees, and I saw those employers at work in the Dome and they were very enthusiastic about the people that they were employing. One hesitancy I must bring from some of the faith communities in Greenwich, some of the Christian congregations, Muslim, Sikh and Hindu communities, is that some of the job opportunities in an entertainment district which contains a casino ought not to be available to members of their faith communities, because of the nature, because they are either fundamentally opposed to gambling or because they recognise the damage that can be done by gambling.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: What you're saying is there's a lot of people, for conscientious reasons would not take those jobs.

REVEREND MALCOLM TORRY: Would not take those jobs. And their faith communities would be concerned at those jobs being offered to them, and I can understand that. However I recognise that having said that, that is an issue that the panel ought to consider with all of its applications, and it might be helpful to you to have that question on your agenda when you're looking at employment opportunities being created by casinos anywhere in the country.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thanks very much. Mr Sagar.

DEEP SAGAR: Mr. Chairman, if I could ask, did the Council consider a formal consultation with the public? We received various pieces of information, I know, in the material, but would you be able to say how many people are in support of the proposal in the authority, roughly.

MARY NEY: We did include, in the submission, the information about the formal consultation that took place by us and also by Greenwich Peninsula Partnership, Bob Scott might want to comment on that. In addition we did do a poll and we've put the information on that within the pack as well, and that commented on people's views about it. The two biggest concerns that people raised were around transport actually, and also obviously the impacts of problem gambling and how we would mitigate that.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: This is a question I'd like to ask of Mr. Torry, or Father Torry? That isn't the question. The question is this, have you any idea what proportion of people in the Greenwich Peninsula have conscientious objections to taking the job with a casino? I'll ask the question again, sorry if I can't be heard. The question is this, are you able to help us with roughly the proportion of people who might have conscientious objections to taking a job at the casino, people in the Greenwich Peninsula that is.

REVEREND MALCOLM TORRY: I can't tell you that, what I can tell you is that a high proportion of some of the ethnic minorities in the borough would not be able to take those jobs, because many of them are Hindu, Sikhs and Muslims.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Sorry, say that again.

REVEREND MALCOLM TORRY: Many of the members of our ethnic minorities are Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: I know Muslims are conscientious objectors, Hindus and Sikhs?

REVEREND MALCOLM TORRY: Yes. In their own sacred texts there are prohibitions against gambling. And the same is true for the ...?. Members of the Sikh, Hindu communities, some might take a bit more relaxed view as in every religious tradition there is a variety of views on those things, as you probably know, it is certainly true of the Christian tradition. There are some Christian congregations totally opposed to gambling and anything to do with it, and some that are not, it's a complex picture and our paper on the issue lays out the detailed evidence, so it's now on the website so people can read that. An important point though is that large proportions of the minority ethnic communities are from those faiths, but that would be true for any of the casino applications, it's an issue which ought to be examined with each application.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you. Mr. Froomberg, you wanted to follow up.

JAMES FROOMBERG: Thank you Mr. Chairman, it's a follow up to Malcolm Torry because I think twice now you've indicated to us how the issues you've raised about concerns about gambling are as relevant to Greenwich as any of the other applications we are considering and I just wondered whether you were able to highlight for us anything particular about Greenwich, either for or, if you like of concern, that differentiate it from others that we might be considering. We obviously recognise and understand the concerns that exist about gambling and casino gambling, and we're pretty well versed on that, but trying to see if there are differences in that category between the different applicants, is something we're hoping to learn more about, so if you can help us with that one please.

REVEREND MALCOLM TORRY: Greenwich does have some interesting aspects in relation to the distribution of different faith communities, the places of worship for the Christian faith are located throughout the borough, but for Muslims, Sikhs and Hindus are concentrated in the Woolwich and Plumstead area. There are almost no Jews in Greenwich and so the particular Jewish aspect of the gambling question is not something we've considered in detail because it's not relevant to the borough, but it may well be for other applications that you look at. The different faiths are small in relation to the Christian church in Greenwich, and you may find that in other application areas they are larger in proportion.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Now there's a lot of other people want to speak. I'll start with someone who hasn't said anything yet, and I think I can read AEG. Now what I'm going to say, would you please tell us what the relationship of AEG is to what's going on in the Dome. Some people, including myself, may misunderstand it.

DAVID CAMPBELL: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I'm David Campbell, Chief Executive of AEG Europe, my question is actually in relation to an earlier question about GLAB that's been up for a while, but if I start out explaining the relationship. We are the developer of the area inside what was the Dome, the O2, and some of the area around the outside of it as well, so in the north of the Peninsula, if you were there yesterday, everything north from the tube station up to the end of the Peninsula, so we are the developer in that area. Does that answer your question there on that?

PROF STEPHEN CROW: What's the relationship between others with an interest in the Dome?

DAVID CAMPBELL: We have a lease on the Dome from English Partnerships and that's just AEG who have the lease on that.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: What's the relationship with the operator please.

DAVID CAMPBELL: With Kerzner?

PROF STEPHEN CROW: If that's the operator, yes.

DAVID CAMPBELL: We've had a relationship for a number of years with Kerzner as a partnership to develop a casino and hotel outside of the Dome on the northern part of the Peninsula.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you for that explanation, now tell me what it was you wanted to tell me.

DAVID CAMPBELL: Thank you very much, it's the dis-benefit of being at the end of the queue. I just wanted to answer the question about GLAB in terms of construction, because as the developer we are the people who are funding and building out the construction. GLAB has been involved since day one in all aspects of the construction, and I think one of the points brought up earlier by the Council is that it isn't just a labour market that we're looking at, but it's also a business market,

a small business market. So the description I would always give to people is, if we have a local business with gravel and we have a local business who has a haulage firm, we try and put the two of those together so that they can take the gravel in one of their trucks and deliver it to the site, and we work with all the prime contractors and subcontractors on that. And one of the reasons it's particularly effective is the location of GLAB. GLAB is actually located on site so that if you were wandering around the building last night you would have found, just by north Greenwich tube station a couple of temporary buildings, one of those buildings is the Work and Learn centre for GLAB which is located there, and so people have ready access to that. And what that's done is meant that if we compare the what we've done to date, in terms of construction jobs, versus construction jobs when the Millennium Dome was built, those to date have exceeded it, which gives us the confidence that when we get to an operational phase we'll manage to get to a number which is in excess of the local employment that comes into the scheme. And just to go onto that we're now starting to work on phase one of that, so we're working very closely with GLAB on that, identifying what those jobs are, we actually have somebody seconded from GLAB in our offices as part of our Human Resources department, working on identifying those jobs and advertising them in the local community. With specific regard to the casino, one of the things that we've looked at is other areas where casinos have gone into where there hasn't been training before, so people who haven't had exposure to casino training. So we've looked at places where people had been trained up from scratch and as Councillor Brooks has said, if Greenwich was fortunate enough to get the licence at the end of year there's then a licensing process that goes on locally, there about a minimum of an 18 month build to build out a casino, and we think within that time there's plenty of time to train up people locally for many of the jobs that would happen within the casino. Particularly important within that, we think is a very important differentiator is that GLAB focuses on individuals and skills gaps with those individuals, rather than an institution, so though we work with GLAB and with local institutions in terms of bridging that skills gap, it's actually about identifying those individuals, understand what their skills gap is, and then going out and finding the right training for those individuals, rather than putting money into, or funding an institution that can take people from any areas that may not be within the borough. And as far as that's concerned with casinos there are, as I think somebody's already identified, a number of hard to reach groups, people who want to work part time, and what would be generally be considered anti-social hours who may be well exposed to, or well placed, to be working within the casino. I think the other point to make as a private developer, this is my final point here, is that somebody mentioned before that private developers get involved with it with some hesitation, and then embrace it, and that couldn't be a truer statement, I've never seen a programme like the before, and I think testament to it is the number of awards, and the Council doesn't really talk about the award they've won, but they've got numerous recognitions from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, the Audit Commission all of which were based on a lot of the labour markets, I think it's very important to do that, and guess the best testament is that within the development of the Olympics in London and development and skills training within that, GLAB has been used and people have been seconded from GLAB into that organisation to develop the skills training for the Olympics. So it's a blueprint that can be used in many other examples in London, and certainly from our experience as a developer it's very successful and very, very effective.

DAVID CAMPBELL: Greenwich Peninsula Partnership please.

SIR BOB SCOTT: You asked a specific question about public consultation and as the Greenwich Peninsula Partnership undertook the public consultation for the borough, I thought I could tell you a few things about that. We had four meetings, three of which were public, one of which was our own Peninsula forum, the Peninsula works on three levels of a strategic board, a senior officers group are both from the government agencies from the private sector and from voluntary agencies, and then we have our forum, which has 150 members, all of which are small organisations, all pan-London organisations, who send delegates to the meeting. If I'm honest, the public consultation, which was very widely advertised in the three main centres of population in Greenwich, in Greenwich itself, in Woolwich and in Eltham, the response to these public meetings, somewhat to our surprise, was rather underwhelming. I have to say that when we started the process, we thought that the resistance, or the aggression against, or whatever you might like to regard it, would come to the fore, that there would be a lot of people who would come to these meetings to

indicate their opposition. We had very little of that, and they were widely advertised. We had our best attended forum meeting, which, I think, it's true to say, we were also quite nervous of, if you like. I mean, its quite difficult to stand up and cheer and shout for a casino, it's not one of those subjects that the public does. What they do is they are a massive part now of the entertainment industry, and as we heard from Councillor Brooks, we are changing from one massive industry to another massive industry at the moment, we're changing from metal bashing to tourism, and I'm glad to say that Greenwich is a borough which actually understands that tourism means tourists. A lot of people want tourism without tourists, but we're quite happy to have tourists as well, as was indicated by the six and a half million visitors to the Dome, which is quite a statistic in itself. Anyway, the meetings were held, and it was really quite difficult, as a chairman of those meetings, to whip up any opposition at all to the outline. The main subjects were, as Mary has said, transport and jobs, that was the great thing, are there going to be jobs, are we going to be defended, are they going to be for us. And disabled groups came, disabled groups were extremely anxious to know that they would have access to the facilities, which we thought was interesting. 'People in wheelchairs like a flutter' is a phrase that I remember very well at one of our public meetings. And all I can say is that they were, they were held in very good spirits, and just going back finally to the sort of social impact, I mean, London is, as we know, a series of villages. Greenwich is a major village on the east, as we all know, the London map used to stop at Tower Bridge, the London map now includes Greenwich, and everybody in Greenwich wishes to see that London map stay including Greenwich, and, indeed, moving further east. And, really, one of the great points about people's support for this is the economic impact, the social impact of seeing, as it were, the shift of that central London tourism offer to include a major, major European destination for tourism in the east of London, on the Thames, and that was one of the things that came up, if this is going to happen we want it on our patch.

DAVID CAMPBELL: The experience of small response to consultation exercises, of course, is not uncommon, I know that from academic colleagues, if nobody else. To what extent do you think perhaps people were put off by thinking 'Well there's nothing much we can do about this?'

SIR BOB SCOTT: I don't think that is the case, because I think that at the time that it came up it was quite a new subject, it was quite well-known to be a competitive subject. I think maybe the fact that it isn't in the middle of the chimney pots, which is something they're coming to later, which is that it's in this very discreet area, which can be, as it were, protected, I think the notion of, you know, gambling in supermarkets, is very much more worrying to people than it is in terms of gambling in dedicated buildings. So all I can say is that I don't think that there was a resistance to knowing about it or feeling there was nothing they could do about it. But then, as you say, there were so few people who came, 30 or 40 to each meeting, I suppose isn't hopeless, but it's hard to know why those who didn't come didn't come. It's rather being like a theatre manager with a failed show.

...?

DAVID CAMPBELL: I think you're doing yourself a disservice. It's the London First, have I got it right? No, Thames Gateway.

MAN 1: London Thames Gateway Development Corporation. A bit of a mouthful, I'm afraid, sir, but it's the UDC, the Urban Development Corporation, that operates in two areas.

DAVID CAMPBELL: I apologise for the mistake. Now tell me what you want to say.

MAN 1: Well I wanted to come back to the Greenwich Local Labour scheme. I mean, certainly, it's something, I've worked in planning in London for the last 25 years, and I've heard of it as being a model, certainly, to use in 106 agreements and other ways of encouraging local labour into jobs and providing training. I think that's a good thing, but obviously one borough isn't a labour market, particularly in London, and one of the things we as a corporation have supported is the idea of improving connections across the river, to try and make a labour market work better in east London. For that reason we supported the proposal for the Thames Gateway bridge, for instance, to connect job opportunities and labour on both sides of the river. Now, of course, just north of here, the Jubilee line goes up to Canning Town, one of our most deprived areas within the Thames Gateway, let alone within the whole of the country, and that's an area within our concern, where we're promoting significant development to try and regenerate that area. And I'm interested to know what assurances, if you like, and the promoters of the scheme here can give, that local

labour initiatives are not going to be confined to the borough of Greenwich, but will also be stretching out to other areas of deprivation and need in the vicinity of the proposals.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: If I can just misrepresent what Greenwich have said for a minute, they're not going to stand much of a chance, are they, because they've got GLAB, and people in Newham who haven't, or have they? Or something like it?

MAN 1: Well I can't speak for other boroughs. There might be others here who possibly can, perhaps Thames Gateway London Partnership, who have a role looking after all the boroughs effectively, in east London, can speak a bit more, perhaps, on their behalf, but certainly we, as the UDC, are keen to promote local labour in our areas as well, which includes Canning Town and parts of Newham, parts of Tower Hamlets and parts of Hackney, stretching up the lower Lea Valley, so I suppose all I'm really saying is, I'm not decrying GLAB at all, from what I understand it's a very good scheme, I'm just saying that I would hope that the operators and proposers of this proposal wouldn't just be confining their efforts on local labour to the borough boundary of Greenwich, since they're very close to other parts of east London.

MAN 2: ...? goes to the heart of some of the general thrust of the questions that began this section of the discussion, which were as much about the viability of the project and the ability to deliver as much as anything else.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: I'd like to come to that later, if you're going to be with us later.

MAN 1: I will be with you later. I just wanted to make a point about the national awards thing, which I think is actually quite important. You'll hear lots of assurances, while you're going around the country. I think what Greenwich does have in its favour is, you know, national recognition for its ability to promote sustainable tourism, which is very much at the heart of what's under discussion more generally today, and I know we'll come onto that in better detail. I mean, there are two sides to that, it does establish a pedigree of sorts for the borough, which I think the borough will no doubt be keen to boast about itself. I think it also raises expectations on the part of organisations such as mine, but I do think it's a relevant consideration for the panel that there is a track record of sorts here, in this area, which I think is relevant to the discussion that we're having today.

PROF PROF STEPHEN CROW: Mr Nelson, I want to move on, but I don't want to miss what you're going to say, so if you say it briefly, please.

STEPHEN NELSON: Yes, sure. Basically it's about public acceptance in Greenwich of the casino. I can tell you that they, at our last, we've not had a chance to poll our members individually, but at the last networking meeting, in August, which was a bit smaller than usual, we had about 90 people along, I told the people who attended what the ...? was going to do as regards backing the casino for Greenwich, and asked if anybody was actually against that they spoke to me afterwards. Nobody did, so I can say from that meeting the vote was unanimous. Having said that, I did afterwards get one email from a member, and one email from a non-member, taking the opposite view, both by and large on religious grounds.

PROF PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thanks. Response on this, and I would like to...Government Office, had you finished saying what you wanted to? You've still got your sign up.

MARY NEY: Thank you Chairman. I just wanted to respond to the point about beneficiaries, in terms of employment, and the point that was made about the level of need for employment opportunities on the north side of the river, and just to say, whilst obviously our concern is, as you would expect, for Greenwich residents, we are in a strong partnership with the other four boroughs on the north side of the river, and we've been developing that partnership as part of our joint work together on the 2012 Olympics, and developing the employment legacy for that, and therefore we have a good understanding of the local labour schemes that they operate. They've been looking at GLAB, and we've been seconding, as has already been mentioned, people into developing that. So I think that there's every sort of reassurance that the benefits will be for that sub-region.

PROF PROF STEPHEN CROW: Well I'd like to move on to considering the other social impacts, which, of course will include social impacts across the board, including crime, and I'm pleased to see that we have the Divisional Commander here. I think perhaps we might just have a break. After consultation with the panel, and the Panel Secretary, we have actually decided what time it is, you'll be pleased to hear. Would it be convenient for you to have a quarter of an hour's break, and would you please all come back so we can make a prompt start. Quarter of an hour I think is

probably long enough for everybody to do what it is they've got to do, including take a deep breath, so we'll adjourn now until 14 minutes past 11 please.

PROF PROF STEPHEN CROW: On second thoughts, I think we'd better make progress. What I want to do now is to continue talking about social impact. And really I'd like to focus now on the other social impacts, and we've heard quite a lot about the positive ones, in particular I've heard a lot about GLAB and I'm grateful for that. I'd like to just explore what the negative social impacts are likely to be. I think I've an idea in general terms, but I'd like to know the extent to which this proposal, and I do mean this one, might lead to some adverse social impacts. I know Greenwich have covered the point in their statement, and, I think, in the supplementary questions. I think perhaps I'd rather that you just left it for a moment in case you want to respond to any of the points made, but I'd like to ask people round the table that are not connected specifically with the Council, how they see things. Commander, from the crime point of view, you have told us some interesting things. Would you like to just tell us a bit more, please, about how you feel the casino proposal would impact on crime on, do you still use the word 'patch', or is that Dixon of Dock Green.

PETER LOWTON: As we're in London, sir, I'd use the term 'manor'. By way of introduction, my name is Peter Lowton. I'm the Chief Superintendent or the Borough Commander for the London Borough of Greenwich. I have responsibility for delivering policing services to that borough, which, by natural definition, cover the full range from response policing, dealing with people's emergency calls, to delivering local policing through 18 dedicated safer neighbourhood teams, through providing a CID proactive and reactive response, as well as supporting the victims and witnesses of crime through the criminal justice process. That's just a very brief summary. It might help, before I come to sort of the points around crime, if I put it in context around what the policing priorities are locally, because I think this is quite important. Our priorities are focussed very, very firmly, under the Commissioner's direction, and the support of the Metropolitan Police Authority, with actually addressing local people's priorities, and improving the quality of life of local people. For me, in simple language, that means fewer victims of crime, crime reduction, that means punishing the offender through the criminal justice system. That means catching the right people, ensuring the correct evidence is gathered, and they are prosecuted appropriately through the Crown Prosecution Service. And of course we must provide reassurance, visible, accessible locally known officers and teams, and we do that through our dedicated ...? Safer Neighbourhood teams, as you know, now cover London in its entirety. And of course we have to have the capacity to deliver policing that meets local people's needs, and we have a very strong partnership working arrangement, both with the local authority, and a range of other groups and organisations, both voluntary and statutory, where we work very closely together to actually address the underlying problems, and not just the symptoms of crime and anti-social behaviour. To give you an example, I would never be as complacent as to suggest that we've got it right, because every day's a new challenge, and to be honest, that's what I love about the job, but, sitting before you today, crime in Greenwich is down 7% this year. That's not an achievement the police could achieve or maintain on their own, it requires very good working relationships with a whole range of different bodies and organisations, and particularly the local authority and other groups, working relationships at a strategical level, and a practical day to day tactical level, and I think all too often one can forget about the need for people who are actually delivering the service on the ground to appreciate and have the ability and the willingness to work in true partnership. And I feel in Greenwich we have that. In terms of crime, in itself, I don't believe it's possible, given the fact that the concept of a regional casino is new, I don't personally think it's possible to quantify with any degree of accuracy what the likely impact is, in terms of crime and anti-social behaviour. But what I do believe I can do is draw upon a range of different issues, to ensure that we minimise any risk of crime and anti-social behaviour, and develop the right strategies and processes to learn from our day to day experiences. A regional casino, as you quite rightly know, is a new concept, you will be aware that in London there are 25 other casinos, 19 in the borough of Westminster, the balance in Camden and Kensington and Chelsea, and we're fortunate because London, as you know, the policing is delivered through one single organisation, the Metropolitan Police Service, I have the ability to draw on and benefit from the immense experience of Scotland Yard's Clubs and Vice Unit. They work very closely with the existing proprietors of those 25 casinos to enforce the regulations in an appropriate fashion. And it is fair to say that the existing casino operators do operate in relation to

a strict compliance with the regulations, and do work in close partnership with the Clubs and Vice Unit of Scotland Yard. And what I've done is try and draw, you know, some rudimentary comparisons, if you will, what exactly has the benefit or the negative impact, I should say, of our 25 London casinos been. What I do know is that there has been very limited fraud, where customers/clients have attempted to tender counterfeit currency, and other fraudulent documents. The existing casinos are very robust, as you would expect, in dealing with those and identifying them. On a voluntary basis they maintain copies of the identity documents that individuals tender in order to gain entry. I believe that the legislation requires them to maintain a record but not copies, and I'd be seeking that, you know, in terms of Greenwich, we maintain that ability, because it improves the police's ability to investigate any crimes that occur. But the number of frauds is extremely low. The other type of crime that they do experience is theft employee, where people who are employed within the casino environment decide to behave in a dishonest or inappropriate way. And, again, the operators are very much alive to that, and work very closely with our Clubs and Vice unit to actually target and investigate, and prevent that type of crime. In terms of anti-social behaviour and disorder outside of the casinos, my understanding is that that just has not happened in relation to the 25 casinos that we have, and that may well be because of the close working relationship that exists, and I'm confident that we can build, with whomever the operators might be, should you decide to award the regional casino to Greenwich. It's also, I think, important to mention that there's a group called the UK Casino Security Managers' Association, which comprises of the security managers for all of the UK's casinos, and the Metropolitan Police Clubs and Vice Unit is the only police force that works and sits on that group, and that's looking at the long term, as well as the short term, reactive response to new crime trends, how you can design and prevent crime, and how you can effectively problem solve it. Having given you that summary, whilst I'm not able to quantify the likely criminal outlook, what I am able to say to you with confidence, but not complacency, is I do feel we are able to build on our strong local partnerships. I do feel we are able to draw upon the experience of the Clubs and Vice Unit in this area of activity after all, they are the only dedicated gambling unit in the country, and bring the two together to ensure that we exploit the opportunities to minimise criminal behaviour and activity, and ensure we exploit the opportunities to reduce and prevent crime and anti-social behaviour away from the casino environment itself. Sir.

PROF PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you very much Commander. Some of the representations we had very early on said all sorts of things would follow from having a casino, casinos generally, not specifically in Greenwich, that there'd be an increase in prostitution, for example. I mean, is there any evidence, to your knowledge, of that view? Is that something you'd expect? Here, that is.

PETER LOWTON: As I have said, I've got no research base to draw upon which would enable me to quantify the likely criminal impact, whatever type of crime, that a regional casino would bring to any area. I do think it's fair to acknowledge that wherever you have large groups of people, whether they're attending a football match, going about their shopping, at whatever shopping centre, that there is a residual, or a base level, of criminal activity that will happen. But that, as you have quite rightly alluded to, would apply to any short-listed regional casino site and not just Greenwich on its own, Greenwich is no different. I cannot comment on what the other short-listed sites have in place but I can comment on what I have in place.

PROF PROF STEPHEN CROW: I think, perhaps, you would be reassured to know that in some of the other places we have people like yourselves in the force, they've got their own forces attending. One of the other things that I vaguely recollect reading about, I can't think where, was the casinos might be a place for money laundering. Is that something that worries you?

PETER LOWTON: No, it doesn't worry me, because a casino, in my view, whether it's large, medium or small, is as likely to be targeted by organised criminal networks in order to attempt to launder money. We're lucky in London, both in the sense of the 25 casino operators that already exists, we're lucky to have, as I say, the Clubs and Vice Unit, who are extremely experienced, and this is one of the reasons where I draw my confidence from, about not only identifying the likely mechanisms for undertaking money laundering, but also getting ahead in using well established intelligence networks for preventing those potential opportunities being exploited by criminal networks in the first place. Of course there is a potential risk of this activity and what we, the police, can do, both locally and through Scotland Yard, is learn from our experience, use the

understanding that we have of how casinos operate, use the very well established intelligence networks that exists within the police service, as well as within the casino operators through their association, in order to prevent those opportunities coming to fruition.

PROF PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you very much. You mentioned that you hadn't got a research base, I wouldn't expect the commander of an active division to have a research base. Does the Metropolitan Police as a whole have one do you know?

PETER LOWTON: My understanding is not, we can quantify the crime and antisocial behaviour that is associated with the 25 casinos that we have, and I've given a very brief overview of that, but in terms of a regional casino and the likely crime that will come out of that, no. One of the interesting things for me, from a policing point of view, is the fact that it is integral to the O2 and part of that development potentially, actually makes my job that bit easier. We're very well established at the moment in liaison with AEG and the operators, to make sure that the security for the premises is correct, both internally and externally, because it is potentially an iconic target for those that wish to disrupt the way we live and operate. But also in terms of general security, for example CCTV provision, police provision up on the Peninsula, enhanced services that we can provide in conjunction with the developers and the operators of the O2, for example contingency plans of the full range that you would expect, from terrorist attack to fire to other issues, are well developed and are well along the route to being agreed, including planned table-top exercises in the next couple of months. So from my perspective, the planning, both in terms of contingency and police resourcing we're actually well along the way to actually getting that in place. Whilst I'm not so naïve to say that a regional casino wouldn't attract significant additional visitors I am confident that taking the two together we are able to police those effectively. What I want is people attending to have a constructive enjoyable experience, whether they're coming to the maritime area, whether they're coming to the O2, whether they're coming going to the casino, indeed any other of our tourist sites, and that's what we work tirelessly to deliver.

PROF PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thanks. You, perhaps, aren't in a position to answer this, unless you know policing in every part of Britain, you might, I don't know. Compared with others, is there anything special about Greenwich that would lead us to attach a plus or a minus somewhere.

PETER LOWTON: In giving an answer to that question I wouldn't wish to imply that my colleagues haven't got the expert wonderful policing service that I have working with me. I'm sure they would speak very highly of their colleagues.

PROF PROF STEPHEN CROW: Have you always been with the Metropolitan Police?

PETER LOWTON: Yes sir, I have twenty years of policing service, I've been the Borough Commander for Greenwich for 18 months, I'm a career CID officer, been a Detective Chief Superintendent, my proper title, for four years.

PROF PROF STEPHEN CROW: That's the Queen's police medal is it?

PETER LOWTON: No, that's the Jubilee medal. I haven't got that quite yet, I've worked well sir. My experience ranges both at a local, regional and notional level, my job prior was as the southeast coordinator for the National Criminal Intelligence Service looking at serious and organised crime from an intelligence perspective, the southeast being the 13 police forces if you went up from the Isle of Wight and in from the Wash, that sit in the southeast.

PROF PROF STEPHEN CROW: I've not noted your non-answer to the question that perhaps I shouldn't have asked, thank you.

PETER LOWTON: I do think, if I may, I'd like to highlight, you'd be aware that Greenwich has a Premiership football club, so from a policing perspective we are experienced in handling and managing what are significant crowds, both in terms of a set venue, a set location, as well as their route to and from the venue. We have, as I said before, 18 dedicated neighbourhood teams and I know that the Commissioner's model and the Mayor's office have worked immensely hard to get this across London, and I know many other forces are seeking to emulate what we already have. I don't know of the other short-listed sites what their local policing arrangements are, but I know many other forces are aspiring to match what London already has.

PROF PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you very much Commander, no doubt the word, even as we speak, is getting back to your equivalents in these other places.

PETER LOWTON: Sir, may I just mention one other thing that may assist you? If one were to look at the role of the Clubs and Vice Unit around its working in partnership with QC operators to

enforce the law fairly and firmly. I would also like to highlight what we do locally in terms of licensing enforcement. One of the issues our local operation, known as Operation GRAPE, and I think that it's well known that, generally speaking, there is a correlation between alcohol and violent crime and when the change in the licensing law came last November, my staff and the Council worked very closely together to look at how we can get ahead of the game, to prevent what potentially is the change in the licensing arrangements fuelling violent crime, fuelling antisocial behaviour. And that led to Operation GRAPE.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Sorry, operation?

PETER LOWTON: GRAPE. We wanted to call it grape vine. That's still running, it ran in an intense phase between November and March and is still running now at a reduced phase, it will pick up again when the intelligence pitch requires us. What it meant was is that on a ground floor level my officers, working very closely with the Council's licensing teams, on a practical level it meant that we policed and enforced the law appropriately and fairly throughout the borough, leading to over 2000 licensing visits in the first four months, over 100 arrests in and around Greenwich, various prosecutions for selling alcohol to minors, and violent crime went down significantly compared with the same period the previous year. The point I'm trying to make is, is that we've learnt from that experience, my officers have a better understanding of how the Council operates given the change in the licensing law, we've demonstrated how we can work in partnership to a key business community, the licensing community, and helped them appreciate, and work with them, to take their responsibilities seriously to ensure that the licensing doesn't require us every night to police it, they're able to police it, in inverted comas, for themselves. My point in giving that example I would like to say, is very real because it is, for me, as important to have effective partnerships at my level, and it's probably more important to have effective day-to-day partnerships on the ground floor. I believe we have that and GRAPE has been a wonderful learning experience for us all and has worked.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Does anybody want to say anything, or perhaps ask the Commander any particular questions or points? If not I'll move onto other social impacts. Yes, Mr Collison?

CHRIS COLLISON: Yes, just one point. We heard earlier from the borough Council that they would evaluate all applications through their licensing committee, that could result in applications from different parts of the borough. Are there any geographic parts of the borough that would raise any particular crime issue if the casino were located in them?

PETER LOWTON: There are three main town centres from a policing perspective in the borough, Woolwich, Eltham, and Greenwich itself. As you've already heard me say, we have dedicated teams that work in those areas, we have enhanced policing delivered in them through Operation GRAPE. So for me there's not any single area that causes me any particular concern. Of course there will be a demand, of course we will need to respond to that, but by actually using our local experience, with the centre's experience, I think we can cope with that. The thing for me, around the licensing is, is I have two dedicated officers who marshal the intelligence on the licensing applications, so we complement that, the role that the Council has in supporting and working through that licensing application process. And my view is that each licence has, and should be, taken on its merits, in the context of that the crime, antisocial behaviour and other issues in that locality, and that works effectively at the moment, and it's worked effectively following the change in the licensing last November.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Government Office please.

ROBERT WHITTAKER: Thank you Chairman. I wonder if I could address a question to the Borough Commander. You mentioned the importance of strong partnerships in your area of work and clearly one of the important ones, one of the crucial ones for you will be the Crime Reduction Partnership. I wonder if you might just say a few words about what you see the role of that playing, should Greenwich be successful in this bid, you know, how you might use that to actually address some of the legitimate concerns that people might have about the impact of crime.

PETER LOWTON: I would be talking for quite a long time to give an overview of all the different partnerships that we have, but my colleague from the Government Office for London is quite right, the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership, as you know, is a statutory group of people, who have the objective of reducing crime within what's called the British Crime Survey Comparator Crimes, I'll explain that if you would like me to in a moment, by 20% over a three year period

against a base line year of 03/04. They are exactly the same objectives that the Commissioner has given me, and for my sort of take on that particular objective regime is that it consists of ten crimes, which have come about through analysis and research at the British Crime Survey. As you will be aware, the British Crime Survey interviews 30 to 40 thousand respondents in England and Wales annually, ascertains what their feelings and feelings about crime and disorder etcetera are, and it's from that, historically, we've had this expression, the 'Reassurance Gap'. This is where recorded crime has been going down, for example in London, consistently, year on year for quite some time. However, historically, people through the British Crime Survey were saying that their fear of crime had gone up. So a fear of crime's going up, even though recorded crime is going down, the gap being the reassurance gap, and neighbourhood policing's objective is to close that gap. And we're doing that. One of the benefits of that collection of ten crimes, and that I as the local Borough Commander having those as my objectives, and the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership having the same, is that it actually ensures, if that were necessary, in my experience of Greenwich it's not, 'cause we do all really work well, that there is a common view, a common aim, a common objective, a common goal, a common vision, and if we didn't have that, none of us would achieve what we actually want, which is a safer Greenwich, that's whether you live there, work there or visit there. And when I talked about earlier, that crime is down in Greenwich, it's down within that basket of ten people, that collection of ten British Crime Survey Comparator Crimes. And one of the things that I think is its strength, personally, is that local people often talked about youth crime, and concerns around that type of issue, 'why aren't you targeting youth crime?', but when you explain that robbery, street crime, burglary, motor vehicle theft of, theft from, violent crime, ABH, GBH, assaults, criminal damage, are all in that collection of ten crimes, and when you explain that, for example, 96% of the suspects of street crime on my borough are under 21, you could actually illustrate and help people understand that we do target local youth crime, and we do it day in day out, but we could only do it if we had the close co-operation and an effective partnership with the local authority, the PCT, voluntary organisations, a range of other groups of people that sit on the CDRP. So, for me, I was lucky, I've come to a borough that's got a well-established, effective partnership, and I think we've improved, and we're going forward in the right direction, and I think that's set us up, hopefully, to succeed, not just in terms of regional casino, but delivering sustained crime reduction, which is, after all, I think, something that most people would want their police service to do.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thanks. Would I be right in thinking, or wrong, that in the ten comparator crimes there's nothing that particularly relates to casinos?

PETER LOWTON: No. For clarity I can tell you what the crimes are, if you'd like.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Yeah, sure

PETER LOWTON: Robbery of personal property, which is mugging, I suppose, colloquially, theft person, which is where somebody snatches a handbag as opposed to actually holding a knife or using violence on the person, pickpocket. Those three crimes, robbery, snatch and pickpocket are collectively known as theft person or street crime. Interestingly, theft of pedal cycles is in there, residential burglary, the taking of motor vehicles, theft from motor vehicles, interference and tampering with motor vehicles, criminal damage, which I'm personally pleased to see, because I think if anything brings down the quality of life of people, it's when you walk outside your front door and see graffiti and damage there, it's got to bring your life down, you know, and I'm proud that this year criminal damage is down 8%, it's a huge volume of crimes, and it's a very good example of how we work with the Council, and on another level, the Council have a range of departments, including a clean sweep, and we work closely with them in the targeting of areas where we have a higher incidence of criminal damage, and we work very closely in its removal. There is a wealth of criminological research that would be often known as the 'broken windows' theory, one bit of graffiti attracts another, so one of our priorities is to tackle it and deal with it, so criminal damage is in there. You also have wounding, which is, in effect, grievous bodily harm and actual bodily harm, and you have common assault. And they're the crimes that sit within that collection.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thanks for that, I think that's helped with our education. Mr Collison.

CHRIS COLLISON: Yes Mr Chairman, thank you. Chief Superintendent, you've just identified sort of the range of crimes, but some of those crimes are particularly relevant to large numbers of people visiting an area, we're talking about a tourist facility of some scale, and perhaps of those

crimes you've mentioned then street crime, and those related to vehicles and those related to assault in streets would be of relevance to visitors to an area, and obviously of concern, you know, people want to be safe when visiting. You mentioned earlier that 96% of crime was being undertaken by those under the age of 21, presumably they are predominantly males, could you say something about how much of that crime you think is related to drug taking, and just say something about measures that are being taken in the borough to address those particular issues?

PETER LOWTON: I want to say, for the point of clarity, Chair, that the 96% was referring to the perpetrators of street crime, as opposed to the whole thing. And I think sir, your summary of the likely offences that may occur is probably quite true. What's very interesting about the whole thing, I'll give you an example of the retail area that's also within the Peninsula ward, in Bugsby's Way, a big, almost like an out of town retail development. Historically large numbers of vehicles attending, for obvious reasons, people are going shopping, therefore it becomes a hotspot for theft from cars, where people have decided to break in and nick their new Christmas present, whether it's a sat nav or whatever, and so on and so forth. We've actually worked very, very hard with the local authority and the retailers themselves, to take steps to raise awareness of the likelihood of that type of criminal activity, even down to having talking signs, so as you walk past it speaks to you and warns you of what you're doing, even down to seeking to recruit special constables from the retailers themselves, which is something that London's led on for quite some time. Even down to using our police cadets to leaflet and raise awareness of these issues. So I am firmly of the belief that by recognising the positive impact that some of those tactical services prior to parking arrangements being created, we're able to put them in at the start, not in response to a crime blip. So it's recognising what works and making sure you take it further, that's first. In terms of robbery and street crime, for me robbery is an issue, it's clearly a priority for London, as it would be anywhere else. We actually have a very, very low incidence of street crime. For example, one less offence in a month is a 1% reduction, one less snatch in a month is a 5% reduction. And the tactics that I can quite happily go into around that but a similar approach would apply from my regard, I have dedicated teams that use intelligence to target the offenders of this crime, no matter where they're from. We, through the Government Office of London, are leading on a five borough partnership to look at the intelligence picture of travelling criminals in relation to street crime, which is an innovative new way of going through it, bringing in different agencies and groups to share the intelligence picture in a way that we may have been able to do within the police service, but haven't been able to do cross agency. So I think there are things being developed and innovative steps being taken that actually put us in a good position ahead of the potential regional casino to come to the ...?. So, for me, you're right, there is a risk of some of these offences occurring, but by applying the lessons we have learned, not just from the borough, but from across London, and I'll borrow with pride from anybody, you know, I'm not proud, in that sense, if there's an initiative working elsewhere I will seek to learn from it and borrow it and use it locally, and the Council take the same approach through the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership. And it's for those reasons that I made the comments I did earlier, and I am confident that we can address the risk of crime and anti-social behaviour in a positive way. And that's why I'm confident that we can work with the operators, whether it be a licensing agency, whether it be the regional casino not, to actually address these issues ahead of it. And my final comment, I know I'm going on a little bit and I apologise for that, but we also have a problem solving group at a borough level and, as I said earlier, we're about actually addressing the problems not just the symptoms. And there is a bottom up, top down approach to problem solving in the borough, so if, for example, a local resident is raising an issue of concern, of whatever level it is, we can actually take it to this multi-agency group and you have people round the table who have the resources at their disposal, and have the ability to look at how we can actually address what's behind this problem. And that, I think, is exactly the model we intend to, and will apply to a regional casino, because I think some of the problems that may develop aren't yet known, and by having that robust structure in place we can address them and prevent them.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Well thank you very much indeed for that.

CHRIS COLLISON: Chairman, just a final point. Did the problem solving approach generate any information about the percentage of those street and related crimes of the vehicle and so on, that

would be relevant to be visitors, the proportion of those crimes that are related in some way to drug problems?

PETER LOWTON: Greenwich is a pilot site for drug testing of detainees on arrest and on charge, that's been going for a couple of months now so I don't have any figures yet to come out of that pilot scheme, but I would anticipate in the next three to six months we would be able to actually look at the number of people who are arrested and charged with a criminal offence and see how many of those have got drugs of whatever size, shape or type in their systems. With that information I would be better placed to draw an answer to your question, but unfortunately I would only be hazarding a guess, and I don't think that would be appropriate if you don't mind sir.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you again. I'd like to move on to other aspects of social problems, and in particular I wonder if anybody would like to educate us on how Greenwich might or might not suffer particularly from problem gambling, or I think some of the literature refers to psychopathic gambling, gambling where people just cannot stop however hard they try. Do we know of such problems in Greenwich? Are people really worried that the casino, where it's proposed at the tip of the Peninsula, would lead to the problem gambling getting worse? Yes, you've caught my eye Mr.

REVEREND MALCOLM TORRY: One of the problems which the population of Greenwich has, and I've heard this from Christian congregations and members of other faith groups, is they just don't know, and that concerns them. We are not sure whether a new casino being built will create extra problem gambling, but having said that they are equally concerned about the number of bookies now appearing on our high streets, apparently with no public consultation.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Bookies shops, which are legal?

REVEREND MALCOLM TORRY: Oh yes, perfectly legal, they, I gather, don't need planning permission because they are shops. That issue is as concerning as the possibility of a large new casino, and I think these issues coming together, along with internet gambling which people are more and more aware of as a problem, increases the anxiety of our community certainly. So yes, there is concern at the possible large casino coming, but it's part of a more general concern.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Yes I see. Is there anything about the location at the tip of the Greenwich Peninsula that might exacerbate the problem, or possibly relieve the problem? I'm thinking of ambient gambling, the possibility that the problem gamblers can just walk into the place and chuck their money away.

REVEREND MALCOLM TORRY: To follow on from Bob Scott's early comment, my perception is that quite a lot of the apathy related to this application is because people do feel it's over there, and not where they are, and I think there's some truth in that, it is on the end of a fairly long Peninsula. But of course in 10 years time it will be in the midst of a new community.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: I was just about to ask that, we've got to look forward haven't we.

REVEREND MALCOLM TORRY: And one of the things the faith communities are already doing is making sure that we are active in that new community from its very beginning, which is why we've established the Greenwich Peninsula Chaplaincy, to work amongst the construction companies who are already there, and then to continue to work in each of the institutions and residential areas the evolves.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thanks. Greenwich Council themselves, do you want to address this point please.

PETER BROOKS: Just a few clarifications, just on the betting shops they do not need planning permission but they have to obtain the licence which goes through the local authority, so I just made that point Mr. Chairman. I know with the papers we've already submitted to you, there's a very strong statement from Greenwich Council and Greenwich Councillors, it was a unanimous with a council meeting that there was established a multi-agency panel which would tackle, and I did mention it in my opening remarks to you, so I think that's very important and I think it's good to know that this was welcome across all parties of Greenwich Council where there's only actually three parties in Greenwich. Just on the area of where the casino is placed, if we were to be granted a casino there, the casino is not on a route that you'd go through something, it's on a route that you would go to, if that makes any form of sense. And also there is actually the buffer zone where it's not actually on the ground floor, once you arrive on your journey's end towards the possible casino you'd then have to travel up some form of lifts or stairs.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: We're talking about the layout of the Dome now are we?

PETER BROOKS: Indeed, the layout of the hotel, yes. So you wouldn't be able to pass it, as you say, like going to a shop to buy a loaf of bread, you wouldn't see it, you'd have to go there and that's why we'd like to call it the buffer zone. It's also, I think, important that this is not really ever going to be a residential area, as of our plans at the moment.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: How close do the proposed houses go to the Dome? Can you tell me, I've read, apart from anything else, in planning journals about what housing is to be permitted, there's a lot of housing to be permitted.

PETER BROOKS: Certainly yes, there is going to be a residential area on the Peninsula, it's always going to be that way, and that was 10,000 homes, but they're all in different districts, this is going to be the area of entertainment, and then there's going to be an area of where the homes are, and so forth, so they're not actually in the.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Can you just guess, fairly sensibly at the distance? Perhaps someone behind you.

PETER BROOKS: Mr. Chairman, I can tell you exactly if I get my Planning Officer.

MARY NEY: Perhaps I could just add Chair, that between the site of the Dome and the residential area there is the commercial district which would act as a buffer as well.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: I see, perhaps that's really all done. I'd like to hear from the Planning Officer, give him something to do.

PETER BROOKS: Mr. Chairman it's more than 70 metres away, and I have been actually handed a piece of paper to say that betting shops do need planning permission actually, I was wrong as well.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Well, I was wondering, but I didn't know the use classes off by heart I'm afraid, although I do stress that my pupils at college do. Thank you for that. Mr. Torry, do you want to say anything more?

REVEREND MALCOLM TORRY: I'm sorry I was misinformed about betting shops. One other contribution which I can make, is we do very much welcome the draft proposals from multi agency group on gambling, we think that if there is a casino built on the Greenwich Peninsula such a body will be essential.

MARY NEY: ...? wanting any operator to co-operate with the work of that panel and to support the panel. We'd be looking to use that panel to address some of the issues you've raised about establishing some base-line data and an ability to monitor the impacts of the casino and the wider entertainment district. We do want it to be a panel which doesn't simply address gambling in relation to the casino, but also looks at the wider prevalence of gambling within the borough, and in particular internet gambling. I think you've commented on the fact that there isn't a great deal of information around the levels of concern that we should have and that is one of the remits of the panel that we're setting up. Obviously it would do a lot of the things that other multi-agency panels like that do in looking at best practice and in introducing projects and services and support to people who have got difficulties with gambling in the way that do with other areas of vulnerability. I think it's probably important to say that as part of some of the issues you've talked about earlier that because of the scale of the entertainment district that we're looking at here, the casino just being a part of that, that we will be looking towards having dedicated licensing enforcement activity in the entertainment district alongside dedicated policing resources. And in the way with operation GRAPE which the Borough Commander referred to and which we did set out in summary on page 7 of the application, we'd be looking to similar sorts of models and not only for the entertainment district but in dealing with the implementation of the new Gambling Act. And as the Borough Commander said, with the Licensing Act, I think, what we did set out to do was to be very proactive, so that from the moment that the legislation was in, we were very proactive, jointly, in visiting and setting down very clear standards and expectations with operators, and that we will do the same for all of the gambling legislation, but we will have the ability, because of the scale, to dedicate resources in the entertainment district.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you very much. Sorry, I can never remember people's names

KARINA BERZINS: It's Karina Berzins. Yes, following on from that, and going back to some issues you were talking about earlier, with the layout of the Dome itself, the concern that I have is

the threat, or the potential threat, of encouraging gambling amongst young people, who may be visiting the arena or leisure centre. I guess I have a question, how will that threat be mitigated?

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Yes, AEG. Do you want to respond to this point?

DAVID CAMPBELL: I can, Mr Chairman, yes. In terms of the layout, I think we'll covered the various activities inside the tent later on, but the actual area that we would have to put a casino, if a license is granted, is three storeys up from the rest of the area, so to get to that you would have to go up lifts or escalators and make a very conscious decision. On top of that there's additional security at the door of that, that would prevent anyone under the age of 18 getting through those doors. So A, it's not unlike, for anyone who's visited a casino in Las Vegas or anywhere else like that, it's not something you can wander through, you have to make a very conscious decision to go to it and B, once you get there there's security that stops you moving into the area unless you've been identified and are over 18. So we do think there are going to be protections against that.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Mr Campbell, I think, with respect, you've only partly answered that question, which I understood to be that people would be attracted to, you know, the other entertainment facilities, and they'd see, perhaps a notice for the casino, or something like that, and they'd say 'Ooh, let's go and have a look at that and see what it's like', and then perhaps from that moment sort of drift into being serious gamblers.

DAVID CAMPBELL: There certainly would be some situations where people may get exposed to it. I understood the question to be people who are under 18, who wouldn't get exposed to it

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Well you'd obviously ask then because that would be unlawful, wouldn't it?

DAVID CAMPBELL: Indeed. And there are all the protections

PROF STEPHEN CROW: So obviously you'd protect yourself about that. But I mean, at the end of the day you're going to want customers, aren't you? I mean you don't run a business without customers as I understand it.

DAVID CAMPBELL: It's a true statement. It's an integrated destination resort, and as an integrated destination resort all the various elements of activity under the tent, and some of the activities outside the tent, work together and cross-subsidise one another, and I think we'll probably get onto that in some of the panel's later questions when we talk about the economic benefits derived and how there's a split. I can start to talk about those now if you prefer.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: I'm grateful for your answers, but I'm not altogether sure that you've really answered the point made. At the end of the day there isn't an answer to this is there?

DAVID CAMPBELL: Perhaps if you repeat the point maybe I can answer the bit that you're missing.

KARINA BERZINS: Certainly, like I said, the concern is that there maybe a threat of encouraging gambling, not just under 18s, but younger people in general, if they are going to the arena for a rock concert or so on and so forth. I guess it comes down to an issue of branding as well, that this venue will be associated with a casino and that association may well encourage young people into gambling.

DAVID CAMPBELL: For anyone going into the venue, most of those people, not all of those people, would be physically exposed to something that would have a, for instance, a map of the building that might say where this was located, so there may be something from that standpoint. I suspect with there being one regional casino nationally and given the prominence this has already taken in the press and the licences that are granted, it's going to be fairly obvious to people before they even go there that there is a casino located there. So I don't think the incremental impact is going to be any greater than it would be by virtue of the fact that there would be a regional casino located in London.

MAN 1: Mr. Chairman, I think you answered the question yourself, which is that I don't think there is an answer. The notion that a regional casino i.e. the biggest casino that this country's ever seen would somehow hide its light under a bushel and not be attractive, is a contradiction in terms.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you for that contribution, I hadn't intended to answer my own questions. Do you want to respond to this Miss Ney?

MARY NEY: I think that our licensing responsibilities won't just stop when we've approved a licence, that there will be the ongoing enforcement activity and one of the key strands of our draft statement in principle on the Gambling Act, which we're currently consulting on, is around

protection of young people. So we will be very vigilant and expect transparency from the operator in terms of the information available to us and our ability to be proactively supervising that on site and being aware of the arrangements they've got for their supervision on the door and the training etc. that people will have.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Would you like, specifically, to respond to the point that in having an integrated leisure facility, the very fact that it is integrated could lead people to go from one leisure activity into another, namely gambling at the casino?

MARY NEY: Clearly we do want people to do that, if they're visiting the site we want them to have the benefit from the whole range that is on offer. I think the particular issue is about how you ensure that young people don't.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: I grasped that, is there anybody else? Old people even, which some of the literature says includes some of the worst problem gamblers.

MARY NEY: I think we would tackle the issue of people who are vulnerable because of the Gambling Activity, not so much to prevent them to getting access but actually through the work which we're going to with the multi-agency panel about transparency, about the comment we made in our submission about the proportion of revenue which will come from problem gamblers, how we can have a transparent process with the operator to monitor that and how we can put arrangements in place, whether it's through the chaplaincy and other arrangements to provide counselling support etc. for people who have got vulnerabilities.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you. Do we have any others?

DAVID CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman I was just going to add the point that Mary has touched upon there, which is that in addition to one of the key things from her standpoint is being able to protect people who are vulnerable and exposed to these areas. So one of the things that we've been working with, with the multi-agency group and specifically with the chaplaincy, is how do we provide those facilities, so how do we have quiet areas where there's no gambling, how do we have areas where people can talk so that if people are exposed to it, we put as many possible precautions as we can in place to allow them to get the counselling or care they might need out of that. The second point I'd just make is that they are very interdependent, again, as Mary's touched upon, and that indeed is part of the reason for having this conversation. They are dependent both ways, without the casino, the casino doesn't generate theatres, hotels, exhibition space and other facilities, and by its very nature that's not a one way set of traffic, that would be traffic that would go both ways.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you. Right. I just want to move into something that does worry me a bit, and it's not directly connected with anything we've been speaking about before, and that's the actual numbers of job creation. We do seem to have moved a long way together from, you know that I had made these observations of the second largest casino in Europe, and got out of their management the numbers of jobs. It's still lower than the number of 708 for gross direct employment that you quote. Did I say our figure, the Dortmund figure, is lower than your 708. Where does your 708 come from? Can I put it this way, you know, if I've got good evidence that my observation is not typical then, you know, that's good observations, that's why I want to know.

NOT SURE (MAN): Thanks Mr Chairman. What I'd like to be able to do, with your permission, is to ask Julie from Price Waterhouse Cooper to explain exactly that. We felt that this was such an important issue that we actually recruited.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: It's not just you that I'm asking. You're Price Waterhouse?

JULIE CLARKE: Price Waterhouse Cooper, Julie Clarke, yeah. Shall I just give you a little bit of context, because we were asked by Greenwich to really review and challenge all the data presented by both AEG as Development Operator of the O2 and then the proposals presented by Kerzner. So their challenge to us was really to give them confidence that the numbers that they had been presented with were sound, based on sound assumptions. So we challenged and tested both of the sort of inputs, ie their initial assumptions on users to the O2 in general, and particularly focussing obviously on the casino and the hotel, and in terms of jobs created. And then we actually put together the analysis for the economic impact. Now I think your specific question I think is on the job creation, and there are a number of different ways of testing job creation. I mean, for the whole work we were doing for Greenwich, we were obviously looking at, there is no regional

casino, obviously, in the UK as such at the moment, so we did take many models from around the world in terms of similar scale developments, in terms of casinos.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: What countries specifically did you look at?

JULIE CLARKE: We looked absolutely all round, but particularly at Australia, South Africa and the US. We have a particularly strong gaming team in the US, so we drew heavily on their experience, although I would really stress that any sort of learning from other jurisdictions, you know, you do need to make sure they're relevant to the UK, and certainly, if you look at the development of gaming in the US, and look at the proportion of people who gamble and go to casinos in the US it's clearly very, very different from the UK model. I'm very happy to talk about that in more detail, but kind of when we're looking at estimates as to numbers

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Well we have read about the US

JULIE CLARKE: But talking about very specifically on the jobs, I'm very happy to go over other areas, and I think there's two things, so clearly looking at the business model from the US, and comparing that with the model that's proposed here, but also, obviously, there are guidance in terms of appraising proposed developments prepared by English partnerships, and specifically..

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Well I've got that, and it didn't actually help me very much, because it just refers to, what does it refer to, it refers to information from Business and Sport in Leisure, and the casino in London, middle upper market, and I tried applying those figures to a number of things, and I frankly didn't get very far at all.

JULIE CLARKE: Well interestingly, what it suggests is, exactly, what it suggests is that you need, for every 6 metres square would generate a full-time employee, which would suggest that, for a development of this scale, say, over 10,000 square metres, that you'd get something like 1700 full-time equivalents which, you know, so yes, we did the maths according to the best guidance we have in the UK, and clearly it just doesn't make sense. I did look at other guidance that they were providing, so, for example, I actually thought of all the guidance they issue, the restaurants are perhaps, the food and drink perhaps is the most similar service model. So, actually, looking at that, that suggests 13 metres per full-time employee.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Yes, but your figure of 708 includes people that are in restaurants and the bars and the cleaners does it?

JULIE CLARKE: It's just looking at the casino operation, so it's just the..

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Within the casino. But it does include people, as I said, cleaners, bar. Why is it such a precise figure? If you'd said 'about 700', I wouldn't have perhaps noticed or bothered to query it.

JULIE CLARKE: I think, exactly, because it's been built up by the potential operator, so it literally is looking at how many tables will we have, what surveillance staff do we need, so it is very precisely built up from the bottom up, and then what I've done is then tested it from sort of top down,

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Right. What casinos have actually been looked at by your organisation which you've got numbers?

JULIE CLARKE: Well I probably can't actually give you any specific quotes because it's actually, in terms of useful examples, they were actually from elsewhere, so from the US, so as I say, what I've done is drawn on the experience of my colleagues from the US who are experienced in regional casinos. Because we just don't have anything similar.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: I mean you could have gone along to Dortmund.

JULIE CLARKE: I could have

PROF STEPHEN CROW: But didn't. Or could have gone along to Storeal, which has the largest in Europe, allegedly.

JULIE CLARKE: But what would that tell me any better by looking at any other sort of regional examples, and I think, obviously, what we're trying to do is look at the models that we already have in operation. I agree one could choose different examples, but I think the principle is understanding the style of the model of operation, and I think the big difference that we, when we're comparing the numbers, is actually looking at the scale of the operation. So when you actually compare sort of like with like, in terms of the number of employees compared with the space of the casino proposed, actually they're not so different/

PROF STEPHEN CROW: I said to the press earlier I'm not going swanning around the world, but just in case I had an unlimited budget and do just that, could you direct me to a casino where I can get the number 700 from?

JULIE CLARKE: I'm very happy to give you some more benchmarks if that would be helpful, extremely happy to. I think what we tried to show in our answers to you is that if you actually are comparing like with like, in terms of the scale of the development, this is specifically in answer to your question 17, actually in terms of the densities, the number of jobs per, looking at the state, not so different.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: One of the problems, of course, is that a proportion of tables which are labour intensive to machines that are not, and I think you pointed out that Dortmund had not many machines in comparison with some of those you have studied, or somebody else studied.

JULIE CLARKE: But frankly, I think there are so many subtleties involved as well, if it depends on the level of the quality of the service, certainly in terms of the slot machines they've become more sophisticated, so in terms of the level service they require, both in terms of being attentive and in terms of the actual technical assistance, they require more support. So actually I think

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Do they really?

JULIE CLARKE: Absolutely, so the industry is getting more sophisticated and I think we do need to be careful about looking at all the benchmarks and look at them in each and every way.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: But there are some fixtures, how do we know, why do I know? Because somebody thought fit to improve my education, that American roulette demands one attendant and French roulette demands two. I mean there are some fixed points about that aren't there? That one can go through all the table games and work it out, then you multiply that by the number hours you're working and so. There are some fixed points here, now have you done that exercise?

JULIE CLARKE: Not to the level degree of actually going through each machine, and I must admit that is well beyond our brief.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: But at the end of the day, before the end of the day I'm going to ask Mr. Froomberg to ask a question or two, then Mr. Sagar.

JAMES FROOMBERG: Thank you very much Chair. It's sort of an opportunity slightly off the jobs estimate that while Julie Clarke of PWC was there I suspect the market study work that lead into the job assessment is relevant to, it's an opportunity whilst Miss Clarke is there. And I wanted to pick up on the tourism benefit and Judith Salomon of London First emphasised for us that one of the key things we need to recognise as a panel is that Greenwich, being London, is going to in your view give the greatest opportunity for attracting international tourism and clearly international tourist spend is an economic benefit to the UK. I'd like to know if you Miss Clarke, or anyone in the team, has got an assessment for us of what will be the impact on international tourism to London and hence the UK as a result of building the regional casino in Greenwich please.

JULIE CLARKE: Shall I go first, then I'm sure other people will contribute. When we looked at the initial estimates on the casino usage specifically, we had a long discussion with the operator, potential operator, of the positioning of the casino and actually it's very easy to be very bullish and upbeat about the potential impact of the casino on encouraging new people to London, actually that didn't seem to be the right place to start, I think that is the upside. What we have very much based the testing of the estimates on is the core catchment for the casino, which is the catchment within the 45 minute drive time, and again apart from obviously Las Vegas there are obviously specific other examples across the world. But if one looks at normal city based casinos of a regional nature then by far the highest proportion of usage is from the local catchment, so that was our starting point. We then have also looked at the potential to attract tourists, but actually again we've looked again at the core saying well this is the tourist market that's already coming to London, so we have looked at an assumption that we will achieve a very small proportion of that total. You'll see in our bid, we did suggest an upside which is actually looking at potential attracting new visitors to London through the casino but actually I think that's not our core scenario, we think there is massive upside but that depends on how the casino operator present the casino. That's the casino argument, and partly we need to discuss, and we've already alluded to the fact that if we get the licence for the casino in Greenwich then also this will allow the development of a hotel and the hotel is also going go be extremely important to London's product, particularly because of the style of hotel proposed. So it's like virtually nothing else in London.

JAMES FROOMBERG: I think what you're saying to us is that the casino and the hotel will add to London's tourism product and its tourism attraction, but in their own right they are not going to deliver greater international tourism to London. And I wondered if it might be possible then to

JULIE CLARKE: Sorry, if I could just clarify that because actually what I've just said is that the economic benefit that we've quantified is on the assumption that it doesn't generate new tourists to London, but I think there is an upside but we've just not quantified that. So I just wanted to make that clarification.

JAMES FROOMBERG: If anybody has quantified that bit then, whether there will be a new clue, in what quantity, new tourism and hence the UK, as a result of this. Miss Salomon you mentioned it, do you want to come back to that later? Later if you want. Miss Clarke, could you tell me, you said that much of the custom for the regional casino would come from existing individuals within a 25 or 45 minute drive time. What impact will it have on the 25 or so casinos already operated in Westminster and nearby?

JULIE CLARKE: In the development of the numbers that we reviewed the assumptions in terms of, perhaps even stepping back from that, there's been a lot of attempts to estimate the impact of the Gambling Act on the demand for casinos in the UK. There are a whole raft of assumptions made in terms of growth and they range from growth such that 6% of the adult population will go to casinos through to 14%. I think, to be honest, everybody is attempting to estimate the potential for the market as a whole, we don't believe it will grow as far as 14%, or certainly not on the basis of one pilot casino, which I think a lot of the estimates were produced before that, before we knew we were only going to have one pilot. So in a way that's a starting point, in terms of actually looking at London, what we have focussed on is, again drawing on our experience from, and our having PWC's experience of casinos in other city locations, which suggests that the demand for casinos is highest closest to the casinos and gradually as you get further away the penetration of the market

PROF STEPHEN CROW: It's called a gravity model I believe.

JULIE CLARKE: Indeed. So what that means is, that clearly looking at the catchments, the Westminster casinos absolutely come with the 45 minute, totally agree with you. However in terms of the presentation of the product of the regional casinos they are very different, a lot of the Westminster casinos are based on a very specific niche market, in many instances and certainly in terms of their turnover, are based on the high-rollers more niche market. That's not the market that we understand this product will be aiming for. This product is presented much more as a full entertainment product, not a product for the hardcore gamblers, high-rollers if you like. So we haven't calculated the impact, but in terms of actually assessing, we haven't calculated the impact on existing casinos but in terms of assessing the potential market for a regional casino in Greenwich, we actually think they are targeting very different markets.

JAMES FROOMBERG: And you haven't quantified that at this stage?

JULIE CLARKE: No.

DEEP SAGAR: Thanks Mr. Chairman. If I could ask two questions, first on demand. Did you consider carrying out a formal survey of residents and tourists to quantify what sort of demand there might be, and second if I could take you back to the business model issue, I know you've said a lot, but why is it that a British regional casino would be very different, in model, to what is available internationally.

JULIE CLARKE: In terms of the first question about did we undertake a survey. I think a number of points there, Greenwich Council did undertake a survey to understand the reaction of the local population to a casino, so there was a survey done and I'm sure you've got the details in the response. In terms of the exercise we were undertaking actually that wasn't a question we were particularly asked to cover, however I must admit to actually answer that question through survey work I think needs to be done extremely carefully because I think, in my experience, when you're asking about would you do something if, you get responses of varying quality. So what we have tried to do is base the analysis we've done on factual information, so looking factually at what is the catchment? How big is the catchment? What are the characteristics of the catchment? And compared with lessons from elsewhere, and clearly it has to be outside of the UK, what is the propensity of that catchment to go to casinos. So the answer is no, we didn't undertake a survey but I think we have based the estimates on objective measures, and certainly transparent. Your second question, it was, as I understand it, is the product proposed in the UK not like any other

casino? I think the product is like other casinos elsewhere in the world, I think all I would say is that if you look, for example, at the US model 26% or something similar, depending on which research you're looking at, of the population go to casinos in the US, we're only at 5% in the UK so all I would say is that the maturity of the market is very, very different, and there is a lot of research which is being done, I suppose particularly on other sectors, which is looking at the differences and similarities between the take-up of new products into the UK. So for example looking at other leisure products which have come from the US and come into the UK, it does take a while to establish, we've looked at all of that to try and understand how casinos might impact on the UK market, so I think it's important to learn from other jurisdictions, but I just think that fundamentally you have to need to understand the differences in those jurisdictions and so, as I say, gambling is very mature in the US and I think you cannot therefore just take the lessons directly from the US.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Parts of the US would you say, or all of it? It's a state competence isn't it.

JULIE CLARKE: You have to be very careful in your choice of case studies, absolutely.

MAN 1: Still on jobs, we had a good debate about the number of direct jobs, within the centre, but I suspect your model is focussed equally strongly on the indirect and the induced jobs and the trickle down and how everyone describes it. I'd just like to understand, in doing your modelling, what were you sort of excited about as far as Greenwich is concerned, in its ability to maximise that indirect and induced, and maximise the retention of it within either Greenwich or in London, or is your model totally standard, that once you've got the direct and the spend, you know, it books it out and it would be the same number anywhere in the country.

JULIE CLARKE: No, I mean, that is the joy of Greenwich, that they actually have got some fantastic data in terms of ability to keep or generate local employment. So, to answer your question, our economic model is absolutely based on standard methodologies, green book methodology, we have put a huge amount of detail in answer six to your questions, which, hopefully gives complete transparency. So in terms of the methodology, absolutely standard, but in terms of then applying or making sure that it reflects the local situation, yes, the one issue that we've talked about quite a lot already this morning, the GLAB model, that's what's unusual or different about Greenwich, so that we can, actually, with some authority, demonstrate, certainly with the Millennium Dome but other projects in Greenwich, how they, how successful they've been at retaining the jobs for the local population. And I think one of the questions that was asked earlier today was about the mix of jobs that are going to be offered, both the O2, but specifically in the casino and the hotels, and if you actually match the skills that are required and the skills that are available in Greenwich, actually there's a reasonably good mix. So not only have you got a system for actually making sure that you maximise the jobs locally, through GLAB, but you've also got a reasonably good mix between the availability of people and the jobs that are going to be generated. So I think that that's a very specific advantage in Greenwich, which enables us to refine the standard models.

MAN 1: What sort of jobs are we actually talking about, that come through the induced and indirect model?

JULIE CLARKE: No, I'm talking about the overall operational jobs that are going to be filled, will need to be filled, in the O2 and including the casino and the hotel.

MAN 1: Sorry, I was specifically interested in the spin off spend that comes beyond that, because the ones in the O2 and the hotel I would count as direct jobs, but I'm looking just to understand how much more we're getting, or you'd be getting through the sort of indirect and induced effect, the multiplier effect and where those jobs are going and how we can Greenwich can be confident that their capturing a share of them because they start getting a bit dispersed don't they at this point, AEG sends its profits off to America, and Kerzner somewhere else. I just want to understand where these extra jobs are coming from.

JULIE CLARKE: As I say, in terms of the GLAB model that's where we were able to draw on specifics for Greenwich, in terms of the other assumptions then we've used very standard assumptions.

MAN 1: In terms of defining catchment anyone listening to you would assume, you talk about the 45 minute drive time and so on, that you very much focussed on visitors arriving by car, whilst I understand government and Mayoral policy and so on, perhaps envisages a future that sees public

transport as having a greater future. I wonder whether you can tell us something about what is the equivalent journey time by public transport that would fit into the model that you've described as 45 minute arrival by car, presumably it's envisaged that the majority of people won't be arriving by car, what length of journey would they be undertaking to get to the facility?

JULIE CLARKE: My mistake, complete slip up, it's travel time, 45 minute travel time. So we absolutely looked at the ability to get to Greenwich.

MAN 1: And just whilst we are on that topic then, what is the modal split?

JULIE CLARKE: I haven't looked at that, sorry. There are transport experts here who may be able to answer.

MAN 1: It would be of interest if the information is available, I mean we've heard earlier about the importance of increased river traffic, arrivals and the tube and so on, yes it would be good.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: One of the things I've learnt from experience in this job is that one's only got to breathe something like a question and a whole department of a local authority gets spending the rest of the night on it, and when you get the answer you think, oh why did I ask that question. Planning officer please note. So if you wouldn't mind please. The other thing is that just looking through my notes I realise the Mr. Froemberg asked the question that I was going to, so thank you very much Mr. Froemberg. You want to say something.

DAVID JESSOP: Mr. Chairman my name is David Jessop I'm from Greenwich Council, you asked a question about modal split, and obviously across the range of offers on the Dome that could vary, but the sort of assumptions we've made in assessing the travel impact for the Dome activity is about 20 to 25% by car, round about 9% by bus, about 50 to 52% by rail and up to 12% by coach. You'll see that that doesn't add up to 100% and you can imagine that some might come by taxi, some might walk, some might ride a bike. So that's the sort of range we're looking at.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: And this is figures for what?

DAVID JESSOP: Travel to and from the Dome.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: During the millennium year?

DAVID JESSOP: No, for the O2 experience. That's our forecast.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: I do beg your pardon, yes, thanks.

JAMES FROEMBERG: And would the split be different for a casino component?

DAVID JESSOP: Substantially not, I mean obviously the timing of peak activity for the casino is slightly different than for some of the other activities, so you might reasonably expect that the car, bus, rail level to change slightly, especially that, as I understand it, the peak time for the casino is 7 till 1. So at 1 o'clock in the morning the rail travel is going to be limited and the coach, taxi, car activity will improve, and of course it is right next door to a major road network.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: It's a long time since I was up at 2 o'clock in the morning, but what sort of public transport is running at that time?

DAVID JESSOP: Two o'clock in the morning the trains have stopped, the trains stop about 1 o'clock in the morning, depends which way you're heading, they start again at about 5 to half past in the morning. There is a 24 hour bus service, one at the moment, but due to increase.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: AEG?

DAVID CAMPBELL: Forgive me for standing between you and your lunch, I'll be very quick. The only thing to add to that is that we are also looking at river transport as a way of increasing access and that is something that could work 24 hours a day, and particularly will be able to operate after the tube shut down, although there are plans to open the tube later on a Friday and Saturday night. Additionally as part of the travel plan that we are developing with all the other parties, we have managed cab ranks and everything else so there will be access for people after 1 o'clock when the main tube access closes.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: But otherwise you don't dissent from Mr. Jessop.

DAVID CAMPBELL: I don't. I think there may be a high proportion of public transport particularly when we introduce rivers, so I think that will take away from car. If you look at Canary Wharf at the moment, on the other side of the river, 91% of arrivals there are by rail and parking is less than 6% so our numbers are probably not as ambitious as those and I suspect that we can move toward those.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you very much. Well we have exceeded our time limit for this morning and I apologise to the rumbling tummies for that, I think we'll keep to an hour. In that case,

can we resume please at 20 to 2. Thank you very much for coming promptly back from the break this morning, and ditto this afternoon. We are adjourned until 20 to 2.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: The first question I want to ask, is this, really one I'd just like to put to you because, to Greenwich in particular, one of the things that's said is, isn't this all about securing the future viability of Dome?

ANDREW BARRY-PURSELL: Excuse me Mr. Chairman is it intended to move off the subject of jobs and regeneration? Because there were some points that I did indicate before lunch that I'd like to raise.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Do you want to deal with that now?

ANDREW BARRY-PURSELL: By all mean, with your permission. What I wanted to say, sorry Andrew Barry-Purssell from the Mayor's office of the Greater London Authority again, that the question of jobs and regeneration is of course one of the primary reasons why the Mayor has backed this particular proposal. We have an economics unit at the Greater London Authority who have reviewed the work the Price Waterhouse Coopers have done, as summarised in the papers submitted by Greenwich, and their conclusion was that the approach that was taken was a reasonable one.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Sorry, I didn't quite hear that.

ANDREW BARRY-PURSELL: We have an economics unit, they reviews the work that Price Waterhouse Coopers have done, as it is summarised in Greenwich, and they concluded that the approach that they had taken was a reasonable one. The panel before lunch touched on the question of displacement, if you have a new economic activity in a place, will it not displace jobs from another? The logical candidate for such a displacement would be the leisure sector, our economics unit in November 2003 published a report called 'Spending Time, London's Leisure Economy', which shows that that leisure sector, including gambling is one of the fastest growing ones in London, in fact over the economic cycle it was looking at at that point, whilst other sectors of the economy had lost jobs, leisure had actually put them on. There are a number of reasons for that, the first is that there are more Londoners, London is growing, you've got an increasing number of people in the important age range for the leisure sector, 24 to 34. You've got more people in work, you've got people with higher incomes, and higher disposable incomes, and you've got households spending more money on leisure, we also have an international status as a tourist destination, London, in fact, is increasing its market share there. So there are more Londoners, more job opportunities and they're spending more on leisure, so I think this is a fairly robust sector and I think that when you're looking at the question of displacement it's important to look at it against that background. And in fact most employment projections that we have done, looking at the future of employment up to 2026, show that this growth is likely to continue in the sectors we're looking at, hotels, restaurants, bars and in the other services block which includes leisure services. So this is an area of strong growth at the moment which is likely to show continued strong growth into the medium and long terms.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Has your economics unit actually done any research on the ground? Is it derived from other sources?

ANDREW BARRY-PURSELL: Secondary derived from other sources.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you. Is there anything you want to respond to those points? I think they were largely supportive. Let me come back to the question which I was just about to ask, which I think I can remember. Isn't it all about securing the viability of the Dome? As some of your more cynical critics have said?

PETER BROOKS: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I believe ...? are unfortunate enough not to secure the regional casino things will carry on. I'm sure, with your permission Mr. Chairman, we'll ask David Campbell to explain a bit further, a bit more than I can possibly do.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: There's an aspect of the question that I perhaps need to put a bit more precisely, and that is, we will obviously be comparing this with some of the northern towns, and I'm not going to mention any names, or indeed the capital of Wales, without mentioning any names, who are going to say, look we've got great swathes of towns that are in need of regeneration, that are in awful bad way. If we'd come here 10 years ago we'd have seen a very different Greenwich Peninsula wouldn't we? But, to some extent hasn't the regeneration happened already? And enormous amount of contamination cleaned up, so I've read, housing going on. You see what I'm

getting at, I don't want to pour cold water on yours, but I mean you must have a chance to answer these thoughts that are put around, and they're bound to come to our mind when we're around the northern towns.

PETER BROOKS: Yes, I misunderstood your question at the beginning. I mean some of the other areas that have put in for the bid, obviously they have a regeneration programme, but Mr. Chairman so do we have a regeneration programme, and I know a lot of people might, in this room and nationally, say it's Greenwich again. Well, it has to be Greenwich again for us because it's the only way we can help the regeneration profile within our borough. I mean, yes, if you had visited the Peninsula some 10, 20 years ago you'd in fact have been in a very different place, and you'd have thought you were on Mars, perhaps. For people that didn't know, it was a gas works years and years ago which fell into decline and stopped producing gas because of mainly the North Sea gas scenario, and it laid derelict and dormant and the area was heavily contaminated and the area did need something to kick start it and we believe, and I believe, that the Dome in the year 2000 was always a warm up to what we're looking at now. We're looking at, I'm not going to go over it again, it's very clear to us that this is an area that still needs a further regeneration and we are still committed 100% to regenerating the whole of our borough. Mr. Chairman can I ask the Chief Exec for a follow up.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Of course.

MARY NEY: Mr. Chairman if I could perhaps follow up on that point as well and make the point that in the regeneration of the Greenwich Peninsula, in particular, the Council has sought very much to go for a mixed use regeneration, we do not want a regeneration of our waterfront which is just about housing, although housing plays an extremely important part and obviously the affordable housing element plays an important part in the regeneration of the borough. We do feel it's important that we develop the area so it provides a mixed-use economy, that we have the vibrancy that we get from a commercial district, from educational institutes moving onto the Peninsula and the role of the Dome, the development of a leisure and entertainment district, with the associated skills within the culture and media industry that that requires, are about developing a new quarter for London and not just developing an area which could just be further housing. So it's not just about the viability of the Dome, but it is about how that fits into our plans and our approach to the regeneration of the borough so we get as much in terms of jobs and a place that people have got pride in, as we do simply just building on what was a derelict site.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Perhaps I'm asking the same question twice, I don't know, I must apologise if I am. Would you come with me, in spirit, you know where we're going for the rest of the week and next week, would you come with me in spirit and say what you would say at any of these other occasions, when they'd set out their case. If that's an unfair question just say so.

MARY NEY: Yes, I don't think it's our place to put down other people's bids, and we wouldn't want to build our case on that. We think that we've got a strong case because we have got a very strong strategy for the regeneration of the borough, it extends beyond the Peninsula, it extends all the way along the waterfront and further south into the borough, and we will build the case on that. And we have, over the years, built the infrastructure, we've referred to the GLAB model this morning, that's part of our infrastructure to help us to deliver on these projects, so that's why I say it's not simply about the viability of the Dome, it is about the viability of our whole regeneration strategy.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: I don't want to keep asking these negative points, but it would be quite wrong for us to think of them next November and not given you a chance to rebut them of course. I'm going to ask Mr. Sorenson in a minute but after a question from Mr. Fromberg and also one from Mr. Sagar.

JAMES FROMBERG: Thanks very much Chair, it builds on this line of enquiry and just looking at one of the quantifiable measures of regeneration, I'd just like to focus on inward investment, and it told us very clearly in your proposal, and I think it was further repeated in Sir Bob's letter from the partnership, that the total investment in the Dome project by AEG and others would be about £600,000,000 and of that about £320,000,000 is the casino specific and associated hotel and additionalities as a consequence of getting the casino licence. And you've also told us now that you think another hotel might come, so possibly both the 600 and the 320 might go up and we'd be interested to hear if that's the case. I'm just looking to understand, on top of that 600 and 320, what else you believe will happen, in terms of inward investment in Greenwich, as a result of the licence

if you got it. Because you've given us some hints, I think Councillor Brooks you said without it the pace of development of the Peninsula would be slower, I think Eric Sorenson's letter to us from Thames Gateway London Partnership said the casino development would leverage private sector investment, and I think the Council's proposal to us said the scale of the O2 development would be the driver for other major investment. So you've given us hints that you think that on top of the 600 and the 320, other stuff will come, whether it's private sector or public sector investment, but we haven't seen anything from you or your supporters to say what that would be or how much it might be or any evidence of it and I really want to use this opportunity to hear if there is anything over and above the investment in the Dome.

PETER BROOKS: I will actually call on support from AEG because they'll be better placed to answer a lot of the questions that have been asked. But the answer to your question, quite directly, is without the casino we won't have as much, with the casino we'll have a lot more, and that's why we're driving it from our point of view and David Campbell will be able to outline the two scenarios hopefully, so that you're very clear what we're doing.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Are you able to answer the question more numerically, I think that's what you were after Mr. Froomberg.

JAMES FROOMBERG: I think we've had a very clear answer from within the AEG envelope, i.e. the difference between the £320,000,000 of additional investment on the AEG site, which might be more than 320 with the hotel, what I'm really looking for is what else happens to the borough of Greenwich, or the Greenwich Peninsula in terms of investment that's perhaps not on the AEG site. But it might be Eric Sorenson, who's got his flag up, has a got a view on this.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Mr. Sorenson, good to hear from you. I'll just mention that we were all very young, and before Mr. Sorenson was called on to do higher things, we did work together in the old Department of the Environment, but that was probably before a lot of you here were born.

ERIC SORENSON: Thank you Mr. Chairman, nice introduction. I wanted to pick up two points, if I may, first of all if I interpreted correctly your reference to coming with you in spirit to places which I think are north of Watford, and whether we'd be able to hold our head up in terms of the regeneration requirement analysis against a background of very severe historic economic and labour market dislocation. And the answer is yes we could. I'm not going to parade you with statistics today because I just don't have them to hand, but we can certainly give them to you very readily, but essentially the argument would be that the change in the job structure, of Greenwich in particular, and indeed the Thames Gateway in general, has been as dramatic and as adverse as you'll find in any part of the regions in this country, the collapse of the port when it's changed to containerisation and the move of all those jobs to Tillberry, which admittedly isn't the Gateway but we're talking about a particular part of it. The loss of defence industries which particularly hit Woolwich and also Chatham further down river, and the chronic loss of manufacturing employment, probably the most famous example, but not the only one by any means, is Ford's in Dagenham not so many years ago used to employ 40,000 people and today they employ about 5,600, admittedly in higher value added diesel engineering jobs. So these are just an indication of, and you could also talk about the Stratford rail lands and rail related employment there as well, and there's a whole series of examples, so the problem about the perception of the London position compared with the regions, is that everybody sees the people in sharp suits making enormous sums of money pressing computer screens in the city or Canary Wharf or whatever, and that's essentially very superficial. Underneath that are dramatic, chronic, highly damaging changes to the local labour market and to work, and indeed unemployment is a very poor measure as you'll appreciate, what is a more interesting measure is economic inactivity, and this is as high in Greenwich, in Newham, in Tower Hamlets as you'll find anywhere in the country. And it is for this reason that people emphasise the need for regeneration as Councillor Brooks and others have set out for you. And that's why it is so important that places like Woolwich, which is still a hollowed area, if you go to Woolwich today it feels a hollowed out town, albeit there is progress but there is an enormous amount of empty real estate in these areas, as there are still vast empty spaces on the Greenwich Peninsula, so there's an opportunity here and it's tremendously important, from our point of view, that it's grasped. The other point I want to make, picking up Mr. Froomberg's point about the spin offs and additionality, these are, in my experience, very difficult things to estimate and predict, as you see from the evidence you've had from AEG and others, if the casino is

granted then there will be all sorts of specific spin offs in terms of the two hotel investments in particular. What is more speculative, but nevertheless more real is the way in which that critical mass, a pump priming process, both the public sector and private sector investment, engenders a lot of other investment and you can have seen that in Canary Wharf where we were at the LDDC quite difficult to get projects off the ground without some public sector pump priming, but when we managed to hit a critical mass, and I appreciate this is a somewhat speculative not to say mystical statement, when we hit that we suddenly engendered very positive forces and other leisure places, other restaurants, other shops opened very fast indeed. And it's trying to engender that sense of pace in the process which I'm afraid goes beyond saying 'Oh if we got the second hotel all sorts of wonderful things would happen', it's a more imprecise process than that, but certainly the process does exist and it's evidential in terms of what you can measure post hoc.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you Mr. Sorenson. The we, of course, when you're talking Canary Wharf was the London Docklands Development Corporation wasn't it, which you presided over.

ERIC SORENSON: Yes Chairman I did.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: I know that, but does everybody in the hall know it, because they ought to. Mr. Froemberg, there was something of a follow up question we spoke about the other night and that's the detail of the Tutankhamun exhibition, do you want to ask about that now?

JAMES FROEMBERG: Oh yes, please, if I could, Chair, and it's just a clarification, and probably, Mr Campbell, you could help us with that. Lots of us will get excited about the Tutankhamun exhibition, but I think, unless you correct me, I'm right in understanding that what you propose to create is a 5 or 6000 square metre sort of black box exhibition hall that could attract any types of events and that you hope or anticipate that the first one of those will be the temporary travelling Tutankhamun exhibition which you'd have for 6 months, but we shouldn't go away as a panel thinking 'Wow, if Greenwich gets the casino licence then Tutankhamun comes to London forever' type thing. Is that right?

ERIC SORENSON: That's partially right, yes. Forever, it won't come forever, no, but it will come for about a ten month period. Currently we as a company own the world wide touring rights to the exhibition, where we've taken it through Los Angeles, Fort Lauderdale. It's currently in Chicago, at the Field Museum there, the goes to Philadelphia, and then comes for one European appearance. What we have is a very low spec black box area that we propose to build up to a higher spec museum quality area if we're successful with the casino were we will put in the first exhibition is Tutankhamun, obviously to go in down the street to the British Museum or to a museum in Paris, an existing museum space is easier than building out that space to such a high level, but we would commit to doing that if the casino were awarded to Greenwich.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Mr. Froemberg wants to ask a follow up question.

JAMES FROEMBERG: It is again a specific one, again I'm thinking what are the types of investment might come in, and this one is particularly on transport infrastructure, again when we're going on our travels around the country other people will tell us that if we give them a casino licence transport investment will follow. I think, in reading what you've submitted both in your original proposal and in your follow up, what you're saying to us is, there's been already phenomenal transport improvements and there are some already planned but you haven't, I ond' think, put forward anything to us that says, if the casino comes this will be additional transport investment, whether it's public or private sector, possibly enhancement both service on the river. Am I missing something? Is there catalysed transport investment as a consequence of the casino?

ERIC SORENSON: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. The reason we haven't is because we won't, we've got the transport infrastructure mainly in place, obviously there is the Jubilee line which is there, North Greenwich station, we've already got in place a new rubber wheeled type of tram system that's called the Waterfront Transit which will be running passed it. There is, as we've heard already this morning, investment in some water transport, as that's the obvious things to do, being right on the shores of the Thames and Mr. Chairman, the rest of it, I guess, is already in place so there won't be us saying, 'Oh if we don't get a casino we're not going to provide a certain mode of transport'. The only thing I probably would add is that if there was a super casino in that position there's possibilities that Transport For London would want to provide more services, I don't have the answers to that but there may be a occasions where if you live in Bromley, for example,

the neighbouring borough, you would need a more direct route bus that we've got at the moment, but it won't be about if we don't get it we won't have it.

JAMES FROOMBERG: Thank you very much, it's what I understood, I just wanted to check. Thank you.

MAN 1: ...? very kindly put in your submission against the East Greenwich Trade Association that they had concerns about the capacity of local infrastructure to cope with the numbers, is that something which you address so far?

PROF STEPHEN CROW: This is to Jessop again I see.

DAVID JESSOP: Thank you Chair, the question was about the transport capacity I think, it's not uncommon in public consultations to have questions about transport capacity in London as a whole, I was reading the Metro on the train this morning and a survey there actually came out with the transport London was the best in any capital city. We had done analysis, we've done analysis of the capacity of the tube, we've done analysis of the capacity of the bus network, and its ability to be increased, obviously that increase is dependant on Transport For London and the demand, but the work has been done.

MAN 1: Just this is a local issue not a London wide issue, that's the reason I raised it, clearly something where the local traders perhaps don't share the view that it's adequate at present.

DAVID JESSOP: I think the issue that local people remember is that for two or three hours a day the Blackwall Tunnel is severely congested, for the rest of the day it's a main arterial link with good links to the rest of the country and to the rest of London, but there's no doubt, during the morning peak period especially, there's severe congestion on the Blackwall Tunnel, and that's what people remember.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Mr. Nelson, I think, wanted to say something, for sometime.

STEPHEN NELSON: You're quite right, Greenwich is a very exciting area at the moment, there is a lot going on. I took a hardhat tour of the Dome and it's fantastic, it's going to be fantastic, but it would be a great shame not to see the baby grow up and I think with the casino comes the hotels, the hotels are going to be needed, they're not just buildings they're landmark structures as well, well certainly the one we know about is. And it's going to be needed for the Olympics and the legacy that comes after the Olympics, I don't think we should forget that. I think the criteria that you laid down almost reads like a travelogue for Greenwich and we've got to remember that Greenwich is still a very poor area and its neighbouring boroughs are very poor. We've probably got as many Objective 2 areas in that small part of London as anywhere else, so it is still desperately in need of regeneration and I think we need the casino to really reach the potential of Greenwich.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Regeneration. Here I think we're all talking economic regeneration, aren't you?

STEPHEN NELSON: I'm talking mainly economic regeneration, yes.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Did I say all or mainly? I said all, you said mainly, that's what I'll record.

SIR BOB SCOTT: Just to return to your question, or challenge almost, about what you would say to the regions. As somebody who lived 27 years and worked 27 years in one of the cities you'll be visiting, I think the question really comes about because we are now saying, you're now having to face the situation of choosing one rather than eight. And my answer to you is, whether the rest of the country will learn from Greenwich being the first home of a regional casino or whether London and the rest of the country would learn more from Cardiff or Glasgow or Manchester having the first regional casino. I think the great thing about the Greenwich bid, if I may say so, is that you get two for the price of one, in the sense that you get a very strong sense in Greenwich if you live there that you're not in the centre of London, that you are in a very particular place which can be defined clearly as Greenwich, not as London, but you are also clearly in London. And I think that the fact that we are the only London bid gives us a further responsibility to make a hit of it.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: There is another authority that thinks they ought to be.

SIR BOB SCOTT: Yes quite. But I would simply say that I think the rest of the country will learn more from London and Greenwich, but particularly from Greenwich, than the others. And one of the reasons why I say that is because I think Greenwich will be probably the most likely to do really well, I think Greenwich will be a hit, and if it's a hit that will give much more oomph to the roll out of the system. And can I just say one thing to Mr. Mundy about the East Greenwich Traders Association, I think one of the problems that they are expressing is something which is going to

happen but which we've been saying to them for a long time is going to happen, which is the Greenwich Waterfront Transit third phase, which is the link between the Dome and Greenwich town centre. And that is something which hasn't been solved, and that is something that concerns people and that is something, if I may then go back to James's question, is that that would be immensely assisted as a transport priority, even though it's in the Mayor's plan, it is definitely going to happen, it's a question of when. And in the same way that the Dome made the Jubilee Line happen quicker, I would suggest that one of the spin-offs of the casino will be that other transport infrastructure will happen quicker.

MAN 1 Could I follow on from the theme of your contribution, which I think was extremely helpful, in relation to others learning from the Greenwich experience. You have at present a World Heritage site within your area which is clearly a very, very prestigious centre, and one which many cities throughout the world would covet. What incremental benefit has that had? What has Greenwich done to capitalise on that, very much in the way you talk about the casino and of course the Olympics, what have you actually succeeded in doing as a result of that?

BOB SCOTT: Most of us go back to the famous Knight Frank and Rutley advert for a desirable residence on the south bank of the Thames, which was put in by Mr. Portillo if you remember all those years ago, which ended up with the University and Trinity College of Music coming to the Royal Naval College, and what I have to tell you as a Greenwich resident who lives in inside the World Heritage site, the impact on the whole life quality of Greenwich of that decision and that decision has meant that buildings which were almost on the verge of dereliction, like Devonport House and those others, have all been done up and are amazing. It's moved from being a military town to being a student town, all the benefits of a student life have meant the increase in bars, in cinemas and things like that have happened actually in the centre, and there is a new pride in Greenwich which Steve is one of the great private sector proponents of. But what I really want to tell you is that everywhere in Greenwich it's a partnership, the local authority is a demanding local authority, we're going to hear about Section 106 agreements in a minute and they're extremely tough on those, but there's just a sense that things are moving and moving well, especially in the World Heritage site at the moment.

DEEP SAGAR: What is it in a regional casino that makes it a silver bullet, when you say a large casino will give you so little?

MARY NEY: I think what we've been trying to talk about and demonstrate is that it's not the casino in isolation, but it's what comes with the casino. Without the silver bullet, as you put it, of the casino we're not imminently looking at the additional hotel facilities, we're not looking at the wider roll out of the entertainment district within the Dome and we've heard from the recent speakers about the knock on implications of all of that. So I think it's about something which triggers a whole chain of other things that we can build on.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Judith?

JUDITH SALOMON: Thank you Chair. Judith Salomon from London First. I wanted to go back to this point about other regions, just make two quick points. First of all successful and lasting regeneration won't happen on the casino alone, and it needs an approach of a number of different strategies, and I think we've seen that London is best placed, partly because of the Mayor and his agencies and partly because of Greenwich and its partnerships to deliver that and make sure we get the best for regeneration from this proposal. The second point is that the Thames Gateway is the national priority for regeneration, I'm not sure any of the other bids could say they have that. Thank you.

JAMES FROOMBERG: I just thought I would take the opportunity whilst Miss Salomon was on mike to see if there was any follow up on what we were just exploring before lunch around international tourism, and I'm particularly keen because you set us off on this track area, that it was going to be good for international tourism, I'm just looking to see if there's been any quantification on that.

JUDITH SALOMON: Thank you. I don't think it would be possible for anyone to try and quantify what the impact might be, however I do think that London has the best chance of capitalising on international tourism. Not only is it the most accessible place, and it's accessible internationally through air travel and of course CTR Rail, and you'll have the CTR Rail station at Stratford, not very far from Greenwich. You also have other attractions in London which creates a critical mass. I

think the other point is that if London benefits from international tourism, the rest of the country will. 45% of people visiting the country do so via London, so that's the greatest benefit to the rest of the country, if the casino is put in London. Thank you.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: AEG, you've been waiting very patiently.

DAVID CAMPBELL: Thank you Mr Chairman. There's just a few points I'd like to just clarify or perhaps confirm, just so there's no doubt. The Panel talked about an additional hotel, a second hotel, which we've been working with Marriott on a Renaissance Hotel, which is a 4-500 bedroom hotel, which isn't included within the £600,000,000 spend, so I just wanted to clarify that was additional to that. We've done some job estimates on that, but we reckon it's in excess of 400 jobs. At this point, without final designs, it's difficult to put a value of investment on that, but obviously it would be fairly substantial as a 4-500 room hotel. And the combination of those two hotels gives 800 hotel rooms, in the 4 to 5 star category in London, south of the Thames. And there isn't any other hotel of that category in London anywhere further east than Westminster and County Hall, the hotel there. So it's quite important in terms of developing the south side of the Thames rather than the north side. The second bit is people have talked about river transport and said yes, there'll be some boat things. I just wanted to clarify the kind of scale of investment we're talking about. In London, for many years, there's been talk about how does one use the river and how does one open the river, and, in fact, as part of the LDA's tourism strategy, Moving Forward, it's one of the key elements to identify what the blocks for that are, and how does one change it. What we're actually proposing here is a high speed service, that will allow a frequency by the time the casino opens, of anywhere from 10 to 15 minutes maximum, between Central London and the O2, and also going out to the east of London, which would be absolutely transformational in terms of the, of the use of the river as a commuter artery in London, which is, by everyone's admission, is very under utilised. I think it also provides a very useful pilot that might be used within the Olympics, because right opposite the O2, the Lea River comes into the Thames and obviously the Lea Valley is the site of the Olympic Park, and the plans with British Waterways and others to use the Lea to transport people in there. I think the third point I just wanted to touch on is large casinos versus regional casinos. In the Greenwich submission, they looked at the different scale, and the Panel is obviously very aware of the different scales between them. You simply do not generate the regenerational benefits. There isn't anything close to the kind of scale that will allow you to build 800 rooms worth of hotels, allow you to extend out an entertainment district, allow you to attract theatres of the calibre of Cirque du Soleil, and an 1800 seat customised theatre within there, or build out exhibition spaces that attract things like Tutankhamun. That just cannot happen with a large casino, the two do just not connect. And the final point I just wanted to touch on is one that Eric did, which was in terms of pump priming, and Chairman, you mentioned that regeneration was only being looked at in an economic basis, and actually the Greenwich Peninsula was already there. I think your words were 'there's housing underway, commercial buildings and so forth'. If you look on the 200 acre site that's currently there, there is absolutely no housing being currently built, there is no commercial activity currently taking place, the only activity that's taking place is in the area underneath the Dome and the first phase of that, if we only build the first phase of that we build an event destination, we want an event destination that will take people in and out from an event, give them a resort destination to go to, won't bring the hotel benefits, won't bring the priming that will get the commercial people into the 3.5 million square feet of commercial space that has been planned for, but hasn't been started. There's no sign of any of that starting, to kick start that and to kick start that part of the Thames Gateway requires one to move on to the full build out with the Dome area. I don't know if the GLA want to comment in terms of that role of that area with the Thames Gateway and how that is in itself a pump primer into the rest of the Gateway.

ANDREW BARRY-PURSSELL: Is one of growth and the strategy that the Mayor has adopted is accommodating that growth as far as possible within London's existing boundaries and not going for the sort of approach that we had, for example, at the end of the Second World War pushing new towns out into the Green Belt. That means making the most efficient possible use of the space that London has available to it, and it is by definition a finite resource and that's why one of the major themes of the Mayor's London plan, both the adopted plan and the plan that is going through a process of addition at the moment, part of his strategy is shifting London's centre of gravity of development eastwards. Mr. Campbell mentioned a number of the things that are happening in

parts of east London and parts of Thames Gateway around the Peninsula, the area that we we're talking about at the moment, and I think there is a risk of the area that we're talking about getting left behind unless it has an impetus on the scale of a regional casino of the scale that we're talking about this afternoon. So it is important in that context, if I could also just pick up on some of the 'Why London?' points were made earlier on, I very much endorse many of the things that Mr. Sorenson said, if you compare many of London's vital statistics with other regions we do not compare well with levels of employment, and we compare particularly badly in terms of level of labour market participation and that's across London as a whole, but particularly in east London, in the Thames Gateway areas that we're talking about at the moment. In those areas London has problems that compare quite badly with other regions throughout the United Kingdom, and it's an issue of particular importance because over the next 10, 15 years we expect to see a very substantial growth in London's working age population, by 2016 I think the figure is something like half a million, it's something that decision makers in London have got to be aware of and we have got to do something to meet that challenge, and in its small way this proposal will help do that, it will provide a range of opportunities suitable for a range of people. Just the sort of opportunities that London needs outside its central core. That again is one of reasons the Mayor has been so keen to support this proposal.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Mr Barry-Purssell, I'm just wondering whether I'm suffering from mid-afternoon amnesia, but didn't the Mayor support the late Brent proposal as well, which I think is in the west of London?

ANDREW BARRY-PURSELL: Yes Chair he did.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: If you want to move things eastwards shouldn't he have supported Greenwich and Havering?

ANDREW BARRY-PURSELL: Chair, the Mayor's position was that he supported both proposals because they were both needed for a range of reasons. To see that the Mayor's strategy is to shift the centre of gravity of development eastwards does not mean that the rest of London has to be left alone and neglected. west London and north west London has its own problems and its own issues which we would have discussed in much more detail had the London Borough of Brent not withdrawn its bid and we had not had the IP proceeded. But the point I was making about growth, growth is going to happen in all areas of London and it has to be met in all parts of London, our focus this afternoon is east London and the Thames Gateway and that's the context in which I'm speaking.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Your office are going to write to us about Havering aren't you? Not that it's any concern of people here, or perhaps it is actually isn't it? But you're going to write to us aren't you?

ANDREW BARRY-PURSELL: Chair, the position is that

PROF STEPHEN CROW: There's no need to tell us what it is, I just want to know that you're going to write to us.

ANDREW BARRY-PURSELL: Well that presentation's been made to us, and once they have been considered and a recommendation made to the Mayor, and he's made his conclusions known, we will let you know.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thanks, that's a long was of saying 'probably'

ANDREW BARRY-PURSELL: It's a lawyer's way of saying 'probably'

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Mr Froomberg

JAMES FROOMBERG: Thank you Chairman. I wanted to pick up, if I could, on two points that Mr Campbell made, from AEG, Mr Campbell, and they were both interesting. One, because I'm a Director of British Waterways, I get very excited when anybody says 'transformational use of the river', even though the Thames is not the British Waterways waterway. But I don't think I had hitherto understood from the Greenwich proposal that what was being proposed in terms of the use of the Thames was something transformational, so if you could give us any more elaboration on that, because I think it's new news to us, levels of investment, scale of operation and so on, and then just tuck away for a moment, the second point I just wanted to raise was I think you were making a little challenge of the Council, really, by actually saying that you didn't think that the housing development was going to happen, or happen, anywhere like as fast unless a casino

came to Greenwich. And I just wanted to see if that's what you were saying, and if it was, whether the Council wanted to ride on the back of that suggestion, or refute it. So two points.

ANDREW BARRY-PURSELL: Ok, in terms of the, thank you for allowing me to clarify, in terms of the first one, in terms of transformational use, we're looking at high speed commuting river services, and we're looking at something that, by the time the casino opens, will roughly triple the amount of capacity in terms of, at any one time, on the river. It will be actually higher than that, because there'll be more services that'll operate. So if you get to a 10-15 minute frequency then that will again increase the capacity over and above that, so it will be something that will go anywhere from 4 or 5 times the actual physical capacity of people that can travel on the river in terms of commuting. And it's our belief that, as demonstrated by TFL, with their investment in new equipment and buses, and higher frequency bus services, if you can create something that has got a high frequency, then you will get people to ride on it and get people to use it, and we believe that if we can get to within a 10-15 minute frequency we can get people to use the river in a way that they don't currently do with new kit that goes onto the river as well, so that's what we're looking at.

JAMES FROOMBERG: Is all of that included in your 320 million, or is that an additional thing that we've forgotten about?

ANDREW BARRY-PURSELL: That is in addition to that. So that in finalising the numbers which are certainly into eight figures, they're probably something around £15,000,000.

JAMES FROOMBERG: Thank you very much.

ANDREW BARRY-PURSELL: In terms of your second question, which was whether I was challenging the Council, I wouldn't dream of challenging the Council, I'll allow them to answer on their own behalf. I guess what I was referring to was the point from Mr. Sorenson about pump priming an area and moving it forward. The timeframe for developing the rest of the Peninsula is a very long timeframe, there aren't many constraints on it in terms of what speed that has to happen at, it's not just my assertion that it's happening at a slow rate, if you look at one of the key partners within the rest of the Peninsula states, their latest annual report said that they were disappointed at the pace of development there, and it's my understanding that the Council Assembly are disappointed at the pace of development there, but I'll allow them to confirm or deny that statement.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thames Gateway please.

ERIC SORENSON: Thank you. I just wanted to come in on the use of the river aspects, because obviously the area for which we are responsible is the other side of the river directly opposite the Dome, the Lea Mouth Valley areas and certainly, in talking with developers, looking at sites known as Thames Side West, which is the east side of the Lea going down toward the Royal Docks, and also talking to developers in Laird at Lea Mouth on the west side of the Lea. The importance of links across the river is often made to us, now clearly there is already the Jubilee Line which links through from North Greenwich to Canning Town, but in terms of making links across the river via boat, that's also important. And I think it's encouraging to hear the comments about use of the river in commuting into town, but I think as important for any proposal that might be accepted here are the links across towards the Isle of Dogs, Lea Mouth, Canary Wharf and all those sorts of areas.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you. I want to, not draw the curtain entirely on regeneration, but we are getting to the close. Is there anything more you wanted to tell us, we have learnt a lot and there's obviously no need to repeat this unless you really think we didn't take any notice at the time.

PETER BROOKS: Mr. Chairman I just wanted to clarify two points if I may. There was a question on the housing on the site, and I just need to point out that it's MDL that's actually doing the build on the site there. MDL, Meridian Delta Limited, are the developers. And it is a twenty year programme. They haven't started at the moment as you won't see a brick put up at the moment as we always said that we wanted to the Dome fit out, before the development started around the area. So that is there, it would be wrong for me to say the casino wouldn't matter, of course it would matter, it would certainly if the regional casino was in place then it would obviously speed the process. And just on a light note for us river enthusiasts, 'cause I'm also one, we already have one of the...?

MAN 2: Could I just ask a couple of questions on tourism. You mention in your submission the emphasis on the sustainability model for tourism, what do you understand by that? I direct that question to Councillor Brooks.

PETER BROOKS: How do we sustain tourism within Greenwich?

MAN 2: Yes, it's a much-used word, 'sustainability', now, what do you understand by that both in economic, social and in environmental terms?

PETER BROOKS: I think Mr. Chairman, I think we've already demonstrated the fact that we can sustain tourism within Greenwich by just referring, I guess, to our World Heritage site, hardly a day in the week will go by when the streets aren't quite packed, summer and winter, with tourism, for those visiting the Maritime Museum that's a free venue to go to now and such as the birthplace of time just up the hill. And we are also, I'm sure people would know that we are in the middle of regenerating, or rebuilding, the Cutty Sark ship which is in a dry dock, which does desperately need lots of replacement, and there will be some further build on the pier to try and help some of the payments of building the ship. But I think in Greenwich we see, to sustain tourism and sustain jobs around tourism, it's something that we do and I think we do well and I think that's probably the best way I can answer it really.

MAN 2: It may be that you have to call on your colleagues, but I'd quite like to put a little bit more flesh on that, because you mention again the World Heritage site, I mean incrementally what has that generated in wealth for Greenwich, and how many jobs and you mentioned about recycling funding to deal with Cutty Sark. What are a few statistics on that that would help me to understand your point.

MARY NEY: I don't think we've got the actual statistics with us just on the World Heritage site, but I think what we have done within the World Heritage site is, I think you've heard reference earlier to the early days when heritage buildings were in decay. Sustainability has been about getting uses into the World Heritage site which actually provide a vibrant use, an educational use in our examples, conference and hotel facilities which are then obviously providing ongoing jobs within the hospitality industry which are sustainable. As part of our tourism strategy we've looked at how we can allow small businesses to provide some residential accommodation because of our shortage of overnight stays, so that we can build sustainable overnight stays into it, and obviously the proposals we're talking about today develop that even further and would be a massive leap for us. I think the way that the World Heritage site offer, the different players with the World Heritage site now work together to provide a single presentation to the tourism industry.

MAN 1: Is there any mention at all of this because I always find it very helpful even if.

MARY NEY: We can certainly submit that if you would like information just on the World Heritage site, and we did get Beacon Council status for sustainable tourism so we can back it all up with information for you.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thanks for that offer, if you do put something in, as I hope you do, would you be good enough to circulate it around all the other people round the table, it's just a matter of formal fairness so that they have a chance to say whatever they want to say, if they want to say it, thanks. Sorry, I'm sorry, yes.

REVEREND MALCOLM TORRY: Just a brief point which comes out of a correspondence between some members of the clergy in south London, on the word regeneration. The correspondence resulted in something of a debate about what the word means, and we would very much like you as a panel, both in this area and by extension any other places that you visit, to make sure that the work means as much as possible about the built environment, the economics, the employment and the quality of community and family life. I thought it worth making that point here.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thanks very much for that point. Mr. Nelson.

STEPHEN NELSON: Just a quick point about the World Heritage centre, regardless of what's happened so far, I think in six years' time when the equestrian events taking place in front of the Queen's house and those cameras pan backwards and you see the observatory on the top, and you see Queen's house and it turns round the other way and you see Canary Wharf and it goes over to the Dome and hopefully this wonderful hotel, then it will be working for us. And it will be hard to measure it because I think the impact on the tourist industry will be absolutely enormous.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Why aren't we in Greenwich today? Mr. Torry has raised an important point, of course, that regeneration is about all the things including quality of community life, now is this casino going to improve quality of community life? Doesn't have to, is it likely to in your opinion?

MARY NEY: I think what we would say is that because of the benefits that the casino will bring, I think particularly in terms of job opportunities and a wide range of skills and mix of job opportunities, that that will benefit and we will be ensuring that that does benefit local people. I think we would say from the knock on implications for the wider regeneration that we've spoken about, which will flow from the regional casino, will again help us to do the job we're trying to do to. I mean the whole emphasis of our regeneration strategy does link back to how do you improve the quality of life for our residents, and that then link into a whole range of strategies we've got around working in deprived neighbourhoods, we've got a neighbourhood renewal programme which works in deprived neighbourhoods, which for instance links with the GLAB scheme that we talked about earlier. Working with families and people needing support within those communities, work we're doing within schools to ensure that the skills base and the educational attainment of children in schools is actually going to fit them for the job opportunities that are going to be available. So I think the relationship that the Council makes, from the regeneration strategy to all of its other strategies, is the key to demonstrating the benefit for local people.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thanks for that, I'll come back to that perhaps before we go home tonight. I want to ask some more questions on something of a detail, you perhaps appreciate, if you're following the agenda that we have actually answered some of the questions, even though we perhaps didn't mean to, but thanks for that so I'm not going to ask them again. We asked 'Why didn't you want a large casino?', we obviously know you didn't want one because you preferred a regional, I mean that's self evident, but you said that the benefits of a large one would be virtually insignificant. Obviously you stand by that, why particularly did you make that comment?

MARY NEY: That stems from the analysis and some of the comments that we've already heard today about the additional benefits we will get flowing from a regional casino in terms of hotel, entertainment district, the way in which that will lever and accelerate regeneration, the impact that will have on overnight stays and tourism. And all the commentaries that we've heard indicate to us that simply having a large casino will not stimulate that chain reaction.

MAN 1: Could I just explore that. Greenwich is first up, you're the one that gets the questions, it's just for my education really. Is it by virtue of the fact that the regional casino will have unlimited jackpot prize fruit machines that therefore will make the regional casino that much more profitable enterprise, and therefore can justify the developer also investing in other, slightly more speculative projects such as the hotels and the exhibition space. Is that the linkage, it's the additional machines and the scale of them that actually drives that profitability.

MARY NEY: I mean David Campbell might want to comment on that, but that's what we understand, that the subsidy, the cross subsidy that we will get

MAN 1: It's what I understand too, I'm just looking to see if we're all on the same planet, really

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Is that so?

MAN 1: That is so. We would be very, very hard pushed to find any operator of a large casino who'd be willing to come in and build a 320 room five star hotel designed by Richard Rogers in a very difficult to build site, which is over the top of the Blackwall Tunnel on contaminated ground. It just won't happen, we wouldn't be able to attract a corporation like Marriott, we wouldn't be able to attract international brands like Cirque du Soleil, you just can't do that on the scale, and it's partly the number of machines, it's partly through the scale of the development and it's partly through the jackpots on those machines.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: I expect you all know that one of the newspapers has been getting very excited about what they think is cheating, by AEG, on starting the development. I don't know who's going to respond to that, what does anybody think I ought to say? Do you want to start with that Mr Campbell? Cheating?

DAVID CAMPBELL: I wasn't sure whether to put my placard up for that one or not. Well, it's, I have read this thing in this newspaper, repeatedly. It's categorically untrue. They, the newspaper in question has said that we'd started building in secret. The Dome is an interesting site, because it's all under cover, you can't actually see a lot of the work that's going on inside, but I mean we're

talking of a total development that's 1.5 million square feet. The area inside the tent, so not including the hotels outside, the area that would house a casino is about 150,000 square feet. You can't do that kind of thing in secret. Secondly we were doing it without planning permission. Clearly we remembered to get planning permission before we started building, we got that in 2004. We have planning permission for an area back of the arena, which is in D2 class, where we're building out an area that we could locate a casino if we were fortunate enough to get a licence there. And basically, let me just explain how that operates. When we first put in our proposal for the Dome, and to take that over, there was originally, at that time, 40 casinos proposed, 40 regional casinos proposed in the UK. As we moved forward with the development, that seemed to be the number that was sticking with. As we came up with the plans and put in the original plans, there was still 40. That came down to 8. After we had started construction that then moved down to one. Clearly, if we'd started with one, we may have had a different proposition, but we started with construction. You may well ask the question, quite rightly so, why did we start? The reason we started is very simple, our lease with English Partnerships with the site requires us to build out an arena that is ready for operation, doesn't have to be open and operating but is ready for operation by June 2007. If you go at the latest possible date in order to do that, we had to begin enabling works at the beginning of 2005, prior to the number going down from 8 to one. So at that point, we'd started a building process that had space, believing that there were going to be 8 regional casinos. If we were to then stop that and stop the area behind it, it would be very, very difficult to do, because it's connected into the arena behind the building. It's essentially the back of house area behind the arena. Underneath that area are all the back of house services, there's where the trucks come in to service the stage, there's where outside broadcast vehicles and everyone else comes into there. I'll talk in just a second about the shell itself, but the National Audit Office did an audit of the sale of the Dome and a firm of accountants, Deloitte Touche, said that it was questionably viable as an arena in its own right. That is very much that case, that is part of the reason we're trying to build some of the other areas around it, and why we're so keen on a proposal to have a regional casino in there, to make it make sense. If you couple that with a building that's got a reputation of being a white elephant, and an internet search of white elephant and dome will generate 650,000 replies, you have something where in my mind, and my companies mind, to stop construction of the arena before between 6 and 12 months, to construct a basic shell into which you could put a regional casino would be a very foolish thing indeed, and may lead to a collapse of the business prior to you being successful with that. And therefore what we've done it build two things, one is a floor, which covers 150,000 square feet which would cover the casino area, the gaming area.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Can I stop you and ask what 160,000 square feet is in measurements we're supposed to use.

DAVID CAMPBELL: Sorry, roughly 15,000 square metres, about half of that is the tables area, the rest of that is back of house. If you think of it, as I say this is above a bank of stage areas so I think it was Paul Simon, who said 'One man's ceiling is another man's floor', this is literally the ceiling, not the area above that, it would be built in a different way if it didn't have a floor above it and is the minimal roof structure which is attached to the arena which has been built as well, there are no walls, it is completely open, the press have been invited many times, including the newspaper in question, to go and see the area, people have stood there and seen it, we're not hiding anything behind it at all. It has all the planning permissions that are required, despite that the newspaper continues to make the allegations, I don't know how you make them not do it.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you very much for that. I see a new player has come on for Greenwich.

STEVE PALLETT: Thank you Chair, my name's Steve Pallett.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Pallett, that's one of our family names

STEVE PALLETT: I concur with what David Campbell has told you, the local planning authority is satisfied that all the necessary planning permissions are in place, it's fairly clear that the structure that we're talking about had to be built to enable the arena to operate because it's built above a service yard. What happens to that, the deck and the floors above it is a matter for a future application, but the structure itself has the benefit of planning permission.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you. Obviously this is very important in some people's minds, and it was sufficiently important for Greenwich to mention that it is a fact, in one of their submissions. In your mind is it an important consideration.

STEVE PALLETT: Well I think it is an important consideration in that if you are minded to grant us this licence then we're fairly along the track of providing a casino. So yes it is important.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: What do you say to the point that perhaps every authority should have jumped the gun like that?

STEVE PALLETT: To advocate the authority's jumped the gun, we haven't jumped the gun, what we've done is we've the structures in place to enable this development to happen, the development itself has not got the benefit of planning permission.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Do you feel embarrassed by this at all?

STEVE PALLETT: No Chair, I'm proud of this.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: AEG, you've heard these questions and most of them apply to you so you're going to tell us what you think aren't you.

DAVID CAMPBELL: I won't add anything other than to say that as the panel will know, there are other positions where people have made applications and already have spaces where that can be accommodated so somewhere like Coventry, which I know wasn't short-listed, but had a fully built out area where a casino could go into to, it's an area space which is concrete on the floor and has a roof over it, it's 150,000 square feet it could accommodate that, it could accommodate anything else that's included within the D2 class that is there. As I've given you the history it would be foolish for us not to consider the option of that being something that could accommodate a casino if we were to get a licence.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Do you think it's important?

DAVID CAMPBELL: I wouldn't want to make a judgement of that, I think I'd probably take a, I can't remember your exact words at the opening of the session, but the panel has noted it and will comment on whether it is advantageous or disadvantageous. I think what it does is provide an ability to take, if we were to go this route and we assumed that we did get a licence for this, it gives the panel the ability to get a casino to market very quickly and if this is a pilot scheme there's a scheme which can be from the time that the licence is awarded to being able to operate, will take about 18 months to happen. So it hasn't got to go through the project being developed, it hasn't got to go through finding all the other parts of it to fit together, you know that the scheme, that it's going to go, and what the attendant benefits are. It's clearly not for me to make a judgement as to whether that's a right thing or a wrong thing to do.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Mr. Froomberg wants to ask you a question.

JAMES FROOMBERG: I do please Chairman. Having the shell, and thank you for explaining that, if Greenwich was unsuccessful in getting the licence you've clearly got two options, you hang around with an empty shell until Government changes its mind at some point in the future, more regional casinos are allowed and you're successful on that occasion. Or you go for a less lucrative and less exciting tenant fit out operator unit use of that space. Have you got any thoughts on which off those routes you're going to follow, and if it was the latter what it might be used for?

DAVID CAMPBELL: I'm afraid it would be the former rather than the latter. I mean clearly we would have to make a judgement if Greenwich and ourselves were unsuccessful in getting a licence, as we talked about the licensing, the number of regional casinos has changed quite dramatically, there's no reason to assume that is going to stay static. It's very difficult to determine how long it's going to be between one and another pilot, or if indeed it may be one, I mean the Government has the ability to go back and change the number from one to a higher number if they so wish, and that may, I guess, happen somewhere before the.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: And if Parliament agrees.

DAVID CAMPBELL: Yes, without going back and revising the act they need the agreement, but they have the mechanism in place that they could attempt to change the number if they wanted to, I think we have to take a judgement at the end of that and I guess if we give up all hope of that ever happening then we have to look at alternative uses. Those alternative uses won't generate two hotels, won't have a Cirque de Soleil, etc. So I won't read off the list again.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: In case anybody should think that it's part of our job to say whether there should be more than one, isn't, and we're not going to. Let's move on, we're approaching

the time when we need to go home. Could I just say to everybody that thinks we're just giving ourselves a short working day, one of the dynamics of working in a panel like this is that after everybody's gone home we have to get together and say to ourselves have we learned anything today, what. And we make a note of that and when we come to reporting our secretary here will remind us that we said such and such on such and such a day. But I'm afraid you won't know what that is until after Christmas.

STEPHEN NELSON: I just wanted to reinforce the fact that there was no secrecy of this building of the casino with the Dome, I was on this hard hat until six or seven months ago, there were 30 people on the tour and it was the third one of that particular week I think, poor souls that showed us around. I asked a question about what these structure where and was told, quite openly then, that in fact they would form the floor of the casino, so there was absolutely no secrecy about it whatsoever.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: If we haven't learnt anything then everybody else has learnt which newspaper to believe. Let's get onto something entirely different, regional context. Do we need to know anything more about London's tourism strategy in relation to this? It has been touched upon, Mr. Barry-Pursell?

ANDREW BARRY-PURSELL: Mr. Chairman, at the risk of boring everybody, just very quickly, the tourism strategy for London is set out in these two documents, London's Tourism Vision 2006-2016, and this document which is the London Tourism Action Plan, and the relationship between these two documents, broadly, is this sets out the strategy, this sets out the things that will be done to implement the strategy. There are a few points in these documents which do have relevance to the discussion this afternoon, just to run through some of the major themes, one of them is improving the quality of visitor accommodation, and we've heard about the additional hotels that a regional casino would bring in, of a high quality. The second is driving up the quality of the visitor experience, and as we've heard earlier on the proposals that we're discussing this afternoon would be an enhancement to the offer that London has to make to visitors both from other parts of the UK and from overseas. And another of the objectives that's set out here is about spreading tourism outside the central area, by doing this we can make sure tourism is more inclusive and sustainable, in the term again that we discussed earlier on, and to alleviate the pressures on some of London's tourism hotspots that you have in central London. And the final objective which I'll draw your attention to is the one about increasing the profile and usage of the Thames, we've heard already about the proposals there are for improving transport along the Thames and for increasing access by river, that will help deliver one of the objectives in the vision of ensuring greater visitor usage of the river and raising its profile as an iconic London attraction. Just while I'm on the subject of river transport that would also help deliver one of the policies and the objectives set out in the Mayor's transport strategy of improving transport by river. I won't tax your patience any further.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you. Do you want to say anything about transport strategy, other than what's been said?

PETER BROOKS: Mr. Chairman, I could go through what we've already gone through but I think that would be very boring for everybody in the room, and I can talk about the World Heritage site for another 20 minutes, but again I think it could become quite boring. But I think, just on the tourism, our main objective in a lot of this is to increase the overnight stay within the Greenwich area. And I'll stop there Chair.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Miss Salomon.

JUDITH SALOMON: Thank you Chair, I just very briefly want to mention the importance of this strategy for the Thames Gateway, which we shouldn't forget. First of all it will provide an iconic development, it will provide a destination that we've heard and also it will add to the mix and the jobs that are created in the Gateway. The Gateway isn't just about 120,000 new homes, but everything else to go with it, an iconic destination like this will complement and help that strategy be developed and implemented. Thank you.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you, well that was quick. No one else want to say anything about it? Can we go on to the connection to the Olympic strategy. Is there a direct connection between having a casino and Olympic strategy, somehow or other I don't associate the picture of young men and women running round the track and throwing things about and all jumping around with gaming in a casino.

PETER BROOKS: I get your point of course Mr. Chairman, but I think it's just worth pointing out that Greenwich is in fact one of the five Olympic host boroughs in London, but Greenwich will actually have a third of the games on the south side of the river, which not a lot of people realise, including equestrian, shooting at the Woolwich barracks, and on the Greenwich peninsula at the O2, temporary facilities for gymnastics and basketball. But why we see the connection here is not so much about young athletes gambling if you like, it is again around the tourism attraction and making Greenwich the centre of the map again within London, and we feel proud of course, I'm sure, everybody feels proud that the Olympic Games is being held in London and obviously we want to again use a regeneration profile of going further. Perhaps if I can ask the Chief Exec to expand on that.

MARY NEY: Just to put a couple points of what the direct linkages are and the synergies, perhaps, between the casino and the Olympic legacy. I think, first of all, the work around the employment and business strand that we will be wanting to develop around the casino are very much in the same model as the Olympic legacy on employment and business that Greenwich is leading on behalf of the five borough, and in partnership with the GLA and the LDA and the Learning and Skills Council and Jobcentre Plus. And there are synergies there, and therefore there will be mutual benefits from both of those processes happening in parallel. The skills range is very similar in the terms of construction industry and also hospitality leisure industry and therefore there are definite synergies there to build on. I think secondly, as we've heard, new hotels are needed as part of the Olympic effort and this will drive hotels on the south side of the river where, as Councillor Brooks has said, there will be eight of the Olympic events taking place. As part of the Olympics there's a strong emphasis, and one of the reasons we were successful in London was around the added cultural and entertainment offer that London wants to provide as part of that whole Olympic period and clearly the developments and the wider developments on the Peninsula will be part of that. And finally in terms of the tourism offer, I think one of the things about Greenwich is, is that we already have our Olympic venues and they're already starting to become an attraction for tourism because they are Olympic venues, and we're starting to see our Olympic venues used for sports activities. So, for instance, the world gymnastics in 2009 will be held in the arena, so there is a strong linkage between the tourism we want the casino help us generate, and also the link to showcasing, you know, our legacy has started from the Olympics, before they've even happened, in the sense that tourism and the link to the venues is already underway and we will be expecting to host a number of events around the Olympic sports.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Mr. Froomberg wants to ask a few questions.

JAMES FROOMBERG: Could I just enquire, in London's Olympic which I didn't examine and presumably the subsequent host city contract, what was suggested, proposed, contracted, committed in terms of hotel accommodation at the Dome site, if anything?

MARY NEY: I would want to double check that but I don't think there was anything specifically on the Dome site, but there was the general lead to build up the hotel base, I don't know if the GLA want to add to that, that was part of the requirement.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: We'll ask them now.

ANDREW BARRY-PURSELL: I would have to check.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Again, if you do find the answer would you please be kind enough to circulate it round the other participants at this table, if you don't know the addresses then I'm sure Mr. Flemming downstairs will tell you them. Government Office please.

ROBERT WHITTAKER: It's just a very brief point Chairman to supplement what Mary said earlier. My understanding of this is that this is a case where the, so called, Olympic legacy and some of the priorities of Greenwich actually do have a very strong synergy around areas such as worklessness in the area, the Olympic legacy is partly about trying to improve the worklessness picture in the east of the city, and also about the wider issue of improving life chances of people who live in the area. And that's very, very strong in tune with some of the immediate priorities that Greenwich faces at the moment, it is an authority that faces some pretty profound challenges around worklessness and the major deprivation indices generally.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Do you share Greenwich's view as to the direct connections between the Olympic activities and the casino?

ROBERT WHITTAKER: I think they're certainly capable of being made and what I would say about it is that it's a unique dimension to this proposal that I don't think you are going to discuss elsewhere.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: I don't know if that was yes or no. You are a Civil Servant aren't you?

ROBERT WHITTAKER: I am yes.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Greenwich Partnership.

BOB SCOTT: Chairman, can I just say that the great gift of the Olympics is that they give you a deadline that you have to be ready by, and it seems to me quite clear that London has the opportunity that perhaps the best games that I've been to, which is Barcelona in '92 where the Mayor said they were able to do 25 years work in 6 years, will occur, mostly, of course, across the river. But it will give enormous emphasis if you award the casino to Greenwich, it will put enormous speed up the hotel operators to make sure that they're ready, that everything around the Dome is built fast, to be ready for 2012. That is the way of the world, in this kind of world, because the opportunity for the hotels to launch their hotels with Olympic occupancy will be almost irresistible.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Isn't the urge to build the hotels that they don't need a casino to lead it?

SIR BOB SCOTT: I certainly have to say that if you build a hotel on the back of having the Olympics for 17 days, that's a pretty bad justification for building a hotel, you've got to have a much more sustainable reason for it than that. And as Mary has already said the great objective of the Greenwich tourism strategy, as opposed to the London, is to get people spending nights in Greenwich. The problem with Greenwich tourism is that we simply have day visitors at the moment, we've got two new hotels in Greenwich and that's made a real impact, but to have two new huge hotels would completely transform the experience of local businesses and that dribble down effect of having people actually staying the night and the interesting change between 17th century Greenwich and 21st Century Greenwich by boat etcetera will be extraordinary.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you. I'll ask you to come back in a moment, 'cause there may be another point that's needed. Miss Salomon.

JUDITH SALOMON: It's Judith Salomon, London First. Just a brief point. An important part of the Olympic legacy will be not just for London but for the whole country, to capitalise on the increase in tourism that's expected, both during the Games and, quite critically, afterwards. And clearly the regional casino at Greenwich would help contribute to this.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you for that point. Now AEG. Mr Campbell please.

DAVID CAMPBELL: Thank you. Just to endorse Sir Bob's point about hotels. You clearly can't build them for 17 days, and I'm not going to ask your indulgence to go through the list of the other things that come with a casino, but it's world class brands like Tutankhamun and Cirque du Soleil, that help drive that hotel audience that goes in there. In terms of Olympics, I think the main areas have been touched upon, which are job creation, re-skilling. I think also transport, and I touched upon that when I talked about the river. The final bit of legacy which is really important is in terms of sport. This is a one-off opportunity for the UK to transform itself in terms of sporting, and just to put it in context with our own company, AEG, I think we are, and I'm not sure if this is a good thing or a bad thing, but I think we are the largest owner of sports franchises in the world. We also operate in Los Angeles the US Olympic training facility that is a training facility for no less than 5 sports, and the reason I say that is that, within that facility, and the sports that we have there, a number of the sports that are played there are loss leaders, in other words we do it to create activity in the area, we do it to encourage sport and we do it to encourage people to look at the facility in a different way. And we see the casino as being directly related to that, that's going to allow us to attract sports that we wouldn't otherwise be able to attract because we would simply have to look at things on a purely economic basis. So while we are an Olympic venue for gymnastics and basketball, and as part of the 2012 bid we helped secure the 2009 World Gymnastic Games, which will be there, and we do have other events coming up such as NHL Hockey and NBA Basketball. We're trying to bring in, for instance, a sports business conference, which is currently staged in New York, to do that we have to transport people by river to hotels in Central London, because there aren't hotels on site. More of those kinds of things we can attract if we have the hotels there. There's also a whole series of other sports we're looking at, which do become, I'm not saying any one of these specific sports are loss leaders, 'cause otherwise I'll have the Federations jumping on top of me saying 'But we can make money', but things like swimming,

which you can actually stage in a short court swimming pool inside, volleyball, badminton, figure skating, equestrian events and so forth, there are lots of things that we can bring in there. In order to do that you need to have the critical mass, the number of people going through, the economic activity that allows you to bring those sports in. So very much from our own standpoint, and also talking to the other UK sporting bodies, the casino does have a direct link as far as sporting and Olympic achievements are concerned.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you. Sir Bob, did you want to say anything more?

SIR BOB SCOTT: No sir, you've heard quite enough.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Mr Barry-Purssell, you've still got your label up. Accidentally or deliberately?

ANDREW BARRY-PURSELL: Deliberately. It was just a point to pick up again on the Mayor's vision for tourism. It will come as little surprise, I guess, that the Olympic and Paralympic Games in 2012 is a key theme for that strategy, for two reasons really. It means that, for a while, London is going to be the centre of the world's attention, and it will be an unparalleled opportunity for London to showcase what it has to offer, and I think that if our offer can be augmented by the sorts of facilities that we've heard mentioned in this segment of the debate, it is going to help. The other thing that experience of other host cities shows is that the benefit to tourism endures. And if you've got a series of events that's going to focus, that's going to showcase London, and most specifically is going to showcase east London, it's important that we have the facilities in east London that can make the most of that lasting effect, to deliver on all the things that I mentioned earlier on as being wider objectives of the strategy. So I think there is a direct link here, and it's a direct link that will endure over quite a long period of time.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you very much. The last thing to talk about, the last thing that I've got on my own agenda here is about community benefits. And I'm not, here, speaking of community benefits in terms of things you expect to happen but perhaps more venal, in terms of what you hope to collect through one way and another through the use of the various provisions in the Gambling Act or Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act of 1990, of which I should warn you that every word of Circular 05 of 2005 is inscribed on my heart.

PETER BROOKS: Mr. Chairman, I'm quite pleased I'm not answering that one in that case. I'd like to introduce Mike Howes who will go through that.

MIKE HOWES: I'm Head of Regeneration at the London Borough of Greenwich. First of all I'd like to refer the panel back to our submission, in terms of the original submission and the answer to the question, which I feel outlines the Council's wealth of experience in terms of gaming community benefits as part of developments. And as an example of that, Greenwich, since 1997 as we outlined, has gained 50,000,000 purely from Section 106, which is obviously not the only route, in terms of community benefits but I think shows our experience in terms of negotiating community benefits, so actually directly related to the development itself, I actually delivered, and actually relate to the needs and aspirations of the community affected by the development. In relation to that, both the Audit Commission and District Audit have commended Greenwich as an authority, in terms of good practice, in relation to this, and I think that's all, I won't dwell on that anymore, I mean there's plenty more of that in the submission. Obviously, in relation to the Peninsula, there is already a negotiated Section 106 and a range of community benefits, covering a whole raft of community benefits, in terms of health, education, employment training and all those things that you would expect in terms of that. Obviously, in terms of the community benefits which the Council would both be using the licence system and the planning system to get, that's obviously something that the Council is working through, not as we speak, but has been thinking about ever since the issue of a casino came up, and in terms of what are the pertinent community benefits to actually seek and to negotiate with the chosen developer, and obviously as part of that, some of the community consultation directly feeds into that in terms of some of the things that those people are thinking about in terms of the impact of that development and what they would expect as part of that community. Whilst obviously, and I said, the Chair quite rightly recognises, I can't go through a sort of, give you a shopping list, there are clearly some things that have already come out of today, and I'm not really going to say much different than some of the things that have come out of today, that we would be seeking, as part of a community benefits package, to actually sit alongside the Peninsula development, and the Section 106 that's already agreed there, and in terms of this

particular development in question. First off, obviously, we would wish to seek support for the setting up and the ongoing operation of the multi-agency panel, and for support for some of the projects that flow from that, directly related to issues around problem gambling etcetera. Secondly I think we are already, as part of the Peninsula development, providing support in terms of multi-faith provision, and we would seek to extend that in relation to support and services that could be provided in relation to some of the issues coming out in the development. The third..

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Wait a minute. We heard from Mr Torry that quite a number of the people that the Chaplaincy represents really have scruples, I think is the right word, about gambling. How are they going to accept gambling money willingly? Won't they say we don't want this money, this is 30 pieces of silver?' ...?

MIKE HOWES: Well it so happens that we have funds we would envisage, without going into details, I think the detail needs to be discussed, around services that would provide services for people in relation to what we've discussed before in terms of pastoral care and actually dealing with issues around problem gambling and stuff like that. I mean I don't see any reason why most faiths wouldn't accept that money if it was dealt on that basis, but I'll leave it for Mr Torry to..

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Yeah well, you give your answer, don't, we'll get Mr Torry's eventually, you carry on.

MIKE HOWES: Well I've finished off, I think I've answered the question

PROF STEPHEN CROW: You've gone through what isn't your shopping list?

MIKE HOWES: Obviously in terms of what we mentioned before, and I think the Borough Commander outlined, in terms of provision for community safety, to enhance community safety within the area, and obviously that can mean a range of things and without making any commitments, it could mean specialised officers, specialised teams, enhanced security, community safety measures within the area to deal with some of the issues that may arise. Importantly, and as we've discussed, the next issue is obviously the whole jobs and training package that we would seek to secure and confirm in legal agreements and ensure that the numbers that have been quoted are actually provided and if possible extended, and also all those things that make those jobs and training happen. And we've had a whole discussion about how GLAB worked with developers to ensure that jobs are related to individuals and individual packages. And finally, well there's two more things sorry, linkages with education in terms package, especially around the whole leisure industry and looking at particular issues and inputs from people in terms of that whole leisure experience. And finally in terms of addressing the tourism offer and what we can get out of that in terms of enhancing and making a synergy with the World Heritage site as we've discussed before. In addition the Council will be looking to ensure that those regeneration benefits that are being quoted are actually delivered and quantified and in that respect some key examples there are the hotels and issues around transport, key there probably is the river transport and enhancements to the river transport that has been discussed. In short, in terms of that, it's not meant to be an exhaustive list but gives you a flavour of some of the things that we've been thinking about and we would be negotiating with the operator. I think, I'll just refer you back, the Council will continue to apply its skills and experience to ensure that appropriate benefits are actually identified and importantly secured and actually contained within the overall offer.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you very much.

MAN 1: May I just add a little detail on the issue of community benefits, it's a very credible record by every account. Could you tell me a little bit about how you and your colleagues go about securing these benefits, what sort of approach do you take? Do you understand what you want before you start negotiations? How is that developed?

MIKE HOWES: Obviously different schemes work in different ways, they have different starting points. The Council does have a broad general shopping list in relation to the casino and the Peninsula development, it's been known about for some time so we have been developing our own ideas in terms of what specifically would work and in terms of what should be on the nature of this development itself, such as security in terms of jobs and stuff like that. Obviously we do have various different processes in terms of community engagement and for consulting with the community, and that local community what people feel. Some of that has happened already in terms, I think the Chief Exec was saying before, in terms of the consultation, it has all been carried out, some of the key issues were access, jobs and training and transport. In terms of we would

also be seeking an offer from the developer, the operator themselves in terms of what they're prepared to put in. Obviously there are then various appraisals and mechanisms and formulas for working out what is deliverable from X development, and in terms of what the actual value is that can be safely secured and negotiated around. So, you know, it's, I think we would use, as I said, the experience that we've built up within Greenwich, over a number of years, in terms of applying that to this development to secure the best community benefits we could, within our powers, and within the legislation.

MAN 1: What sticks out in your mind as the most successful benefit or group of benefits you've secured in the last 5 years?

MIKE HOWES: Well I think if we're really talking about just the last 5 years I suppose the benefits accrued from the Peninsula, that we have mentioned in the submission, which I think was community benefits of a figure of around just over one hundred million. I would also, more recently, in terms of the community benefits, in terms of the Royal Arsenal development, which is just along the waterfront, and is a key marker, if you like, in terms of the regeneration of Woolwich. And just to go back to a discussion earlier, I mean, there is still a lot of developments and contaminated land and waterfronts that need development along Greenwich, it's not completed, by a long stretch. But I suppose the most recent one is the Royal Arsenal, and the actual development there, which actually brings back into use an area of land that until recently the public didn't have access to for the last 300 years, with a key, a key blockage, if you like in terms of the development of Woolwich town centre.

MAN 1: Can you give us an indication of the value of the Royal Arsenal development?

MIKE HOWES: I haven't got that off the top of my head

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Is this something we really want to know?

MAN 1: I feel it would be indicative of the ability to handle the benefits of that scale

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Can you answer that question?

MIKE HOWES: Yes, I can provide categories and values. I mean, it is of many millions.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: That'll probably do. Thank you very much for that. Mr Torry, 30 pieces of silver?

REV MALCOM TORRY: In order to put my answer in context, I'll begin by saying how we are structured as a Chaplaincy. The three faith community in the Borough of Greenwich remains independent, we, each has its own governance and each is going to retain its independence, because each of us recognise an authority beyond ourselves. For Christians it's God revealed in Christ, for other religions it's sacred texts and prophets. We come together as a Chaplaincy, to do a particular task, and that's to serve the new community on the Greenwich Peninsula, and for that purpose we've established a charitable trust, and that charitable trust is governed by trustees. We've always made it clear that we shall need, and we do accept facilities for our work, from the institutions within which we're working. McAlpines, who are constructing the inside of the Dome, loan us a cupboard which is find, it's what we need at the moment, the Section 106 Agreement which exists at the moment, in relation to the Peninsula, grants us the use of space, buildings, initially a temporary building, and eventually the Greenwich Pavilion, which is going to be relocated on the east side of the Peninsula. And we're at the moment working on the detailed agreement with MDL and the Borough over our occupancy of those spaces. We've also made it clear, to ourselves and others, that we will not be accepting money for our own work from any other organisation, because our independence is very important to us. We need an independent voice so that the faiths can continue to express themselves independently. We haven't yet discussed, as a chaplaincy, the precise mechanism through which we will involve ourselves in work limiting any damage that might be done by the location of a super casino on the Greenwich Peninsula. We shall do that hypothetically now that we've received draft proposals for the multi agency group, and we shall be happy to look at those proposals and respond, and I think we shall be responding very positively. If the decision is made to locate a casino on the Greenwich Peninsula at that point we shall need to make a decision about precisely how we relate to work that's done, and in particular how we relate to any money that's made available. It may well have to be at arms length through our cooperation with an independent body set up to deal with those issues.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you very much. Mr. Campbell when Mr. Howes was telling us about all the things that he hoped to get, your face was looking glummer and glummer.

DAVID CAMPBELL: It's a relatively short list for Greenwich so I was actually quite happy. It was not intentional, I apologise.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: You don't want to raise any point now is that it?

DAVID CAMPBELL: As has been made clear, there are a number of areas to be addressed, I think we share a number of those areas, and we share a number of the same concerns so one of the areas we are very concerned about is the multi agency panel and providing protection for people who may be exposed to problem gambling, so that's what we would want to see, funds put into transport. I talked about, jobs and training I've talked about so there's nothing that comes as a surprise on there. So I apologise for my glum look, I will make a concerted effort to look happy from now on.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Let's get on. London Thames Gateway Development Corporation.

JOHN ALLEN: I just wanted to make a comment about community benefits, because obviously this is a strategic proposal, there's only one in the whole country that's being talked about here, I just think it's quite important that community benefits are looked at on a strategic basis as well, obviously within London at the moment we have the Mayor of London looking for more powers on planning around 106 and negotiation and making powers to approve applications to the Government's current proposals. And obviously, as a development corporation, we have been established to take a more strategic view of these sort of proposals and certainly in relation to a Havering proposal, were it to come forward, we'd be taking a strategic view about the regeneration benefits and community benefits that a proposal would offer, and I know it's not for discussion here but that is something that Havering are quite keen to emphasise. So I'd just like to hear a bit more about what strategic community benefits are going to be sought with the proposal here at Greenwich, after all again we talk about a 25 or 45 minute journey time for people using this development, so you would have thought some of the community benefits would flow out to some of those people in that 25 and 45 minute journey time, which obviously is beyond the borough boundary. And clearly, most significantly for us, immediately north of the river into London Thames Gateway Development Corporation operating area, Lower Lea Valley. So I would just like to hear a bit more about strategic community benefits that will be linked with what is a very, very strategic proposal and development after all.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Are you able to help on that?

MAN 1: I thought, really, I take the point it quite key, and as we tried to put across in terms of regeneration of the Thames Gateway its location as a regional casino for London, there are obviously key strategic issues, I did think that, and I'm sorry if I didn't get it across, some of the issues I've outlined I do think are strategic issues in terms of employment and training as we've discussed earlier, and I think it's not just about Greenwich residents but linking in to the Olympics for the five boroughs. And in terms of the key transport and the location that is used by people, not just from Greenwich but in wider London in terms of that 45 minute journey, I thought there were quite strategic issues. I think we are as a borough quite interested in further discussions with boroughs in terms of key issues that they feel should be part of that package which could contribute to this impact and effect.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you, Mr. Froomberg.

JAMES FROOMBERG: Thankyou Chairman. I was just wanting to ask whether the benefits that we're talking about come from the developer, which is AEG, or the casino operator and whether you would look to both directions, one through the planning process with the developer and one through the licensing process with the operator. And then I was reminded of the conversation that we had, right at the start of the day, where Councillor Brooks committed that if Greenwich was awarded the licence then you run the Schedule 9 competitive process. And I sort of hadn't understood how AEG might cope with that if they already have a contractual relationship with one particular operator. So it's, I suppose it's a sort of double-barrelled thing, are you looking for your benefits from both the operator and the developer and how is the developer going to cope if he's got a contractual relationship, and you're going out for a competition for the operator. It would be very helpful to understand that.

DAVID CAMPBELL: It is quite complex, too, in terms of two processes, and as Greenwich stands at the moment there would be a licensing process, and there will be a planning process. What I don't think we would be doing is sort of trying to double count, or double bubble, if you like, you

know, what, in terms of developments, and community benefits, Section 106 agreements, the scheme pays for community benefits, it's, you don't go for each participant in that in terms of any relationship to any approval process. So I think we would take a long, hard, cold look at the scheme, and see what we would extract from the scheme in terms of what we feel were appropriate and reasonable community benefits, and I would hope, and I think this would need a bit of discussion in terms of the tying into process, is that the licensing process and the planning process would hopefully have some synergy about them in terms that we wouldn't actually, you know, run the competition around the licence, and then say 'Now we go to the second 106 process, and we're going to, you know, put another wad of benefits for you', I think there's only one set of community benefits and the Council would be clear about that. We will then need to work out how we secure that, through the processes that go on.

JAMES FROMBERG: Thank you, that's the first half of the question. The rest I'm probably looking to AEG, I suppose to understand.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: I have circular 205 in my hand. It's not our job to police the work of a foreign department but they might just feel that it acts as a constraint on you wouldn't you?

MAN 1: In terms of what that circular says and what we've said about community benefits and appropriate development in the area, I don't see that there would be any conflict, but obviously we would work within the legislation and the government guidance that is applicable at the time.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Let's not get into an argument about what's in it, you know what's in it and I know what's in it, thank you. ...?

MAN 2: I'm afraid so Chairman and I suppose the half is for AEG really which is, as I understand it at the moment, earlier today Councillor Brooks said, of course they'd run the competitive process that's required under Schedule 9 of the act if Greenwich was awarded the licence, but I'd still struggling with the fact that as I understand it AEG have a contractual commitment with one particular operator. While our job is limited to choosing an area, if we choose an area and you then get awarded I'd be fascinated to see how you would make it work given what I understand is a current situation. You're going to have to unravel your relationship with your operator.

MAN 2: I think at this points it's not entirely clear how that process would work, and I guess from a Greenwich standpoint the point to stress, and I'm sure somebody from the Council will correct me if I'm wrong here, but there has been nobody else that has approached the Council, we are the only people who have approached the Council with regards to developing a regional casino, which is why it's been centred on this development. Yes we have a partnership with Kerzner, that related to both the casino and the hotel, if that conflicts with the legislation, such as it's defined when it moves further forward, then we'll need to address it at that time.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Greater London Authority.

ANDREW BARRY-PURSSELL: I was just going to pick up on something that was said earlier on about setting of priorities for benefits, part of the policy background to that, of course, is the Mayoral strategies like the London Plan, the Mayor's economic development strategy and the Mayor's transport strategy. And during the course of this afternoon I've tried to show how the proposals put forward meet those objectives. Unfortunately the time that the first London plan which was adopted was written, that was two years ago now, this was not even a glimmer on the horizon I don't think. There is now a draft policy in the draft further alterations to the London plan which were issued for consultation with the London Assembly and the functional bodies in May 2006, and that does mention some benefits that the Mayor has suggested the boroughs ought to try and secure, whether through their planning powers or through their licensing powers. And they include protection of the vulnerable, minimisation of negative impacts of local and wider amenity, employment and training and transport improvements, and again we have discussed a number of the course of the day.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Could you just give us chapter and verse.

ANDREW BARRY-PURSSELL: Certainly, it's policy 3D.41, and it's headed casinos.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Yes we've seen it, thank you. Does that lead you to dissent from what you've heard from Mr. Howes or to say that he's missing something?

ANDREW BARRY-PURSSELL: Very much the opposite, to say that he has, as far as we can see, Greenwich has come forward, fits very well with the emerging policy in the draft alterations.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you. Greenwich do you want to say anything more about community benefits in the sense we've been talking about. Any more inquisition panel? Well it's customary, on these occasions, as it is, I was going to say as it is before somebody's hanged, but I won't. It's customary on these occasions to just let the proposing authority say anything that might have been missed, I don't want you to give a closing speech, otherwise I would have invited Council here and booked another night. Is there anything you just want to round off on?

PETER BROOKS: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. I don't think I want to add anything further to what has already been said here today, but I've got a few words if you don't mind if I go through as a closing gesture, not as a closing speech. Obviously I thank yourself Mr. Chairman, members of the panel and everyone around the table that's taken time to come and listen to Greenwich's proposal today, I think you'll see that we have determination within Greenwich to do this and I think you can see that we are keen and nowhere along the lines are we determined from the fact that we definitely want the regional casino for Greenwich, for all the reasons I've already said. It will create further employment within the borough, we've gone through that and we've also talked about our GLAB process where we, I can assure you Mr. Chairman, we will roll it out as we have done in any other application. I don't think I really want to go all through this because I sense from yourself that you didn't want a closing speech, but I would add that we'd be more than happy to add any other further information that we haven't come out with today, so when you do go through later on, and I do know what it's like I have been on, and also I know that you will be working late into the night, so if you think of anything during that time we would be only happy to forward, if we have the information, it on to you. But thank you very much.

PROF STEPHEN CROW: Thank you for that and could I just say again, what I said this morning, if a prejudicial situation does turn up, and I don't think it will, and I certainly hope if won't, the we'll be in contact. Well it just remains for me now to thank al participants, you've all been very good, very restrained if I may say so, but thanks very much for all that and I think it only remains for me to close the proceedings which are now closed, and god speed on your journeys home. Thank you all very much.