MINUTES

Meeting: London Assembly (Plenary)

Date: Thursday 7 December 2023

Time: 10.00 am

Place: Chamber, City Hall,

Kamal Chunchie Way, London, E16 1ZE

Copies of the minutes may be found at:

www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/whole-assembly

Present:

Andrew Boff AM (Chair) Susan Hall AM

Lord Bailey of Paddington AM Krupesh Hirani AM

Siân Berry AM Joanne McCartney AM

Emma Best AM Sem Moema AM

Hina Bokhari AM Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM

Anne Clarke AM Zack Polanski AM
Léonie Cooper AM Keith Prince AM
Unmesh Desai AM Nick Rogers AM

Len Duvall AM Caroline Russell AM

Peter Fortune AM Sakina Sheikh AM

Neil Garratt AM

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

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Marina Ahmad AM, Elly Baker AM, Tony Devenish AM and Dr Onkar Sahota AM.
- 1.2 The Chair explained that, in accordance with Standing Order 2.2D, the agenda items would be varied to assist with the conduct of business, namely that Item 5 Petitions, Item 6 Petitions Update and Item 7 Motions would be taken after Item 3 Minutes, followed by Item 4 Question and Answer Session on Housing in London for the second half of the meeting.

City Hall, Kamal Chunchie Way, London, E16 1ZE Enquiries: 020 7983 4100 www.london.gov.uk

- 1.3 The Chair provided an update on recent Assembly activity including:
 - The Budget and Performance Committee's initiation of its annual scrutiny of the Mayor's budget by examining the initial budget plans for the Greater London Authority (GLA) for 2024/25;
 - The Police and Crime Committee's discussion on the Metropolitan Police Service's approach to investigating serious injury collisions in London;
 - The GLA Oversight Committee's discussion on what good consultation and public engagement looks like, part of an investigation into consultation across the GLA Group;
 - The Planning and Regeneration Committee's discussion on how London's planning system considered the needs of disabled Londoners, to ensure that London continues to improve its accessibility;
 - The Health Committee's examination of the extent of harmful gambling participation in London and what the Mayor can do to support those affected;
 - The Transport Committee's consideration of the personal safety of customers travelling on the Transport for London network, and the work that Transport for London and the British Transport Police were doing to reduce and prevent crime;
 - The Budget and Performance Committee's recommendations to the Mayor to support and improve the coming drafts of the Mayor's budget for 2024/25;
 - The Health Committee's recommendations to the Mayor on how this important work could be better supported, following an investigation into trauma-informed approaches to violence that affects young people in London;
 - The Fire, Resilience and Emergency Planning Committee's examination of the impact of the review on staff and how they felt about the culture of the Brigade a year after the publication of the London Fire Brigade review of culture; and
 - The Housing Committee's discussion on the financial sustainability of the housing sector and how this could impact housing supply in London.
- 1.4 The Chair also provided an update on his activity as Chair of the Assembly, namely his attendance at the London Youth Assembly (LYA) meeting on 30 November 2023 at City Hall where he had the opportunity to talk about ways for the LYA to get involved in Assembly investigations and have the voices of young people heard.

2 Declarations of Interests (Item 2)

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

2.2 **Resolved:**

(a) That the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table at Agenda Item 2, be noted as disclosable pecuniary interests.

(b) That the declaration of a non-pecuniary interest by Léonie Cooper AM, in respect of the first petition in the name of Hina Bokhari AM set out in Item 5, namely that she was a member of the London Borough of Wandsworth Planning Applications Committee but had recused herself from voting in the meeting on 26 October 2023, be noted.

3 Minutes (Item 3)

- 3.1 **Resolved:**
- 3.2 That the minutes of the London Assembly (Plenary) meeting held on 2 November 2023 and the London Assembly (Mayor's Question Time) meeting held on 16 November 2023, be signed by the Chair as correct records.

4 Petitions (Item 5)

- 4.1 The Assembly received the report of the Executive Director of Assembly Secretariat.
- 4.2 Léonie Cooper AM presented a petition with the following prayer:

"We the undersigned petition the council to call upon the Mayor and TFL to provide public toilets at Morden Station.

There are currently no public toilets at Morden station.

Access to public toilets is crucial as a matter of health, hygiene and safety and many individuals have differing levels of need. 25 of 28 terminus tube stations have public toilets in or immediately adjacent to the station - Morden is part of the Night Tube but is one of the 3 that does not."

4.3 **Resolved:**

That the petition be noted and forwarded to the Mayor of London, for response.

4.4 Hina Bokhari AM presented a petition with the following prayer:

"SAVE WIMBLEDON PARK

The All England Lawn Tennis Club have applied to develop the Heritage Landscape of the Grade II* registered Wimbledon Park. Although the application received approval by Merton's planning committee on 26th October 2023, this was just the first stage in the process. Wandsworth Council's planning committee met on 21st November and voted unanimously to refuse the application. It now goes to the GLA for a Mayoral decision; the Secretary of State can also call it in.

Each decision making body has to review the All England's proposals. On Capability Brown's Grade II* historic and highly protected Metropolitan Open Land they plan an 8,000-seat stadium, 38 courts, 10 other buildings and 9kms of roads and paths. They propose a new AELTC private park to which the public may be admitted but which would contain a 30,000sqft maintenance building.

This "industrial tennis complex" would break the 1993 covenants demanded by Merton to protect the golf course and agreed by AELTC on their purchase. On 14 July 1993 Merton promised that the golf course would be kept as open space: statement by Tony Colman, leader of Merton Council: "... when we decided to sell this land, we did so ensuring it would be kept as open space and we did so determined that the next owner and any future owner would be denied forever the opportunity to use this space for any development".

Help protect the Environment

There would be unacceptable Environmental Impact. The golf course will be excavated, infilled, and levelled over 7 years, threatening protected priority habitats. Claims for biodiversity net gains have been challenged in expert analysis. 300 mature trees will be felled. An estimated 500+ younger trees will be uprooted. Established trees are vastly superior to new saplings for carbon storage, heritage and biodiversity. You cannot replace a 150-year-old tree without waiting 150 years.

Hold Merton and the AELTC to their promises

This is important open space heavily protected in planning policy and by the 1993 covenants. Once built upon it could become completely developed. The 28m high and 104m wide Stadium will dominate the site, contrary to the 1993 covenants. When they bought in 1993, AELTC promised to keep it for leisure, recreation, and open space with only ancillary buildings. The then AELTC chairman said: "We completely understand and support everyone's determination to keep the land open and we purchased [it] on that basis.

Save Wimbledon Park for future generations

The new AELTC park will still belong to the AELTC. Public access to it and the walk around the lake is "permissive"; it may be withdrawn as their commercial priorities change. The AELTC say their Masterplan for the future of their estate is "an evolving vision.

A walking route around the lake is welcome and would fulfil a 1993 obligation. The boardwalk over the lake is unacceptable on visual, ecological, and historical grounds.

With tournament use limited to 3 weeks, the density of courts and infrastructure across the site is excessive. Community access to play tennis will be negligible. Championship parking and the Queue will still be on public park land.

Church Road, a main thoroughfare for locals and bus route to St George's Hospital will be closed during the Championships, even to pedestrians and cyclists.

We are not anti-tennis, nor are we anti-AELTC and the Championships. The "Wimbledon Fortnight" is known around the world and enjoyed by thousands of visitors and residents alike, but development on this scale is unjustified. The AELTC must think again.

We call upon the planning authorities to reject this application, and upon Merton to uphold the 1993 covenants they imposed on the AELTC.

Help protect the Environment.

Hold Merton and the AELTC to their promises. Save Wimbledon Park for future generations."

4.5 **Resolved:**

That the petition be noted and forwarded to the Mayor of London, for response.

4.6 Siân Berry AM presented a petition with the following prayer:

"We, the 1500 plus residents of Netherne-on-the-hill call upon the Mayor and Transport for London to uphold their strategy to provide affordable and sustainable public transport to outer London and to grant us a public bus service. We have no access to Public Transport or Community Transport thus making residents dependent on cars.

We request the 463 bus route, which currently terminates at Coulsdon South rail station, be extended to Netherne-on-the-Hill, giving our community access to our closest shopping, transport, and medical hub, Coulsdon Town Centre."

4.7 **Resolved:**

That the petition be noted and forwarded to the Mayor of London, for response.

4.8 Siân Berry AM presented a petition with the following prayer:

"The cost of public transport in London is higher than any other global major city."

We need the Mayor of London and Transport for London to urgently focus on reducing the cost of getting around our city.

In the run up to the next Transport for London budget, we are asking the Mayor to prioritise measures to reduce costs of travel to help all Londoners with the cost of living.

We are calling on the Mayor to:

- Freeze fares at current levels.
- Extend free bus travel to under-22s
- Make free travel available 24 hours a day for Freedom Pass holders.
- Offer free travel to all emergency services staff.
- Provide free bus travel for people seeking asylum."

4.9 **Resolved:**

That the petition be noted and forwarded to the Mayor of London, for response.

4.10 Hina Bokhari AM presented a petition with the following prayer:

"There are currently no public toilets at Morden station. Access to public toilets is crucial as a matter of accessibility, hygiene and safety as many individuals have differing levels of need. 25 of 28 terminus tube stations have public toilets in or immediately adjacent to the station - Morden is one of the 3 that does not. We, the undersigned, call on Transport for London to open public toilets at Morden station.

Sign below to add your voice to calling for TfL to open public toilets at Morden tube station."

4.11 **Resolved:**

That the petition be noted and forwarded to the Mayor of London, for response.

5 Petitions Update (Item 6)

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

5.2 **Resolved:**

That the responses received to petitions presented at the 8 June and 7 September 2023 London Assembly (Plenary) meetings, be noted.

6 Motions (Item 7)

- At the start of the debate on the motions set out on the agenda, the Chair explained that, in accordance with Standing Order 4.2A and following informal discussions with Assembly party Groups, he had agreed to vary the time limits for speeches for the remainder of the meeting so that: the mover of each motion and amendment was permitted to speak for up to 3 minutes; the seconder of each motion and amendment was permitted to speak for up to 2 minutes; and any other Members contributing to the debate were permitted to speak for up to 2 minutes.
- 6.2 Anne Clarke AM proposed and, Sakina Sheikh AM seconded the following motion:

"This Assembly notes that London has many buildings which only have a single staircase, posing a fire risk. We also note the increasing calls for a second staircase to be installed in new buildings in recent years and the importance of having two means of escape and access in the event of an emergency.

The Assembly further notes the Levelling Up Secretary, The Rt Hon Michael Gove MP, confirmed in July 2023 that all new buildings over 18m will require a second staircase. This is a change from the previous threshold of 30m. According to GLA

estimates, this impacts some 34,000 homes in the London development pipeline that are referrable to the Mayor. However, this figure will be higher as this does not include schemes that are not referrable.

This Assembly welcomes the Mayor's actions to date, including GLA policies going beyond Building Regulations, calling for a mandatory second staircase on buildings and writing twice to the Government in July and September 2023 highlighting his concerns at the delay and lack of clarity.

This Assembly notes the Government's October announcement of a 30-month transition period for developers to amend their schemes to include a second staircase but is concerned that this period is too long. Plus schemes that start within the first 18 months will not be required to include a second staircase, meaning we will still see new builds with only one staircase.

We are further concerned that the 30-month transition period is yet to start and will only commence when Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) publishes the guidance that includes the technical details of what is required. This lack of clarity from the Department is further delaying the pipeline of new homes, which are badly needed in London.

This Assembly calls on the DLUHC to:

- 1) Publish the guidance on second staircases as soon as possible, thereby commencing the transition period; and
- 2) Shorten the 30-month transition period as much as possible to ensure that all schemes over 18m in height are constructed with a second staircase."
- 6.3 Following debate and upon being put to a vote, the motion in the name of Anne Clarke AM was agreed, with 12 votes being cast in favour and no votes being cast against.
- 6.4 Hina Bokhari AM proposed and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM seconded the following motion, which had been altered in accordance with Standing Order 3.6:

"This Assembly notes:

- That London has one of the highest rates of child poverty in England with 33% of 800,000 (or 39% of) children in the capital living in poverty, with the figure as high as 48% in some London boroughs such as Tower Hamlets.
- Charities such as Child Poverty Action Group have highlighted how the Two Child Benefit Cap has a disproportionately negative impact on London compared to the rest of the country.

- In some London boroughs, three in ten children live in households affected by the two-child limits.
- Across the UK, 42 per cent of children living in families with three or more children live in poverty.5 The two-child benefit cap has impacted an estimated 1.5 million children.
- A recent report from the Child Poverty Action Group states that the economic and societal effects of child poverty, including spending on public services, costs the UK £39 billion every year.
- That a report by the Child Poverty Action Group estimates that removing the Two Child Benefit Cap would cost £1.3bn a year but would lift 250,000 children out of poverty overnight and result in 850,000 children living in less deep poverty.
- A study by the London School of Economics has found that the Two Child Benefit Cap has seen no positive impact on employment rates or on work hours.

This Assembly calls for:

- The Mayor of London, alongside the Chair of the London Assembly, to write to the UK Government calling for the Two Child Benefit cap to be removed.
- The UK Government to drop the Two Child Benefit Cap. "
- 6.5 Following debate and upon being put to a vote, the motion, as altered, in the name of Hina Bokhari AM was agreed with 13 votes being cast in favour and no votes being cast against.
- 6.6 Unmesh Desai AM proposed, and Léonie Cooper AM seconded the following motion:

"This Assembly notes that different pay models exist for different employers, such as schools, councils, the NHS and the Metropolitan Police.

This Assembly further notes that there is a mismatch between which boroughs are considered inner or outer London within the same workplace. Teachers in a school can find themselves being paid inner London Weighting, while school support staff in the same school can find themselves paid outer London weighting due to differing pay arrangements. Boroughs in which this occurs include Barking and Dagenham, Brent, Ealing, Greenwich, Haringey, Merton and Newham. In all other London boroughs, teachers and school support staffs' London weighting is aligned with both sets of employees being graded the same category.

Furthermore, there is disparity between the working conditions within schools as over 95 per cent of school support staff are paid 'term-time only' contracts. This has resulted in substantial financial pressure on support staffs' families and significant issues for schools in terms of retention and recruitment.

School support staff play a vital role in the education of our children. Yet schools are facing issues with retention for teaching assistants, those in facilities, catering, cleaners, administrative staff and those dealing with children with Special Educational Needs within schools.

This Assembly welcomes the GMB's 'Weighting for Change' campaign, calling for redress for those who work for councils, often within schools, to be paid inner London weighting where other professions, such as teachers, receive an enhanced inner payment.

The standardisation in London weighting is imperative to improve recruitment and retention of public sector workers, but also is a necessity to provide dignity in the cost-of-living crisis. This Assembly welcomes the Mayor's commitment to London weighting and notes that he committed to gather evidence on how it is applied and lobby for greater consistency.

This Assembly calls for:

- all London Borough's employing support staff on outer London weighting in schools where teachers are employed on inner London weighting, to address this inequitable and egregious abnormality;
- the Mayor to continue to lobby for greater London weighting parity between the rates paid by public sector employers such as schools, police, NHS and councils;
- the Mayor to look at introducing an independent pay board to fairly set London weighting, and to include London weighting in the Good Work Standard;
- the Mayor to support the GMB's 'Weighting for Change' campaign; and
- the Mayor to report back to the Assembly what progress has been made with regards to London weighting within the next 6 months."
- 6.7 Neil Garratt AM proposed and Keith Prince AM seconded, the following amendment to the motion, to delete the wording in strikethrough text:

"This Assembly notes that different pay models exist for different employers, such as schools, councils, the NHS and the Metropolitan Police.

This Assembly further notes that there is a mismatch between which boroughs are considered inner or outer London within the same workplace. Teachers in a school can find themselves being paid inner London Weighting, while school support staff in the same school can find themselves paid outer London weighting due to differing pay arrangements. Boroughs in which this occurs include Barking and Dagenham, Brent, Ealing, Greenwich, Haringey, Merton and Newham. In all other London boroughs, teachers and school support staffs' London weighting is aligned with both sets of employees being graded the same category.

Furthermore, there is disparity between the working conditions within schools as over 95 per cent of school support staff are paid 'term-time only' contracts. This has resulted in substantial financial pressure on support staffs' families and significant issues for schools in terms of retention and recruitment.

School support staff play a vital role in the education of our children. Yet schools are facing issues with retention for teaching assistants, those in facilities, catering, cleaners, administrative staff and those dealing with children with Special Educational Needs within schools.

This Assembly welcomes the GMB's 'Weighting for Change' campaign, calling for redress for those who work for councils, often within schools, to be paid inner London weighting where other professions, such as teachers, receive an enhanced inner payment.

The standardisation in London weighting is imperative to improve recruitment and retention of public sector workers, but also is a necessity to provide dignity in the cost of-living crisis.

This Assembly welcomes the Mayor's commitment to London weighting and notes that he committed to gather evidence on how it is applied and lobby for greater consistency.

This Assembly calls for:

- all London Borough's employing support staff on outer London weighting in schools where teachers are employed on inner London weighting, to address this inequitable and egregious abnormality;
- the Mayor to continue to lobby for greater London weighting parity between the rates paid by public sector employers such as schools, police, NHS and councils;
- the Mayor to look at introducing an independent pay board to fairly set London weighting, and to include London weighting in the Good Work Standard;
- the Mayor to support the GMB's 'Weighting for Change' campaign; and
- the Mayor to report back to the Assembly what progress has been made with regards to London weighting within the next 6 months."
- 6.8 Upon being put to a vote, the amendment, was carried, with 10 votes being cast in favour and 8 votes being cast against.
- 6.9 Following debate and upon being put to a vote, the motion as amended, namely:

"This Assembly notes that different pay models exist for different employers, such as schools, councils, the NHS and the Metropolitan Police.

This Assembly further notes that there is a mismatch between which boroughs are considered inner or outer London within the same workplace. Teachers in a school can find themselves being paid inner London Weighting, while school support staff in the same school can find themselves paid outer London weighting due to differing pay arrangements. Boroughs in which this occurs include Barking and Dagenham, Brent, Ealing, Greenwich, Haringey, Merton and Newham. In all other London boroughs, teachers and school support staffs' London weighting is aligned with both sets of employees being graded the same category.

Furthermore, there is disparity between the working conditions within schools as over 95 per cent of school support staff are paid 'term-time only' contracts. This has resulted in substantial financial pressure on support staffs' families and significant issues for schools in terms of retention and recruitment.

School support staff play a vital role in the education of our children. Yet schools are facing issues with retention for teaching assistants, those in facilities, catering, cleaners, administrative staff and those dealing with children with Special Educational Needs within schools.

This Assembly welcomes the GMB's 'Weighting for Change' campaign, calling for redress for those who work for councils, often within schools, to be paid inner London weighting where other professions, such as teachers, receive an enhanced inner payment.

The standardisation in London weighting is imperative to improve recruitment and retention of public sector workers, but also is a necessity to provide dignity in the cost of-living crisis.

This Assembly welcomes the Mayor's commitment to London weighting and notes that he committed to gather evidence on how it is applied and lobby for greater consistency.

This Assembly calls for:

- all London Borough's employing support staff on outer London weighting in schools where teachers are employed on inner London weighting, to address this inequitable and egregious abnormality;
- the Mayor to continue to lobby for greater London weighting parity between the rates paid by public sector employers such as schools, police, NHS and councils:
- the Mayor to look at introducing an independent pay board to fairly set London weighting, and to include London weighting in the Good Work Standard; and
- the Mayor to report back to the Assembly what progress has been made with regards to London weighting within the next 6 months."

was agreed unanimously.

6.10 Neil Garratt AM proposed, and Siân Berry AM seconded the following motion:

"This Assembly strongly supports the Mayor's aspiration for no one to be killed in or by a London bus by 2030, and for all deaths and serious injuries from road collisions to be eliminated from London's streets by 2041, and stands with all victims and their families.

However, this Assembly is very concerned that this aspiration seems unlikely to be met on current trends given Transport for London's 7th September 2023 Bus Safety strategy showed more people were killed or seriously injured by London's buses in 2022 than in 2016 when the current Mayor took office. In addition, the Mayor's own target for a 70 per cent reduction in people killed or seriously injured in or by a bus by 2022 was not met and the current reduction from the 2005-09 baseline is 54 per cent.

This Assembly was therefore encouraged by the Mayor's promise to "take away the idea" that the TfL Commissioner should include the number of those hospitalised by or on TfL buses in the Commissioner's Report to the TfL Board.

This Assembly is concerned that, without significant improvement, a continuation of the current trend on bus-related KSIs (killed or seriously injured) would mean the Mayor missing his target. This Assembly calls on the Mayor to give an update to Londoners on how Vision Zero for London's buses will now be reached, and any further interim targets.

As an immediate step, this Assembly further believes that the Commissioner should include both the number of bus-related KSIs and significantly more detail on those KSIs in the Commissioner's report so that the TfL Board is aware of both the level and trend in bus KSI data, and thus better able to do its job in holding Transport for London to account."

- 6.11 Following debate and upon being put to a vote, the motion, in the name of Neil Garratt AM, was agreed unanimously.
- 6.12 Emma Best AM proposed, and Peter Fortune AM seconded the following motion:

"This Assembly welcomes the positive steps taken in response to the climate emergency, specifically the design of four 'Pathways to Net Zero Carbon', each outlining different approaches to accelerate action in the capital to reduce carbon emissions.

This Assembly notes that the 'Accelerated Green' pathway has been selected as the preferred route to reaching net zero in London by the Mayor of London, part of which estimates hydrogen demand in industrial processes will stand at approximately 0.3TWh per year by 2030.

Cadent, SGN and National Gas are currently undertaking their Capital Hydrogen programme, working alongside key stakeholders to identify and realise the potential of hydrogen in London's net zero transition. They have spent the past six months working with industrial users and producers, gathering hydrogen forecasts to further understand what supply and demand could look like.

Forecasts received from just 15 industrial users across 19 sites all north of the Thames in East London, has suggested demand could total 2.0TWh per annum by 2030, far exceeding the predicted estimates within the 'Accelerated Green scenario' in just one part of London. Many of these customers have told Cadent that they have no other option than to convert to hydrogen as a dominant energy source, presenting a potential risk for long term economic prospects in the region if hydrogen supply and end use is not realised.

This Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor to re-evaluate whether the hydrogen supply and demand targets outlined in the 'Pathways to Net Zero Carbon' and in the chosen 'Accelerated Green' scenario are representative of business needs in London, and amend where required.

Given this, the Assembly would also call for a review of how we monitor progress of the Net Zero Carbon Pathways action plan to ensure targets align with the expectations of businesses and customers.

And finally, this Assembly calls on the Mayor and Chair of Assembly to write to the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero highlighting these findings and urging the Government to establish a more ambitious commitment for hydrogen production, distribution, and end use across the country. "

6.13 Zack Polanski AM proposed, and Léonie Cooper AM seconded, the following amendment to the motion, to add the wording set out in bold below and to delete the wording in strikethrough text:

"This Assembly welcomes the positive steps taken in response to the climate emergency, specifically the design of four 'Pathways to Net Zero Carbon', each outlining different approaches to accelerate action in the capital to reduce carbon emissions.

This Assembly notes that the 'Accelerated Green' pathway has been selected as the preferred route to reaching net zero in London by the Mayor of London, part of which estimates hydrogen demand in industrial processes will stand at approximately 0.3TWh per year by 2030.

Cadent, SGN and National Gas are currently undertaking their Capital Hydrogen programme, working alongside key stakeholders to identify and realise the potential of hydrogen in London's net zero transition. They have spent the past six months working with industrial users and producers, gathering hydrogen forecasts to further understand what supply and demand could look like.

Forecasts received from just 15 industrial users across 19 sites all north of the Thames in East London, has suggested demand could total 2.0TWh per annum by 2030, far exceeding the predicted estimates within the 'Accelerated Green scenario' in just one part of London. Many of these customers have told Cadent that they have no other option than to convert to hydrogen as a dominant energy source, presenting a potential risk for long term economic prospects in the region if hydrogen supply and end use is not realised.

We particularly note that the companies named above are currently heavily invested in natural gas and therefore the need expressed during this exercise must be assessed and independently analysed.

We also note that the source for the hydrogen projected to be used by these businesses is a crucial factor in any decarbonisation plan. There will be an accompanying massive scaling up of renewables needed to ensure London's businesses can access sufficient green hydrogen, otherwise it will be obtained from fossil fuel sources.

This Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor to re-evaluate whether the hydrogen supply and demand targets outlined in the 'Pathways to Net Zero Carbon' and in the chosen 'Accelerated

Green' scenario are representative of business needs in London **and independently assess this**. amend where required.

Given this, the Assembly would also call for a review of how we monitor progress of the Net Zero Carbon Pathways action plan to ensure targets align with the expectations of businesses and customers.

And finally, this Assembly calls on the Mayor and Chair of Assembly to write to the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero highlighting these findings and urging the Government to establish a more ambitious commitment for **green** hydrogen production, distribution, and end use across the country. "

- 6.14 In accordance with Standing Order 3.6, Emma Best AM accepted the amendment to the motion in her name.
- 6.15 Following debate and upon being put to a vote, the motion as altered, namely:

"This Assembly welcomes the positive steps taken in response to the climate emergency, specifically the design of four 'Pathways to Net Zero Carbon', each outlining different approaches to accelerate action in the capital to reduce carbon emissions.

This Assembly notes that the 'Accelerated Green' pathway has been selected as the preferred route to reaching net zero in London by the Mayor of London, part of which estimates hydrogen demand in industrial processes will stand at approximately 0.3TWh per year by 2030.

Cadent, SGN and National Gas are currently undertaking their Capital Hydrogen programme, working alongside key stakeholders to identify and realise the potential of hydrogen in London's net zero transition. They have spent the past six months working with industrial users and producers, gathering hydrogen forecasts to further understand what supply and demand could look like.

Forecasts received from just 15 industrial users across 19 sites all north of the Thames in East London, has suggested demand could total 2.0TWh per annum by 2030, far exceeding the predicted estimates within the 'Accelerated Green scenario' in just one part of London. Many of these customers have told Cadent that they have no other option than to convert to hydrogen as a dominant energy source, presenting a potential risk for long term economic prospects in the region if hydrogen supply and end use is not realised.

We particularly note that the companies named above are currently heavily invested in natural gas and therefore the need expressed during this exercise must be assessed and independently analysed.

We also note that the source for the hydrogen projected to be used by these businesses is a crucial factor in any decarbonisation plan. There will be an accompanying massive scaling up of renewables needed to ensure London's

businesses can access sufficient green hydrogen, otherwise it will be obtained from fossil fuel sources.

This Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor to re-evaluate whether the hydrogen supply and demand targets outlined in the 'Pathways to Net Zero Carbon' and in the chosen 'Accelerated Green' scenario are representative of business needs in London and independently assess this.

Given this, the Assembly would also call for a review of how we monitor progress of the Net Zero Carbon Pathways action plan to ensure targets align with the expectations of businesses and customers.

And finally, this Assembly calls on the Mayor and Chair of Assembly to write to the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero highlighting these findings and urging the Government to establish a more ambitious commitment for green hydrogen production, distribution, and end use across the country. "

was agreed unanimously.

7 Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent (Item 10)

7.1 In accordance with section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Chair agreed to accept an urgent item of business. The urgent item was admitted to the agenda on the grounds that this was the last London Assembly (Plenary) meeting before the expiry of the term of office of the current Independent Persons and the report was not available until after the publication of the agenda.

7a Appointment of Independent Persons (Item 10a)

7.2 The Assembly received a report from the Greater London Authority's Monitoring Officer.

7.3 **Resolved:**

- (a) That the appointment of Suzanne McCarthy and Alan Simcock as Independent Persons under Section 28(7) of the Localism Act 2011 be extended to 2 May 2024, noting that this matter is a joint decision with the Mayor;
- (b) That Suzanne McCarthy and Farhat Sadik be appointed as Independent Persons under Section 28(7) of the Localism Act 2011 for the period 3 May 2024 to 30 April 2026, noting that such appointments are subject also to approval by the Mayor; and
- (c) That with effect from 3 May 2024, each Independent Person be paid £1250 per annum as an allowance payable in April each year for the work undertaken in the previous year.

- 7.4 The Chair proposed, and it was agreed, that Standing Order 2.9B be suspended to extend the meeting in order for the remaining items of business on the agenda to be considered.
- 7.5 The meeting adjourned at 11.05am, reconvening at 12.30pm

8 Question and Answer Session: Housing in London (Item 4)

Part A:

- 8.1 The Assembly put questions to the following guests on housing issues in London:
 - Tom Copley, Deputy Mayor for Housing and Residential Development;
 - Tim Steer, Executive Director of Housing and Land, Greater London Authority (GLA);
 - Kate Webb, Head of Housing Strategy, GLA;
 - Lisa Fairmaner, Head of the London Plan and Growth Strategy, GLA;
 - Fiona Fletcher-Smith, Chair of the G15 Group of Housing Associations in London;
 - Alistair Smyth, Director of Policy and Research, National Housing Federation;
 - Robert Colvile, Director of the Centre for Policy Studies; and
 - Conor O'Shea, Policy and Public Affairs Manager, Generation Rent.
- The record of the questions put by Assembly Members and the answers given is attached as **Appendix 1.** Written answers provided following the meeting are attached as **Appendix 2**.
- 8.3 During the course of the discussion, the Deputy Mayor for Housing and Residential Development undertook:
 - To write to the Assembly with information on what has been done to address failings in housing identified by the Kerslake review, such as asset management plans being out of date and fragmented approach to housing delivery;
 - To share with the Assembly the report on lessons learnt from the Affordable Housing Programme 2016/23;
 - To consider whether GLA funding could be used to target empty homes in London; and
 - To provide details of the percentage target for wheelchair accessible properties within the Council Homes Acquisition Programme.
- 8.4 During the course of the discussion, the Head of the London Plan and Growth Strategy, GLA undertook:
 - To provide the criteria by which participants were recruited to deliberative events hosted by the GLA on housing challenges in London.

8.5	During the course of the discussion,	the Policy and	Public Affairs	Manager,	Generation	Rent
	undertook:					

• To share with the Assembly a report published by Generation Rent on the trends of private renters within the UK and specifically within London.

Part B:

8.6 At the conclusion of the question-and-answer session, the Chair formally moved the motion on the agenda in his name, namely:

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

8.7 **Resolved:**

That the answers to the questions asked be noted.

- 9 Future Meetings of the Assembly (Item 8)
- 9.1 **Resolved:**

That the London Assembly uses the 8 February 2024 Plenary meeting to principally hold a question-and-answer session on fire and resilience in London with the Mayor of London, Deputy Mayor for Fire and Resilience and the London Fire Commissioner.

10 Date of Next Meeting (Item 9)

10.1 The next scheduled meeting of the London Assembly was the Mayor's Question Time meeting which would take place at 10.00am on Thursday 21 December 2023 in the Chamber, City Hall.

11 Close of Meeting

11.1 The meeting ended at 2.50pm.

Chair	Date

Contact Officer: Nikoleta Kemp, Principal Committee Manager; Email: nikoleta.kemp@london.gov.uk