

AGENDA

Meeting **London Assembly (Plenary)**

Date **Tuesday 8 September 2015**

Time **10.00 am**

Place **Chamber, City Hall, The Queen's
Walk, London, SE1 2AA**

Copies of the reports and any attachments may be found at
www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/whole-assembly

Most meetings of the London Assembly and its Committees are webcast live at
www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/webcasts where you can also view past meetings.

A meeting of the Assembly will be held to deal with the business listed below.

Jennette Arnold OBE AM
Chair of the London Assembly

Tony Arbour AM
Deputy Chairman
Friday 28 August 2015

Further Information

If you have questions, would like further information about the meeting or require special facilities please contact: John Barry, Principal Committee Manager; Telephone: 020 7983 4425; Email: john.barry@london.gov.uk; Minicom: 020 7983 4458.

For media enquiries please contact: Alison Bell; Telephone: 020 7983 5769;
Email: alison.bell@london.gov.uk; Minicom: 020 7983 4458. If you have any questions about individual items please contact the author whose details are at the end of the report.

This meeting will be open to the public, except for where exempt information is being discussed as noted on the agenda. A guide for the press and public on attending and reporting meetings of local government bodies, including the use of film, photography, social media and other means is available at www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Openness-in-Meetings.pdf.

There is access for disabled people, and induction loops are available. There is limited underground parking for orange and blue badge holders, which will be allocated on a first-come first-served basis. Please contact Facilities Management on 020 7983 4750 in advance if you require a parking space or further information.

Proper Officer: Mark Roberts, Executive Director of Secretariat.

If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of the agenda, minutes or reports in large print or Braille, audio, or in another language, then please call us on 020 7983 4100 or email assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Si usted, o algùn conocido desea recibir una copia del order del día, acta o informe en Braille o en su propio idioma, y gratis, no dude en ponerse en contacto con nosotros llamando al teléfano 020 7983 4100 o por correo electrónico: assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Se você, ou alguém que conheça precisa uma cópia da ordem do dia, anotações ou relatorios em prensa grande ou Braille, ou em outra lingu, então por favour nos telephone em 020 7983 4100 ou e-mail assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Haddii ama ama qof aad taqaanid, uu ugu baahan yahay koobiga ajendhada, haddaladii ama warbixinta in far waaweyn loogu qoro ama farta qofka indoolaha akhrin karo, amaba luuqad kale, fadlan naga soo wac telefoonkan 020 7983 4100 ama email assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

Ta ba ri eniken ti o ba ni ife ni eda ewe nla ti igbimo awon asoju tabi papa julo ni ede ti abinibi won, ki o kansiya lori ero ibanisoro. Nomba wa ni 020 7983 4100 tabi ki e kan si wa lori ero assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

જો તમને અથવા તમે જાણતાં હો તેવી કોઈ વ્યક્તિને એજન્ડા (કાર્યસૂચિ), મિનિટ્સ (ટૂંકી નોંધો) અથવા રિપોર્ટ્સ (અહેવાલો)ની નકલ મોટા અક્ષરોમાં છપાયેલી કે બ્રેઈલમાં અથવા બીજી કોઈ ભાષામાં જોઈતી હોય, તો કૃપા કરીને 020 7983 4100 ઉપર ફોન અથવા assembly.translations@london.gov.uk ઉપર અમને ઈ-મેઈલ કરો.

আপনি বা আপনার পরিচিত কেউ যদি এজেন্ডা, মিনিট বা রিপোর্টের একটি কপি বড় ছাপা বা ব্রেইল অথবা অন্য কোন ভাষায় পেতে চান তবে দয়া করে আমাদেরকে 020 7983 4100 এ নাম্বারে ফোন করুন বা assembly.translations@london.gov.uk এ ই-মেইলে যোগাযোগ করুন।

ਜੇ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਜਾਂ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਵਾਕਫ਼ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਵਿਅਕਤੀ ਨੂੰ, ਏਜੰਡੇ, ਮੀਟਿੰਗ ਦੀ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਂ ਰਿਪੋਰਟਾਂ ਦੀ ਕਾਪੀ, ਵੱਡੇ ਅੱਖਰਾਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਛਪਾਈ ਜਾਂ ਬਰੇਲ ਦੇ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਜਾਂ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਬੋਲੀ ਵਿੱਚ ਚਾਹੀਦੀ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਸਾਨੂੰ 020 7983 4100 'ਤੇ ਟੈਲੀਫ਼ੋਨ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ ਇਸ ਪਤੇ 'ਤੇ ਈਮੇਲ ਕਰੋ : assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

اگر آپ یا آپ کے جاننے والے کسی فرد کو اس ایجنڈا کی کاپی، تفصیل یا رپورٹیں بڑے پرنٹ یا بریل یا کسی دوسری زبان میں درکار ہوں تو براہ کرم ہمیں 020 7983 4100 پر فون کیجئے یا درج ذیل ای میل پر رابطہ کیجئے assembly.translations@london.gov.uk



Certificate Number: FS 80233

Agenda
London Assembly (Plenary)
Tuesday 8 September 2015

1 Apologies for Absence and Chair's Announcements

To receive any apologies for absence and any announcements from the Chair.

2 Declarations of Interests (Pages 1 - 4)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: John Barry, john.barry@london.gov.uk, tel: 020 7983 4425

The Assembly is recommended to:

- (a) Note the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table at Agenda Item 2, as disclosable pecuniary interests;**
- (b) Note the declaration by any Member(s) of any disclosable pecuniary interests in specific items listed on the agenda and the necessary action taken by the Member(s) regarding withdrawal following such declaration(s); and**
- (c) Note the declaration by any Member(s) of any other interests deemed to be relevant (including any interests arising from gifts and hospitality received which are not at the time of the meeting reflected on the Authority's register of gifts and hospitality, and noting also the advice from the GLA's Monitoring Officer set out at Agenda Item 2) and to note any necessary action taken by the Member(s) following such declaration(s).**

3 Minutes (Pages 5 - 24)

The Assembly is recommended to confirm the minutes of the London Assembly meetings held on 1 July 2015 (Plenary) and 15 July 2015 (Mayor's Question Time) meeting held on to be signed by the Chair as a correct record.

The appendices to the minutes of the 1 July 2015 (Assembly Plenary) and 15 July 2015 (Mayor's Question Time) meetings, including transcripts from both sessions and written answers from the Mayor's Question Time meeting, have been circulated to Members separately. Transcripts and written answers for past meetings can be downloaded from www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/whole-assembly

4 Question and Answer Session (Pages 25 - 26)

Part A:

The Assembly will put questions to Sir Howard Davies, Chair of the Airports Commission, on the Commission's final report.

Part B:

Motion submitted in the name of the Chair:

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

5 Action Taken Under Delegated Authority (Pages 27 - 28)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: John Barry, john.barry@london.gov.uk, tel: 020 7983 4425

The Assembly is recommended to note the action taken by the Chair under delegated authority, namely to agree, in consultation with the Deputy Chairman and party Group Leaders, the subject matter and detailed arrangements for the London Assembly (Plenary) meeting held on 1 July 2015.

6 Petition (Pages 29 - 32)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: John Barry, john.barry@london.gov.uk, tel: 020 7983 4425

The Assembly is recommended to receive and note the petitions listed at paragraph 4 of this report and to decide whether to refer the petitions, and if so where to, and to seek a response to the points raised.

7 Petitions Update (Pages 33 - 36)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: John Barry, john.barry@london.gov.uk, tel: 020 7983 4425

The Assembly is recommended to note the response received to a petition presented at a recent Assembly (Plenary) meeting.

8 Motions (Pages 37 - 40)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: John Barry, john.barry@london.gov.uk, tel: 020 7983 4425

The Assembly is asked to consider motions submitted by Assembly Members.

9 Future Meetings of the Assembly

It is proposed that the Assembly uses the Assembly (Plenary) meeting on 4 November 2015 meeting principally to hold a question and answer session with Sir Edward Lister, Chairman, London & Partners, and Gordon Innes, Chief Executive Officer, London & Partners, on the work of London & Partners.

Recommendation:

That the Assembly agrees to use the 4 November 2015 meeting principally to hold a question and answer session with Sir Edward Lister, Chairman of London & Partners, and Gordon Innes, Chief Executive Officer of London & Partners, on the work of London & Partners.

10 Date of Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting of the London Assembly will be the Mayor's Question Time meeting which will take place at 10.00am on Wednesday 16 September 2015 in the Chamber, City Hall.

11 Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent

This page is intentionally left blank

Subject: Declarations of Interests

Report to: London Assembly (Plenary)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 8 September 2015

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report sets out details of offices held by Assembly Members for noting as disclosable pecuniary interests and requires additional relevant declarations relating to disclosable pecuniary interests, and gifts and hospitality to be made.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 **That the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table below, be noted as disclosable pecuniary interests¹;**
- 2.2 **That the declaration by any Member(s) of any disclosable pecuniary interests in specific items listed on the agenda and the necessary action taken by the Member(s) regarding withdrawal following such declaration(s) be noted; and**
- 2.3 **That the declaration by any Member(s) of any other interests deemed to be relevant (including any interests arising from gifts and hospitality received which are not at the time of the meeting reflected on the Authority's register of gifts and hospitality, and noting also the advice from the GLA's Monitoring Officer set out at below) and any necessary action taken by the Member(s) following such declaration(s) be noted.**

3. Issues for Consideration

- 3.1 Relevant offices held by Assembly Members are listed in the table overleaf:

¹ The Monitoring Officer advises that: Paragraph 10 of the Code of Conduct will only preclude a Member from participating in any matter to be considered or being considered at, for example, a meeting of the Assembly, where the Member has a direct Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in that particular matter. The effect of this is that the 'matter to be considered, or being considered' must be about the Member's interest. So, by way of example, if an Assembly Member is also a councillor of London Borough X, that Assembly Member will be precluded from participating in an Assembly meeting where the Assembly is to consider a matter about the Member's role / employment as a councillor of London Borough X; the Member will not be precluded from participating in a meeting where the Assembly is to consider a matter about an activity or decision of London Borough X.

Member	Interest
Tony Arbour AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Richmond
Jennette Arnold OBE AM	Committee of the Regions
Gareth Bacon AM	Chairman of LFEPA; Chairman of the London Local Resilience Forum; Member, LB Bexley
Mayor John Biggs AM	Mayor of Tower Hamlets (LB); Member, LLDC Board
Andrew Boff AM	Member, LFEPA; Congress of Local and Regional Authorities (Council of Europe)
Victoria Borwick AM MP	Member of Parliament; Member, Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
James Cleverly AM MP	Member of Parliament
Tom Copley AM	Member, LFEPA
Andrew Dismore AM	Member, LFEPA
Len Duvall AM	
Roger Evans AM	Deputy Mayor; Committee of the Regions; Trust for London (Trustee)
Nicky Gavron AM	
Darren Johnson AM	Member, LFEPA
Jenny Jones AM	Member, House of Lords
Stephen Knight AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Richmond
Kit Malthouse AM MP	Member of Parliament
Joanne McCartney AM	
Steve O'Connell AM	Member, LB Croydon; MOPAC Non-Executive Adviser for Neighbourhoods
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM	
Murad Qureshi AM	Congress of Local and Regional Authorities (Council of Europe)
Dr Onkar Sahota AM	
Navin Shah AM	
Valerie Shawcross CBE AM	
Richard Tracey AM	Chairman of the London Waste and Recycling Board; Mayor's Ambassador for River Transport
Fiona Twycross AM	Member, LFEPA

[Note: LB - London Borough; LFEPA - London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority; LLDC – London Legacy Development Corporation; MOPAC – Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime]

3.2 Paragraph 10 of the GLA's Code of Conduct, which reflects the relevant provisions of the Localism Act 2011, provides that:

- where an Assembly Member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter to be considered or being considered or at
 - (i) a meeting of the Assembly and any of its committees or sub-committees; or
 - (ii) any formal meeting held by the Mayor in connection with the exercise of the Authority's functions
- they must disclose that interest to the meeting (or, if it is a sensitive interest, disclose the fact that they have a sensitive interest to the meeting); and
- must not (i) participate, or participate any further, in any discussion of the matter at the meeting; or (ii) participate in any vote, or further vote, taken on the matter at the meeting

UNLESS

- they have obtained a dispensation from the GLA's Monitoring Officer (in accordance with section 2 of the Procedure for registration and declarations of interests, gifts and hospitality – Appendix 5 to the Code).

- 3.3 Failure to comply with the above requirements, without reasonable excuse, is a criminal offence; as is knowingly or recklessly providing information about your interests that is false or misleading.
- 3.4 In addition, the Monitoring Officer has advised Assembly Members to continue to apply the test that was previously applied to help determine whether a pecuniary / prejudicial interest was arising - namely, that Members rely on a reasonable estimation of whether a member of the public, with knowledge of the relevant facts, could, with justification, regard the matter as so significant that it would be likely to prejudice the Member's judgement of the public interest.
- 3.5 Members should then exercise their judgement as to whether or not, in view of their interests and the interests of others close to them, they should participate in any given discussions and/or decisions business of within and by the GLA. It remains the responsibility of individual Members to make further declarations about their actual or apparent interests at formal meetings noting also that a Member's failure to disclose relevant interest(s) has become a potential criminal offence.
- 3.6 Members are also required, where considering a matter which relates to or is likely to affect a person from whom they have received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25 within the previous three years or from the date of election to the London Assembly, whichever is the later, to disclose the existence and nature of that interest at any meeting of the Authority which they attend at which that business is considered.
- 3.7 The obligation to declare any gift or hospitality at a meeting is discharged, subject to the proviso set out below, by registering gifts and hospitality received on the Authority's on-line database. The on-line database may be viewed here:
<http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/gifts-and-hospitality>.
- 3.8 If any gift or hospitality received by a Member is not set out on the on-line database at the time of the meeting, and under consideration is a matter which relates to or is likely to affect a person from whom a Member has received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25, Members are asked to disclose these at the meeting, either at the declarations of interest agenda item or when the interest becomes apparent.
- 3.9 It is for Members to decide, in light of the particular circumstances, whether their receipt of a gift or hospitality, could, on a reasonable estimation of a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts, with justification, be regarded as so significant that it would be likely to prejudice the Member's judgement of the public interest. Where receipt of a gift or hospitality could be so regarded, the Member must exercise their judgement as to whether or not, they should participate in any given discussions and/or decisions business of within and by the GLA.

4. Legal Implications

- 4.1 The legal implications are as set out in the body of this report.

5. Financial Implications

- 5.1 There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
--

List of Background Papers: None

Contact Officer: John Barry, Principal Committee Manager
--

Telephone: 020 7983 4425

E-mail: john.barry@london.gov.uk

MINUTES

Meeting: London Assembly (Plenary)

Date: Wednesday 1 July 2015

Time: 10.00 am

Place: Chamber, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA

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

Present:

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair)	Stephen Knight AM
Gareth Bacon AM	Kit Malthouse AM MP
John Biggs AM	Steve O'Connell AM
Victoria Borwick AM MP	Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM
James Cleverly AM MP	Murad Qureshi AM
Tom Copley AM	Navin Shah AM
Andrew Dismore AM	Valerie Shawcross CBE AM
Nicky Gavron AM	Richard Tracey AM
Darren Johnson AM	Fiona Twycross AM
Jenny Jones AM	

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

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Tony Arbour AM, Andrew Boff AM, Roger Evans AM, Len Duvall AM, Joanne McCartney AM and Dr Onkar Sahota AM.

2 Declarations of Interests (Item 2)

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

2.2 **Resolved:**

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

3 Minutes (Item 3)

3.1 **Resolved:**

That the minutes of the 3 June 2015 London Assembly (Plenary) meeting be signed by the Chair as a correct record.

4 Question and Answer Session (Item 4)

Part A:

4.1 The Assembly put questions to Harvey McGrath, Deputy Chair of the London Enterprise Panel (LEP), and Cathy Walsh OBE, Further Education Representative on the LEP.

4.2 The record of the questions put by Assembly Members and the answers given is attached as **Appendix 1**.

Part B:

4.3 The Chair formally moved the motion on the agenda, namely:

“That the Assembly notes the answers to the questions asked.”

4.4 **Resolved:**

That the answers to the questions asked be noted.

4.5 At the conclusion of the question and answer session, at 11.41am, and in accordance with Standing Order 2.2(C), the Chair adjourned the meeting until 11.51am in order to allow the Assembly time to consider proposed amendments to motions.

5 Motions (Item 5)

- 5.1 The Assembly received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.
- 5.2 Andrew Dismore AM moved and Jennette Arnold OBE AM seconded the following motion, altered in accordance with Standing Order 3.6A (1), with the consent of the meeting:

“This Assembly condemns the decision of a number of fringe extreme right wing groups to hold a rally in Golders Green on 4th July, **and welcomes the decision of the Metropolitan Police to impose conditions to move the event away from the area and to limit its time and duration. This is highly provocative and is** ~~The decision to hold the rally in Golders Green was~~ intended to insult and incite hatred against the Jewish community **and, by being held on Shabbat, clearly an attempt to provoke a reaction from local residents.**

“2014 saw a significant rise in **anti-Semitic** attacks in London, including in Barnet where the rally is to be held, and after the deadly events in Paris and Copenhagen targeting Jews and others, London’s Jewish community is understandably apprehensive about its security. **Irrespective of its location, this event is** designed to play on those fears and the risk of violence against Jewish residents and businesses is clearly present.

“Whilst the demonstration cannot be banned, this Assembly calls upon the Mayor to support ~~a the~~ peaceful, community-led ~~counter-protest, solidarity plan to decorate Golders Green in green and gold colours on 3 July,~~ including permitting TfL street furniture to be decorated ~~with green and gold~~ as part of the community’s response. **and**

“Further, this Assembly calls upon the Metropolitan Police Commissioner to ensure that the most stringent conditions possible are imposed on the far right rally **in its new location,** so as to avoid serious disorder and serious disruption to the local community, **and to continue taking action to close down the anti-Semitic website advertising the event and to prosecute those responsible for it.”**

- 5.3 Upon being put to the vote, the revised motion in the name of Andrew Dismore AM, namely:

“This Assembly condemns the decision of a number of fringe extreme right wing groups to hold a rally in Golders Green on 4th July, and welcomes the decision of the Metropolitan Police to impose conditions to move the event away from the area and to limit its time and duration. The decision to hold the rally in Golders Green was intended to insult and incite hatred against the Jewish community and, by being held on Shabbat, clearly an attempt to provoke a reaction from local residents.

2014 saw a significant rise in anti-Semitic attacks in London, including in Barnet where the rally is to be held, and after the deadly events in Paris and Copenhagen targeting Jews and others, London’s Jewish community is understandably apprehensive about its security. Irrespective of its location, this event is designed to

play on those fears and the risk of violence against Jewish residents and businesses is clearly present.

Whilst the demonstration cannot be banned, this Assembly calls upon the Mayor to support the peaceful, community-led solidarity plan to decorate Golders Green in green and gold colours on 3 July, including permitting TfL street furniture to be decorated as part of the community's response.

Further, this Assembly calls upon the Metropolitan Police Commissioner to ensure that the most stringent conditions possible are imposed on the far right rally in its new location, so as to avoid serious disorder and serious disruption to the local community, and to continue taking action to close down the anti-Semitic website advertising the event and to prosecute those responsible for it."

was agreed (with 15 votes cast in favour and one abstention).

5.4 Darren Johnson AM moved and Fiona Twycross AM seconded the following motion:

"This Assembly notes the GLA's recent projects for Crystal Palace Park, including: the collapsed deal with the ZhongRong Group to build a major commercial development on the hill top of Crystal Palace Park, which the Mayor secretly brokered following the London 2012 Games without the involvement of local stakeholder groups^[1]; its draft plans to radically redevelop the National Sports Centre and grounds with a significant loss of sporting facilities, which only involved the local sporting community after significant protest^[2]; and the park's designation, without a clear rationale, in the London Plan as an Outer London Development Centre.

This Assembly notes that the Mayor is continuing to pursue secretive discussions with companies regarding building on the park's hill top^[3], and believes he risks repeating the mistakes of the ZhongRong Group proposals, which resulted in the loss of £4.5 million from the Heritage Lottery Fund^[4] and eighteen wasted months during which community projects were suspended.

This Assembly also welcomes that the local community is progressing plans for a Crystal Palace Neighbourhood Forum^[5], and that Bromley Council is working with local stakeholders to establish a community trust to govern Crystal Palace Park^[6].

^[1] The Mayor met Mr Ni Zhaoxing at the Games, and officers first held meetings in February 2013. Plans were not made public until October of that year.

^[2] See, for example, <https://crystalpalacesp.files.wordpress.com/2014/11/press-statement-11-11-14.pdf>

^[3] http://questions.london.gov.uk/QuestionSearch/searchclient/questions/question_275672

^[4] http://questions.london.gov.uk/QuestionSearch/searchclient/questions/question_282130

^[5] <http://www.crystalpalacepark.org.uk/2014/heritage-lottery-fund-application-fails/>

^[6] http://questions.london.gov.uk/QuestionSearch/searchclient/questions/question_275673

^[6] http://www.bromley.gov.uk/press/article/984/improving_crystal_palace_park_taking_shape

This Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor to end any private discussions about proposals for development on the park, and engage openly and transparently with the emerging community trust and Neighbourhood Forum in developing any future projects for the park and wider area.”

5.5 Upon being put to the vote, the motion in the name of Darren Johnson AM, namely:

“This Assembly notes the GLA’s recent projects for Crystal Palace Park, including: the collapsed deal with the ZhongRong Group to build a major commercial development on the hill top of Crystal Palace Park, which the Mayor secretly brokered following the London 2012 Games without the involvement of local stakeholder groups^[1]; its draft plans to radically redevelop the National Sports Centre and grounds with a significant loss of sporting facilities, which only involved the local sporting community after significant protest^[2]; and the park’s designation, without a clear rationale, in the London Plan as an Outer London Development Centre.

This Assembly notes that the Mayor is continuing to pursue secretive discussions with companies regarding building on the park’s hill top^[3], and believes he risks repeating the mistakes of the ZhongRong Group proposals, which resulted in the loss of £4.5 million from the Heritage Lottery Fund^[4] and eighteen wasted months during which community projects were suspended.

This Assembly also welcomes that the local community is progressing plans for a Crystal Palace Neighbourhood Forum^[5], and that Bromley Council is working with local stakeholders to establish a community trust to govern Crystal Palace Park^[6].

This Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor to end any private discussions about proposals for development on the park, and engage openly and transparently with the emerging community trust and Neighbourhood Forum in developing any future projects for the park and wider area.”

was agreed (with 11 votes cast in favour, three votes cast against).

^[1] The Mayor met Mr Ni Zhaoxing at the Games, and officers first held meetings in February 2013. Plans were not made public until October of that year.

^[2] See, for example, <https://crystalpalacesp.files.wordpress.com/2014/11/press-statement-11-11-14.pdf>

^[3] http://questions.london.gov.uk/QuestionSearch/searchclient/questions/question_275672

^[4] http://questions.london.gov.uk/QuestionSearch/searchclient/questions/question_282130

^[5] <http://www.crystalpalacepark.org.uk/2014/heritage-lottery-fund-application-fails/>

^[6] http://questions.london.gov.uk/QuestionSearch/searchclient/questions/question_275673

^[6] http://www.bromley.gov.uk/press/article/984/improving_crystal_palace_park_taking_shape

5.6 Fiona Twycross AM moved and Tom Copley AM seconded the following motion:

“Following International Justice Day for Cleaners (15 June 2015), this Assembly would like to put on record its support for employees in this sector.

Across Greater London, 85 per cent of cleaning jobs are low paid.^[7] The cleaning sector is indicative of a wider lack of progress in increasing the number of jobs paying the London Living Wage in London’s low-pay sectors since 2008. In June 2009, the Mayor addressed the British Hospitality Association annual lunch, during which he encouraged the sector to adopt the London Living Wage. Since then, no London-based employers in this sector have become accredited.

This Assembly is deeply concerned by the growth of low pay in Greater London. Real wages are now £2,097 a year lower than they were in 2008^[8], while the proportion of jobs paying less than the London Living Wage has increased from 13.2 per cent to 19.4 per cent since the Mayor took office, dragging an additional 348,000 workers further into poverty pay.^[9] In London, 917,000 jobs now pay less than the London Living Wage.^[10]

This Assembly supports the Mayor’s vision for the London Living Wage to be the norm by 2020; but we recognise that the city is moving further away from achieving this objective. In his final year in office, we call on the Mayor to refocus his attentions on reversing this trend. We particularly call on him to focus on London’s low pay sectors and to increase the Greater London Authority resources available for engaging with employers in these sectors.”^[11]

5.7 Upon being put to the vote, the motion in the name of Fiona Twycross AM, namely:

“Following International Justice Day for Cleaners (15 June 2015), this Assembly would like to put on record its support for employees in this sector.

Across Greater London, 85 per cent of cleaning jobs are low paid.^[7] The cleaning sector is indicative of a wider lack of progress in increasing the number of jobs paying the London Living Wage in London’s low-pay sectors since 2008. In June 2009, the Mayor addressed the British Hospitality Association annual lunch, during which he encouraged the sector to adopt the London Living Wage. Since then, no London-based employers in this sector have become accredited.

^[7] ‘Fair pay: Making the London Living Wage the norm’, London Assembly Economy Committee, February 2014, p.8

^[8] Written question No: 2015/0380, January 2015

^[9] Written question No: 2014/5918, December 2014

^[10] Written question No: 2014/5918, December 2014

^[11] ‘Fair pay: Making the London Living Wage the norm’, London Assembly Economy Committee, February 2014, p.8

^[7] ‘Fair pay: Making the London Living Wage the norm’, London Assembly Economy Committee, February 2014, p.8

This Assembly is deeply concerned by the growth of low pay in Greater London. Real wages are now £2,097 a year lower than they were in 2008^[8], while the proportion of jobs paying less than the London Living Wage has increased from 13.2 per cent to 19.4 per cent since the Mayor took office, dragging an additional 348,000 workers further into poverty pay.^[9] In London, 917,000 jobs now pay less than the London Living Wage.^[10]

This Assembly supports the Mayor's vision for the London Living Wage to be the norm by 2020; but we recognise that the city is moving further away from achieving this objective. In his final year in office, we call on the Mayor to refocus his attentions on reversing this trend. We particularly call on him to focus on London's low pay sectors and to increase the Greater London Authority resources available for engaging with employers in these sectors."^[11]

was agreed (unanimously).

- 5.8 During the course of the discussion, at 12.30pm the Chair proposed, and it was agreed, that Standing Order 2.9B be suspended to extend the meeting in order to allow the remaining items of business on the agenda to be considered.
- 5.9 Fiona Twycross AM moved and Stephen Knight AM seconded the following motion, altered in accordance with Standing Order 3.6A (1), with the consent of the meeting:

"This Assembly notes Mayoral Direction 1516 – LFEPA 2016-17 Budget Options – instructing the Authority to 'not redeploy' thirteen fire engines, which are used to support the contingency arrangements during periods of industrial action.

This Assembly is deeply concerned that, despite repeated calls at LFEPA for the thirteen appliances to be returned, the Mayor has proceeded with this combative course of action; especially at the point at which LFB and the FBU ~~had reached~~ **were close to reaching** an agreement on the terms of their return.

Furthermore, this Assembly regrets that the Mayor appears intent on the permanent removal of the 13 appliances, despite the fact that alternative budget options have not yet been formally considered by LFEPA, and while considerable work is being undertaken by officers and board members on finding alternatives to additional frontline cuts to meet the Mayor's £11m reduction in the 2016/17 fire service budget.

^[8] Written question No: 2015/0380, January 2015

^[9] Written question No: 2014/5918, December 2014

^[10] Written question No: 2014/5918, December 2014

^[11] 'Fair pay: Making the London Living Wage the norm', London Assembly Economy Committee, February 2014, p.8

This Assembly regards the Mayor's Direction as unnecessary, and believes that it demonstrates that the Mayor is not committed to protecting frontline emergency services in the capital. Furthermore, the Assembly believes that the premise upon which the decision appears to have been made is not sufficiently strong to demonstrate that the safety of Londoners will not be jeopardised by his Decision; especially were that Decision the first step towards permanent removal of the thirteen appliances.

This Assembly calls on the Mayor to withdraw MD 1516 and to allow the re-introduction of the 13 appliances to London's streets immediately, returning fire cover to the levels committed to within the fifth London Safety Plan (LSP5)."

5.10 Upon being put to the vote, the revised motion in the name of Fiona Twycross AM, namely:

"This Assembly notes Mayoral Direction 1516 – LFEPA 2016-17 Budget Options – instructing the Authority to 'not redeploy' thirteen fire engines, which are used to support the contingency arrangements during periods of industrial action.

This Assembly is deeply concerned that, despite repeated calls at LFEPA for the thirteen appliances to be returned, the Mayor has proceeded with this combative course of action; especially at the point at which LFB and the FBU were close to reaching an agreement on the terms of their return.

Furthermore, this Assembly regrets that the Mayor appears intent on the permanent removal of the 13 appliances, despite the fact that alternative budget options have not yet been formally considered by LFEPA, and while considerable work is being undertaken by officers and board members on finding alternatives to additional frontline cuts to meet the Mayor's £11m reduction in the 2016/17 fire service budget.

This Assembly regards the Mayor's Direction as unnecessary, and believes that it demonstrates that the Mayor is not committed to protecting frontline emergency services in the capital. Furthermore, the Assembly believes that the premise upon which the decision appears to have been made is not sufficiently strong to demonstrate that the safety of Londoners will not be jeopardised by his Decision; especially were that Decision the first step towards permanent removal of the thirteen appliances.

This Assembly calls on the Mayor to withdraw MD 1516 and to allow the re-introduction of the 13 appliances to London's streets immediately, returning fire cover to the levels committed to within the fifth London Safety Plan (LSP5)."

was agreed (with 12 votes cast in favour and four votes cast against).

- 5.11 Murad Qureshi AM moved and Navin Shah AM seconded the following motion, altered in accordance with Standing Order 3.6A (1), with the consent of the meeting:

“The London Assembly is concerned that the quality of London’s universal postal service is under threat following the Chancellor Exchequer’s recent announcement that the Government is to sell its remaining stake in Royal Mail^[12]. Shortly after this announcement the Government sold half of its remaining 30 per cent share^[13].

~~When the government began the privatisation of the Royal Mail in 2013 it was poorly managed, rushed, and cost the UK tax payer £180 million.~~ This Assembly believes that the move to fully privatise the service not only represents a bad deal for tax payers but will also potentially reduce scrutiny and transparency in an organisation that has been serving the public interest since the early 1500s^[14]. These concerns are not merely limited to the delivery of the Royal Mail’s core services, but are also relevant in respect of the availability of affordable housing in London, as the Royal Mail seeks to divest itself of land assets capable of delivering thousands of homes in the capital^[15].

The London Assembly calls on the Mayor to defend London’s postal service and ensure Royal Mail’s land assets are used to deliver housing across all tenures in the capital by lobbying the government to conduct an open and transparent cost-benefit analysis of selling the remaining 15% stake in the Royal Mail.”

- 5.12 Upon being put to the vote, the revised motion in the name of Murad Qureshi AM, namely:

“The London Assembly is concerned that the quality of London’s universal postal service is under threat following the Chancellor Exchequer’s recent announcement that the Government is to sell its remaining stake in Royal Mail^[12]. Shortly after this announcement the Government sold half of its remaining 30 per cent share^[13].

This Assembly believes that the move to fully privatise the service not only represents a bad deal for tax payers but will also potentially reduce scrutiny and transparency in an organisation that has been serving the public interest since the early 1500s^[14]. These concerns are not merely limited to the delivery of the Royal Mail’s core services, but are also relevant in respect of the availability of affordable

[12] <http://www.ftadviser.com/2015/06/04/investments/economic-indicators/royal-mail-privatisation-top-of-chancellor-s-debt-reduction-sUX0WX8FU59Trlh4OYhmPL/article.html>

[13] <http://news.sky.com/story/1499747/govt-sells-its-15-percent-stake-in-royal-mail>

[14] <http://www.royalmailgroup.com/Timeline>

[15] Julia Kollewe, Royal Mail may reap £662m from planned sale of London sorting office, *The Guardian*, 11.11.14

[12] <http://www.ftadviser.com/2015/06/04/investments/economic-indicators/royal-mail-privatisation-top-of-chancellor-s-debt-reduction-sUX0WX8FU59Trlh4OYhmPL/article.html>

[13] <http://news.sky.com/story/1499747/govt-sells-its-15-percent-stake-in-royal-mail>

[14] <http://www.royalmailgroup.com/Timeline>

housing in London, as the Royal Mail seeks to divest itself of land assets capable of delivering thousands of homes in the capital^[15].

The London Assembly calls on the Mayor to defend London's postal service and ensure Royal Mail's land assets are used to deliver housing across all tenures in the capital by lobbying the government to conduct an open and transparent cost-benefit analysis of selling the remaining 15% stake in the Royal Mail."

was agreed (with 13 votes cast in favour and two votes cast against).

5.13 Stephen Knight AM moved and Tom Copley AM seconded the following motion:

"This Assembly notes the Mayor's recent statement that the proposal to extend the Right to Buy to housing associations tenants "will only work for London if it delivers more homes - and more low-cost homes - [and] makes sure that the cash from the sale of any council homes stays firmly in London and is used to build more homes for Londoners" adding that he did not want to see London's "great mixture of socioeconomic groups" displaced as a result of the policy.^[16]

This Assembly further notes that the rate of replacement for council homes sold under the Right to Buy scheme since the the maximum discount was increased in 2012 has been closer to one in ten, despite a commitment to ensure that the receipts from every additional home sold would be used to fund its replacement on a one for one basis.^[17]

This Assembly is furthered concerned that the way the policy is to be funded – through forcing local councils to sell off their most valuable properties – may result in many new council properties being sold off almost as soon as they are built, instead of being let to local residents in housing need.

This Assembly believes that the proposal to extend the Right to Buy to housing associations tenants in London risks undermining other efforts to increase the supply of new affordable homes across the capital.

This Assembly is concerned by the Mayor's failure to respond to its motion – agreed at Mayor's Question Time on 21 May 2015 – calling on him to commission an assessment of the implications of an extended Right to Buy for housing associations in London.^[18]

^[15] Julia Kollewe, Royal Mail may reap £662m from planned sale of London sorting office, *The Guardian*, 11.11.14

^[16] See transcript of Mayor speaking in response to MQ2015/1210 ['Right to buy' for housing association tenants in London]: <http://www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/documents/s46961/Minutes%20-%20Appendix%20%20-%20Transcript%20of%20Item%204%20-%20Questions%20to%20the%20Mayor.pdf>

^[17] Institute of Fiscal Studies (IFS) Briefing Note BN171: <http://www.ifs.org.uk/uploads/publications/bns/BN171.pdf>

^[18] See the minutes of the meeting of the London Assembly held on 21 May 2015: <http://www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/mgAi.aspx?ID=18095>

This Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor to provide an oral update to the Assembly at the earliest opportunity confirming whether or not he intends to commission an assessment of the implications of extending Right to Buy to Housing Association tenants in London, and if not, to provide a list of reasons for his decision. "

5.14 Upon being put to the vote, the motion in the name of Stephen Knight AM, namely:

"This Assembly notes the Mayor's recent statement that the proposal to extend the Right to Buy to housing associations tenants "will only work for London if it delivers more homes - and more low-cost homes – [and] makes sure that the cash from the sale of any council homes stays firmly in London and is used to build more homes for Londoners" adding that he did not want to see London's "great mixture of socioeconomic groups" displaced as a result of the policy.^[16]

This Assembly further notes that the rate of replacement for council homes sold under the Right to Buy scheme since the the maximum discount was increased in 2012 has been closer to one in ten, despite a commitment to ensure that the receipts from every additional home sold would be used to fund its replacement on a one for one basis.^[17]

This Assembly is further concerned that the way the policy is to be funded – through forcing local councils to sell off their most valuable properties – may result in many new council properties being sold off almost as soon as they are built, instead of being let to local residents in housing need.

This Assembly believes that the proposal to extend the Right to Buy to housing associations tenants in London risks undermining other efforts to increase the supply of new affordable homes across the capital.

This Assembly is concerned by the Mayor's failure to respond to its motion – agreed at Mayor's Question Time on 21 May 2015 – calling on him to commission an assessment of the implications of an extended Right to Buy for housing associations in London.^[18]

This Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor to provide an oral update to the Assembly at the earliest opportunity confirming whether or not he intends to commission an assessment of the implications of extending Right to Buy to Housing

^[16] See transcript of Mayor speaking in response to MQ2015/1210 ['Right to buy' for housing association tenants in London]: <http://www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/documents/s46961/Minutes%20-%20Appendix%20%20-%20Transcript%20of%20Item%204%20-%20Questions%20to%20the%20Mayor.pdf>

^[17] Institute of Fiscal Studies (IFS) Briefing Note BN171: <http://www.ifs.org.uk/uploads/publications/bns/BN171.pdf>

^[18] See the minutes of the meeting of the London Assembly held on 21 May 2015: <http://www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/mgAi.aspx?ID=18095>

Association tenants in London, and if not, to provide a list of reasons for his decision.”

was agreed (with 13 votes cast in favour and one vote cast against).

6 Mayoral Commitments (Item 6)

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

6.2 **Resolved:**

That the commitments made by the Mayor, Boris Johnson MP, during London Assembly (Mayor’s Question Time) meetings held between June 2014 and June 2015 be noted.

7 Future Meetings of the Assembly (Item 7)

7.1 **Resolved:**

- (a) That the Assembly (Plenary) meeting in September be rescheduled from Wednesday 9 September 2015 at 10am to Tuesday 8 September 2015 at 10am;**
- (b) That the Transport Committee meeting in September be rescheduled from Tuesday 8 September 2015 at 10am to Wednesday 9 September 2015 at 10am;**
- (c) That the Assembly (Plenary) meeting in September be used principally for a question and answer session in relation to the Airports Commission with Sir Howard Davies, Chairman of the Airports Commission, subject to the publication of the Commission’s final report; and**
- (d) That authority be delegated to the Chair of the Assembly to determine the details of any necessary changes to the September Assembly (Plenary) meeting, in consultation with the Assembly Deputy Chairman and the Assembly’s party Group Leaders.**

8 Date of Next Meeting (Item 8)

8.1 The next scheduled meeting of the London Assembly would be the Mayor’s Question Time meeting which would take place at 10.00 am on Wednesday 15 July 2015 in the Chamber, City Hall.

9 Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent (Item 9)

- 9.1 The Chair, on behalf of the Assembly, congratulated the England Women's football team on their World Cup quarter-final victory and wished them well for their next game.

Changes to Membership of Assembly Committees (Item 9a)

- 9.2 In accordance with section 100(B)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Chair agreed to accept the above item, which had been circulated under cover of a supplemantary agenda, as an item of urgent business to ensure that the vacancies on the Police and Crime Committee and the Audit Panel would be dealt with at the first opportunity.

9.3 **Resolved:**

- (a) That Andrew Dismore AM be appointed as a Member of the Police and Crime Committee for the remainder of the 2015-17 year, to replace John Biggs AM;**
- (b) That John Biggs AM be appointed as a substitute member of the Police and Crime Committee for the remainder of the 2015-16 year, to replace Andrew Dismore AM;**
- (c) That Valerie Shawcross CBE AM be appointed as a member of the Audit Panel for the remainder of the 2015-16 year, to replace John Biggs AM;**
- (d) That John Biggs AM be appointed as a substitute member of the Audit Panel for the remainder of the 2015-16 year, to replace Valerie Shawcross CBE AM; and**
- (e) That, in accordance with Standing Order 1.6, it be agreed to allow the Audit Panel to appoint its Chair at its next meeting.**

Urgent Motion

- 9.4 In accordance with section 100(B)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Chair agreed to admit an urgent motion in the name of Valerie Shawcross CBE AM to the agenda. In accordance with Standing Order 3.15 B(1), Fiona Twycross AM, summarised the reasons for urgent consideration of the motion, namely that the matter was of concern to all Assembly party Groups and Londoners, and that events relating to the motion would occur before the next London Assembly Plenary meeting. The Assembly then voted unanimously to accept the motion as urgent.

9.5 Valerie Shawcross CBE AM moved and Stephen Knight AM seconded the following motion:

“The London Assembly is alarmed by the current threats facing the quality and long term survival of local newspapers in south London owned and run by the Newsquest Group.

We understand that severe cut backs and restructuring will dramatically reduce both the numbers of reporters and editorial staff, and severely compromise the working conditions and pay of those who remain on the following newspapers:

The Croydon Guardian, Sutton Guardian, Epsom Guardian, Wimbledon Guardian, Wandsworth Guardian, Balham and Tooting Guardian, Mitcham and Morden Guardian, Kingston Guardian, Surrey Comet, Elmbridge Comet, and the Richmond & Twickenham Times. The News Shopper – for Lewisham, Greenwich, Bexley and Bromley.

The populations served by these papers are large – Croydon alone for example is home to over a third of a million people, it covers 3 Parliamentary Constituencies and one London Borough Council. Under Newsquest’s proposals, this huge geographical area would be covered by just one reporter. It is difficult to see how this would work on a practical, let alone efficient, level.

Newsquest local newspapers are popular and regarded as a useful and interesting source of local information by the communities they cover. We are therefore surprised that Newsquest seem to be seeking to undermine this. London needs quality local newspapers to ensure democratic scrutiny, accountability, and to encourage an informed and active citizenship.

Further to these concerns, we also understand that some staff, including qualified journalists, are being paid less than the ‘London Living Wage’ – which takes account of the high cost of living in London and is calculated as the rate of pay at which it is possible to adequately maintain an adequate quality of life here. We call upon the senior management at Newsquest to adopt the ‘London Living Wage’ and pay staff a livable salary.

Finally, we are alarmed to learn that in future, staff producing these papers may be based outside of London. It’s difficult to understand how any publication registered as a local newspaper could be written and produced outside the city it serves. Such a move would be detrimental to the development and economic growth of London. Furthermore, we understand that some staff may be expected to work remotely and alone, without physical access to office facilities or support from colleagues.

This proposed decimation of staff, pay and conditions cannot fail to be detrimental not only to staff themselves but also to the quality of Newsquest products and we believe that this is a misguided and retrograde step.

Recognising the Mayor’s duty to promote social development and economic development, as well as his declared objective of increasing the adoption of the London Living Wage, we call

upon the Mayor to urgently write to Newsquest expressing the concerns raised by the London Assembly and seeking assurance for the staff of Newsquest.”

9.6 Upon being put to the vote, the motion in the name of Valerie Shawcross CBE AM, namely:

“The London Assembly is alarmed by the current threats facing the quality and long term survival of local newspapers in south London owned and run by the Newsquest Group.

We understand that severe cut backs and restructuring will dramatically reduce both the numbers of reporters and editorial staff, and severely compromise the working conditions and pay of those who remain on the following newspapers:

The Croydon Guardian, Sutton Guardian, Epsom Guardian, Wimbledon Guardian, Wandsworth Guardian, Balham and Tooting Guardian, Mitcham and Morden Guardian, Kingston Guardian, Surrey Comet, Elmbridge Comet, and the Richmond & Twickenham Times. The News Shopper - for Lewisham, Greenwich, Bexley and Bromley.

The populations served by these papers are large - Croydon alone for example is home to over a third of a million people, it covers 3 Parliamentary Constituencies and one London Borough Council. Under Newsquest’s proposals, this huge geographical area would be covered by just one reporter. It is difficult to see how this would work on a practical, let alone efficient, level.

Newsquest local newspapers are popular and regarded as a useful and interesting source of local information by the communities they cover. We are therefore surprised that Newsquest seem to be seeking to undermine this. London needs quality local newspapers to ensure democratic scrutiny, accountability, and to encourage an informed and active citizenship.

Further to these concerns, we also understand that some staff, including qualified journalists, are being paid less than the ‘London Living Wage’ – which takes account of the high cost of living in London and is calculated as the rate of pay at which it is possible to adequately maintain an adequate quality of life here. We call upon the senior management at Newsquest to adopt the ‘London Living Wage’ and pay staff a livable salary.

Finally, we are alarmed to learn that in future, staff producing these papers may be based outside of London. It’s difficult to understand how any publication registered as a local newspaper could be written and produced outside the city it serves. Such a move would be detrimental to the development and economic growth of London.

Furthermore, we understand that some staff may be expected to work remotely and alone, without physical access to office facilities or support from colleagues.

This proposed decimation of staff, pay and conditions cannot fail to be detrimental not only to staff themselves but also to the quality of Newsquest products and we believe that this is a misguided and retrograde step.

Recognising the Mayor's duty to promote social development and economic development, as well as his declared objective of increasing the adoption of the London Living Wage, we call upon the Mayor to urgently write to Newsquest expressing the concerns raised by the London Assembly and seeking assurance for the staff of Newsquest."

was agreed (unanimously).

10 Close of Meeting

10.1 The meeting ended at 1.21pm.

Chair

Date

Contact Officers: John Barry
Principal Committee Manager
GLA Secretariat, City Hall
The Queen's Walk, London SE1 2AA

Telephone: 020 7983 4425
Email: john.barry@london.gov.uk

MINUTES

**Meeting: London Assembly
(Mayor's Question Time)**
Date: Wednesday 15 July 2015
Time: 10.00 am
**Place: Chamber, City Hall, The Queen's
Walk, London, SE1 2AA**

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

Present:

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair)	Jenny Jones AM
Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman)	Stephen Knight AM
Gareth Bacon AM	Kit Malthouse AM MP
John Biggs AM	Joanne McCartney AM
Andrew Boff AM	Steve O'Connell AM
Victoria Borwick AM MP	Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM
James Cleverly AM MP	Murad Qureshi AM
Tom Copley AM	Dr Onkar Sahota AM
Andrew Dismore AM	Navin Shah AM
Len Duvall AM	Valerie Shawcross CBE AM
Roger Evans AM	Richard Tracey AM
Nicky Gavron AM	Fiona Twycross AM
Darren Johnson AM	

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

- 1.1 There were no apologies for absence.
- 1.2 During the course of the meeting, the Chair welcomed to the public gallery: students from London South Bank University; visitors from the Lewisham Cardiac Support Group, "Artful Dodgers"; visitors from the Southgate District Civic Trust; students from Richmond Park Politics Summer School; and elected Members from Nairobi City Council.

2 Declarations of Interests (Item 2)

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

2.2 **Resolved:**

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.

3 Minutes (Item 3)

3.1 **Resolved:**

That the minutes of the London Assembly (Mayor's Question Time) meeting held on 17 June 2015 be signed by the Chair as a correct record.

4 Mayor's Report (Item 4)

4.1 **Resolved:**

That the Mayor's Report covering the period from 1 June to 4 July 2015 be noted.

- 4.2 In accordance with Standing Order 5.4A, the Mayor gave an oral update on matters occurring since the publication of his report. The record of the oral update is attached at **Appendix 1**.

5 Questions to the Mayor (Item 5)

- 5.1 The record of the discussion with the Mayor, including oral answers given by the Mayor to Members' questions, is attached as **Appendix 2**.

- 5.2 The written answers to those questions not asked or unanswered during the meeting is attached as **Appendix 3**.
- 5.3 During the course of the question and answer session, at 12.30pm, the Chair proposed, and it was agreed, that Standing Order 2.9B be suspended to extend the meeting in order to allow the remaining questions on the priority order paper to be put to the Mayor and for the remaining items of business on the agenda to be considered.
- 5.4 At the conclusion of the question and answer session, the Assembly agreed the motion set out on the agenda in the name of the Chair, namely:

“That the Assembly notes the answers to the questions asked”.

6 Proposed Delegation of Authority to the Chair of the Assembly (Item 6)

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

6.2 **Resolved:**

That, in relation to urgent matters only, a general delegation of authority in respect of the Assembly’s powers and functions (apart from those that cannot under the Greater London Authority Act 1999 be delegated), be given to the Chair of the Assembly, in consultation with the Deputy Chairman, party Group Leaders and relevant Committee Chairs, from the close of this meeting until the next meeting of the Assembly, which will be the Plenary meeting on 8 September 2015.

7 Changes to the Terms and Conditions of an Appointment made by the Mayor under Section 67(1) (b) of the GLA Act (Item 7)

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

7.2 **Resolved:**

That the change to the terms and conditions of Matthew Pencharz, now Deputy Mayor for Environment and Energy, who was appointed by the Mayor under Section 67(1) (b) of the GLA Act, be noted.

8 Date of Next Meeting (Item 8)

- 8.1 It was noted that the next scheduled meeting of the London Assembly would be the Plenary meeting which would take place at 10.00am on Tuesday 8 September 2015 in the Chamber, City Hall.

9 Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent (Item 9)

9.1 There was no urgent business requiring consideration.

10 Close of Meeting

10.1 The meeting closed at 12.45pm.

Chair

Date

Contact Officer: Rebecca Arnold
Committee Services Manager
GLA Secretariat, City Hall
The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA
Telephone: 020 7983 4421
Email: rebecca.arnold@london.gov.uk

London Assembly (Plenary)**8 September 2015****PRIORITY ORDER PAPER****Subject: Questions and Answer Session – Airport Commission****Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat****Subject: 3rd Runway Mitigation****Question No: 2015/2492**[Richard Tracey](#)

Your report calls for a 3rd runway at Heathrow to be mitigated by a number of measures including the banning of night flights. Can you confirm that, if those mitigating factors were not introduced then you would no longer support a 3rd runway?

Meagre benefits from a third runway**Question No: 2015/2493**[Darren Johnson](#)

What proportion of new passenger journeys generated by a third runway by 2031 would be new origin and destination flights, as opposed to international transfers and passengers swapping from other British airports?

Utilising Capacity at Airports in the South East.**Question No: 2015/2494**[Caroline Pidgeon](#)

Given the extensive political opposition to a third runway at Heathrow and the inevitable legal and planning challenges that will arise it is almost certain expansion is unlikely to happen in the foreseeable future at Heathrow. In light of these realities do you believe sufficient attention has been given to improving surface transport to ensure that the significant spare air capacity at existing airports in the south east is fully utilised.

Effect on the Environment of a Third Runway**Question No: 2015/2495**[Valerie Shawcross](#)

Is it possible to expand Heathrow Airport without having a negative effect on London's environment and the health of Londoners?

This page is intentionally left blank

Subject: Action Taken by the Chair Under Delegated Authority

Report to: London Assembly (Plenary)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 8 September 2015

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report sets out recent action taken by the Chair under delegated authority.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Assembly notes the action taken by the Chair under delegated authority, namely to agree, in consultation with the Deputy Chairman and party Group Leaders, the subject matter and detailed arrangements for the London Assembly (Plenary) meeting on 1 July 2015.**

3. Background

- 3.1 Under Standing Orders and the Assembly's Scheme of Delegation, certain decisions by Members can be taken under delegated authority. This report details those actions.
- 3.2 At its meeting on 3 June 2015, the Assembly resolved:

"That authority be delegated to Jennette Arnold OBE AM, as Chair of the London Assembly, to determine the subject matter and detailed arrangements for the London Assembly (Plenary) meeting on 1 July 2015, in consultation with the Deputy Chairman and party Group Leaders."

4. Issues for Consideration

- 4.1 Following consultation with party Group Leaders concerning the July 2015 meeting, the Chair wrote to invite Harvey McGrath, Deputy Chair of the London Enterprise Panel (LEP), and Cathy Walsh OBE, Further Education Representative on the LEP, to the Assembly (Plenary) meeting on 1 July 2015 to discuss the work of the LEP.

5. Legal Implications

5.1 The Committee has the power to do what is recommended in the report.

6. Financial Implications

6.1 There are no direct financial implications to the GLA arising from this report.

List of appendices to this report:

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
List of Background Papers: Member's Delegated Authority Form 609
Contact Officer: John Barry, Principal Committee Manager
Telephone: 020 7983 4425
E-mail: john.barry@london.gov.uk

Subject: Petitions

Report to: London Assembly (Plenary)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 8 September 2015

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report sets out details of petitions to be presented at this meeting by Assembly Members.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Assembly receives and notes the petitions listed at paragraph 4 of this report and decides whether to refer the petitions, and if so where to, and seeks a response to the points raised.**

3. Background

- 3.1 Standing Orders 3.20 to 3.21 make provision for the presentation of petitions by an Assembly Member at an ordinary meeting of the Assembly.

A petition to be presented must:

- (a) Be addressed to the Mayor, the Assembly, a Functional Body (as the case may be);
- (b) Clearly indicate the name, address and contact telephone number of the person organising the petition, or where the petition was organised on the internet, its data controller;
- (c) Be presented in the form of printed sheets, each of which includes the “prayer” of the petition (the “prayer” is the formal request or other subject matter of the petition) or, if the petition was organised on the internet, clearly demonstrate that internet users who subscribed to the petition knew what the prayer was;
- (d) Include each petitioner’s name (which may be printed or be in the form of a signature, provided that the signature is legible) and address (sufficient that the person and their address can be identified) or, where the petition was organised on the internet, their names and email addresses;
- (e) Indicate the total number of manual or electronic signatories to the petition.

(f) Young people aged 17 or under signing a petition may give their address as that of the school, or other recognised youth group or similar organisation that they attend (with details of their class name where appropriate), provided that the lead petitioner is a teacher at or leader of that school or youth group or similar organisation.

(g) Indicate the total number of manual or electronic signatories to the petition; and

(h) Refer to matters within the responsibilities of the Mayor, the London Assembly or the functional bodies, or to matters of importance to Londoners, including those who visit, live or work in Greater London.

- 3.2 Notice of the intention to present a petition at an Assembly meeting and a copy of the petition must be given to the Executive Director of the Secretariat by no later than 12 noon six clear working days before that meeting.
- 3.3 Under Standing Orders the Member presenting the petition will read out the prayer of the petition (but not the signatories). The Assembly will not debate the petition. If the Assembly agrees without debate, the petition will be forwarded to the Mayor, Functional Body, relevant committee or other organisation with a request for a response to the points made by the petitioner. The response received will be reported to the Assembly for information and forwarded to the petition's organiser. The prayer of the petition and the response received will be published in the appropriate Assembly Minutes.

4. Petition to be presented

- 4.1 Notice of the following petitions has been received:
- 4.2 A petition, received by **Jennette Arnold OBE AM**, is to be presented to the London Assembly, in accordance with Standing Orders 3.20 to 3.21, saying:

'We, the residents of Lordship Park N16 and the surrounding area ask that more funding be made available to Hackney police to enable them to plan and pursue a long-term strategy for ridding the area of prostitution, kerb-crawling and associated anti-social behaviour.

Increasingly, kerb crawlers are accosting local residents, and such incidents have involved victims between the ages of 14 and 60. These activities are highly inappropriate in a family residential area, particularly one with an exceptionally high proportion of young people.

It's time for a safer neighbourhood!

The petition has 446 signatories.

[Note: This petition is associated with an e-petition hosted by Change.org which sets out a further 106 signatures.]

The contact person for this petition is Penelope Roskell-Griffiths of 66 Queen Elizabeth's Walk, London, N16 5UQ.

- 4.3 A petition, received by **Murad Qureshi AM**, is to be presented to the London Assembly, in accordance with Standing Orders 3.20 to 3.21, saying:

"We call upon Westminster City Council, the Mayor of London and Transport for London to reject all proposals for the Baker Street/Gloucester Place Two-Way Traffic Scheme.

- 1) The proposed scheme is not needed and has not been demanded by local residents, businesses or road users.**
- 2) It would damage the quality of life for residents by diverting traffic into the residential streets of the Dorset Square Conservation Area and other residential streets on the south side of Marylebone Rd where air pollution and the risk of accidents would increase.**
- 3) It would increase journey times on Baker St, Gloucester Pl and Marylebone Rd for buses, coaches, taxis, delivery vehicles and emergency services.**
- 4) It would push up rents for shops and restaurants on Baker St, many of which may be forced out of business by higher rents and the loss of parking/unloading spaces.**

The existing one-way system is very successful in maintaining traffic flows, providing spaces for parking/unloading and keeping traffic out of residential side streets. The two-way scheme is being promoted by landowners and property developers who would gain enormously from this unjustifiable waste of taxpayers' money."

The petition has 1,535 signatories.

[Note: This petition is associated with an e-petition hosted by Westminster City Council which, as at 27 August 2015, sets out a further 392 signatures.]

The contact people for this petition are Steven Dolland, 16 Berkeley Court, Marylebone Road, London, NW1 5NA and Tamer Hassan, 79 Baker Street, London, W1U 6RG.

5. Legal Implications

- 5.1 By virtue of sections 59, 34 and 53 of the GLA Act 1999 (as amended), the Assembly has the power to do what is recommended in this report.
- 5.2 Under Standing Order 3.20 the petitions presented to the Assembly, together with the pages containing the names and addresses of the signatories to the petition, are documents to which the access to information rules from sections 100A - H and Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 apply.
- 5.3 Any applications from Members to see the names and addresses of the signatories to the petition will be considered by the Executive Director of the Secretariat on a case by case basis and in

accordance with the relevant provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 and the Data Protection Act 1988.

6. Financial Implications

6.1 There are no financial implications directly arising from this report.

List of appendices to this report: None.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
List of Background Papers: None.
Contact Officer: John Barry, Principal Committee Manager Telephone: 020 7983 4425 Email: John.barry@london.gov.uk

Subject: Petitions Update

Report to: London Assembly (Plenary)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 8 September 2015

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

- 1.1 The Assembly is asked to note the response received to a petition presented at a recent Assembly (Plenary) meeting.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Assembly notes the response received to a petition presented at a recent Assembly (Plenary) meeting.**

3. Background

- 3.1 In accordance with the procedure set out in the Authority's Standing Orders, Assembly Members may present petitions to the Assembly concerning any matter within the responsibilities of the Mayor of London, the London Assembly or the Functional Bodies, or otherwise of importance to Londoners.
- 3.2 Any responses received are reported to the Assembly for information.

4. Issues for Consideration

- 4.1 Set out at **Appendix 1** is the response received to a petition presented at a recent Assembly (Plenary) meeting.

5. Legal Implications

- 5.1 The Assembly has the power to do what is recommended in this report.

6. Financial Implications

6.1 There are no direct finance implications arising from this report

List of appendices to this report:

Appendix 1 – Letter from the Mayor to Jennette Arnold OBE AM dated 4 August 2015.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
List of Background Papers: None.
Contact Officer: John Barry, Principal Committee Manager Telephone: 020 7983 4425 Email: john.barry@london.gov.uk

Jennette Arnold OBE AM
Chair of the London Assembly
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
More London
London SE1 2AA

Our ref: MGLA080615-7142

Date: 04 AUG 2015

Dear Jennette

Re: London Assembly (Plenary) Meeting 3 June 2015 – Petition

Thank you for your letter of 5 June and enclosed petition about the provision of cycle facilities along Tooting Bec Road. I apologise for the delay in responding to you.

The minimum standard for a two-way cycle facility is 3m, with some additional space needed depending on the form of segregation used. Along the A214, which has two general traffic lanes, there is potentially physical space for cycle lanes. As you will appreciate, the needs of cyclists need to be carefully balanced against those of other road users along this busy corridor, including bus passengers. Transport for London (TfL) would also need to carefully consider the needs of numerous retail and residential premises along the route, particularly in relation to parking and loading activity.

A key component of my *'Vision for Cycling'* is to work with the London Boroughs to create a network of Quietways, which are pleasant backstreet routes that provide improved connections for cyclists away from the most heavily trafficked roads.

TfL is undertaking design work along the section of Tooting Bec Road between Dr Johnson Avenue and Aldington Road to provide a cycle link, as part of a Quietway route to connect Croydon and Waterloo. The design is at an early stage. However, a bi-directional segregated cycle facility alongside the bridleway is one option under consideration. You can find out more about the Quietways programme on TfL's website at <https://tfl.gov.uk/travel-information/improvements-and-projects/quietways>

TfL will also continue to actively monitor collisions along the A214. Where particular issues are identified, TfL will of course allocate funding to further improvements for cyclists in future.

Thank you again for writing to me.

Yours ever,



Boris Johnson
Mayor of London

This page is intentionally left blank

Subject: Motions

Report to: London Assembly (Plenary)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 8 September 2015

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

- 1.1 The Assembly is asked to consider the motions set out which have been submitted by Assembly Members.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Assembly considers the motion set out below.**

3. Issues for Consideration

- 3.1 The following motion has been proposed in the name of **Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM** and will be seconded by Len Duvall AM:

“This Assembly notes that the Government plans to bring forward the full implementation of Individual Electoral Registration (IER) by one year from 1st December 2016 to 1st December 2015, resulting in the deletion of hundreds of thousands of names from the London Electoral Register ahead of the Mayor and Assembly elections next May.

The Assembly recalls that under the Electoral Registration and Administration Act 2013, people who were only on the electoral register as a result of the previous household registration system would remain on the list of voters until December 2016. While Ministers have the power to bring the date forward, the independent Electoral Commission has given clear advice that doing so would be wrong. The effect would be to delete nearly two million names from UK Electoral Registers of which an estimated quarter of a million are in London.

The Assembly is concerned that according to their June 2015 report on IER, the Electoral Commission identified that six of the eight boroughs where more than 10% of voters' names will be deleted from the electoral register are in London. These six are Brent, Hackney, Haringey, Lambeth, Kensington and Chelsea, Redbridge and the worst in the country is Hackney which is set to see 23% of electors lose their right to vote.

This Assembly accepts the conclusions of the Electoral Commission that:

- a) "The number of London boroughs with high proportions of retained entries further underlines the importance of considering the transition end date in relation to the polls scheduled for May 2016 – which includes elections to the London Assembly and for London Mayor."

and

- b) "Ministers should not make an order to bring forward the end of the transition to Individual Electoral Registration."

While recognising that the primary role of maximising electoral registration within the Greater London Authority rests with the Greater London Returning Officer, this Assembly notes the distinctive role and influence that the Mayor can use in opposing these changes and therefore urges the Mayor to protect the right to vote of all Londoners and to back moves in the House of Commons and House of Lords to block the deletion of names from the Electoral Register. "

- 3.2 The following motion has been proposed in the name of **Richard Tracey AM** and will be seconded by Darren Johnson AM:

"This Assembly believes there is no circumstance under which Heathrow Expansion would be acceptable"

- 3.3 The following motion has been proposed in the name of **Stephen Knight AM** and will be seconded at the meeting:

"This Assembly notes with concern possible plans by the Government to extend Permitted Development Rights after May 2016, making permanent the removal of the need to apply for planning permission for office to residential conversions.

Objections to the rights have been raised on a number of occasions not only by the Assembly and London boroughs, but additionally by organisations such as the Federation of Small Businesses, given the serious threat they pose to the availability of premises for small businesses in London.

The Assembly believes extension will further deplete the number of commercial sites, driving up the cost of property, reducing opportunities for new businesses and jobs, and ultimately hindering London's economic development.

This Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor to make representations regarding the extension to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, highlighting the negative impact this could have on London's economic recovery specifically."

- 3.4 The following motion has been proposed in the name of **Victoria Borwick AM** and will be seconded by Andrew Boff AM:

"This Assembly would not support any proposal for female only train carriages on TFL trains. The idea amounts to nothing more than gender segregation and does nothing to address any of the issues of sexual harassment. Everyone should feel safe on TFL trains – isolating women and treating them as the problem is not the answer."

- 3.5 The following motion has been proposed in the name of **Murad Qureshi AM** and will be seconded at the meeting:

"This Assembly calls on the Mayor to seek an urgent meeting with Government Ministers to discuss ways of mitigating the worst effects of the Government's summer budget and to lobby for stronger

national policies that will facilitate a cleaner, greener London. Looking ahead to the Paris Conference in a few months' time, this Assembly believes the budget was a historic missed opportunity to set out an agenda for a change and show real leadership amongst the world's leading economies.

It is increasingly cities around the world that are leading the charge against the biggest environmental challenges of our age. However, London, like other global cities, can only act in the parameters of the policies set down by national governments. This budget is the latest in a long list of retrograde steps since reports appeared in the press of the Prime Minister calling for an end to "all this green crap".¹

The decision to abandon the commitment to zero carbon homes, which was due to come in next year, will severely limit the ability of the Mayor to meet his carbon reduction targets and deliver sustainable homes in the capital. London already has an uphill battle in making its existing housing stock energy efficient, following this announcement it is likely that many new homes being built today will require retro-fits in the near future.

This Assembly also notes with concern the changes to Vehicle Excise Duty, which will dis-incentivise consumers buying low emission vehicles. These changes will create policy uncertainty at the very time when London needs to up its game in tackling poor air quality. Given that it is low emission vehicles that is driving growth in the UK new car market, this policy change will damage business and consumer confidence.²

The attacks on renewables outlined in the Budget, such as the changes to the Climate Change Levy, will result in renewable electricity effectively paying a carbon tax, a measure described as "totally bizarre" by Friends of the Earth.³ It is deeply disappointing that London's domestic solar power generating capacity is the lowest of any region in the country and these changes will do sustained damage to industry confidence."

List of appendices to this report: None.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
--

List of Background Papers: None.

Contact Officer:	John Barry, Principal Committee Manager
Telephone:	020 7983 4425
Email:	john.barry@london.gov.uk

¹ [The Guardian Online](#) 21.11.13 (Accessed 21.8.15)

² Information from the Society of Motor Manufacturers and Traders (SMMT) via [Autocar.co.uk](#) (Accessed 21.8.15)

³ Spokesperson for Friends of the Earth, as quoted in [BusinessGreen.com](#) (Accessed 21.8.15)

This page is intentionally left blank