

# MINUTES

**Meeting: London Assembly (Plenary)**  
**Date: Wednesday 10 February 2016**  
**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)	Darren Johnson AM
Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman)	Jenny Jones AM
Gareth Bacon AM	Stephen Knight AM
Mayor John Biggs AM	Kit Malthouse AM MP
Kemi Badenoch AM	Joanne McCartney AM
Andrew Boff AM	Steve O'Connell AM
James Cleverly AM MP	Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM
Tom Copley AM	Murad Qureshi 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

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

- 1.1 An apology for absence was received from Dr Onkar Sahota AM.
- 1.2 Mayor John Biggs AM gave apologies for the first part of the meeting, but was in attendance as from Item 10 onwards; Caroline Pidgeon AM was in attendance for Items 1-9.

## **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 20 January 2016 (Mayor's Question Time) meeting be signed by the Chair as a correct record.**

## **4 Question and Answer Session - Transport for London (Item 4)**

- 4.1 The Assembly put questions to Boris Johnson, Mayor of London in his capacity as Chairman of Transport for London (TfL), and Mike Brown MVO, Commissioner of Transport, on the work and policies of TfL.
- 4.2 During the course of the discussion, TfL undertook to:
- Consider what could be done to preserve the frequency of bus routes affected by Hertfordshire County Council's decision to reduce its bus service subsidy;
  - Consider what more could be done to expand the use of the Lane Rental Scheme;
  - Review the route of the rail replacement service for the TfL service into Liverpool Street Station during Crossrail engineering works to ensure those that require step-free access were not disadvantaged; and
  - Provide an explanation as to why consideration had not been given to installing traffic signals at Gallows Corner roundabout in Havering.

- 4.3 During the course of the question and answer session, at 11.11am the Deputy Chairman assumed the Chair until 12 noon in order to allow the Chair to put questions to the guests in her role as an Assembly Member.
- 4.4 The record of the questions put by Assembly Members and the answers given is attached as **Appendix 1**.
- 4.5 The written answers to those questions not asked at the meeting are attached as **Appendix 2**.
- 4.6 The Chair formally moved the motion in the agenda, namely:  
“That the Assembly notes the answers to the questions asked.”
- 4.7 **Resolved:**  
**That the answers to the questions asked be noted.**

## **5 Petitions (Item 5)**

- 5.1 The Assembly received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.
- 5.2 Steve O’Connell AM presented a petition with the following prayer:

“You’ve probably heard about Thameslink, it’s the DfT’s program that promises to further open up transport options in South London, making it faster and easier than ever before to get to central London.

The big question that’s being asked and discussed at the moment is; which stations in South London should the Thameslink service stop at?

We believe that Norwood Junction is an ideal station, for a number of reasons:

1. It will cut down commuting time - the Thameslink service would mean traveling from Norwood Junction to Kings Cross would take around just 15 minutes – that’s a faster time to get to work, from work, and to all the fun that the big city has to offer!
2. It will help South Norwood regenerate quicker – Increased accessibility will attract new residents to the area and in turn, attract more quality businesses to the area.
3. Increased demand requires increased supply - Norwood Junction station is a busy station, a c20% YoY increase in traffic through the station demonstrates the increasing popularity of the area for commuters which is only set to continue.
4. We’re ready and waiting - There is a platform at Norwood Junction which is currently unused other than for trains passing through, meaning no extra platform or train line would need to be built for us to accommodate the Thameslink service.

If you'd welcome the Thameslink service stopping at Norwood Junction please sign our petition in support!

5.3 **Resolved:**

**That the petition be forwarded to the Mayor of London, as Chairman of Transport for London, for a response.**

5.4 Kit Malthouse MP AM presented a petition with the following prayer:

'We, the undersigned strongly object to and oppose the proposal to build a CrossRail2 station at the Kings Road Station site. We already have excellent tube services and bus services serving Chelsea. The building of a main line train station and large retail development would destroy the special character of Chelsea. Routing the line to avoid the diversion to Chelsea would save both over £1bn and longer journey times on Crossrail2.'

5.5 **Resolved:**

**That the petition be forwarded to the Mayor of London, as Chairman of Transport for London, for a response.**

## **6 Petitions Update (Item 6)**

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

6.2 **Resolved:**

**That the responses received to petitions presented at recent London Assembly (Plenary) meetings be noted.**

## **7 Motions (Item 7)**

7.1 Murad Qureshi AM proposed and Stephen Knight AM seconded the following motion:

"This Assembly notes the response from the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change to the Chair of the Assembly regarding the cuts to the solar Feed in Tariff and the motion passed by the Assembly on 4 November 2015.

This Assembly believes the decision to press ahead with cuts to the FiT is a short sighted decision which will seriously hamper efforts to make London a global leader on solar power.

The Assembly further notes:

- The UK is the only member of the G7 to increase fossil fuel subsidies whilst simultaneously attacking the renewables sector<sup>1</sup>;
- London has the lowest amount of installed solar power capacity of any region in the UK<sup>2</sup>;
- The Mayor's statement in the London Infrastructure Plan that there will be "up to a 20 per cent increase in (energy) demand in the capital by 2050"<sup>3</sup>; and
- Analysis by the Solar Trade Association shows that almost 1,800 jobs have been lost in the UK solar industry, with many thousands more expected to go<sup>4</sup>.

This Assembly was disappointed the Mayor failed to take a leadership role and stand up for London, by taking forward the Assembly's suggestion of leading a delegation to meet with the Secretary of State.

The London Assembly represents the views and interests of over 8.5 million Londoners. The Secretary of State's decision to shun London's democratic institutions by refusing to meet a cross-party delegation of Members and entrepreneurs, sends the strongest message possible that the future sustainability of London's energy supply and its renewables industry are a matter of worryingly low priority to the Government.

Although the Government has now made its decision, this Assembly asks that the Mayor consider this request again, so to impress on the Secretary of State the likely impact of these changes."

7.2 Upon being put to the vote, the motion, namely:

**"This Assembly notes the response from the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change to the Chair of the Assembly regarding the cuts to the solar Feed in Tariff and the motion passed by the Assembly on 4 November 2015.**

**This Assembly believes the decision to press ahead with cuts to the FiT is a short sighted decision which will seriously hamper efforts to make London a global leader on solar power.**

The Assembly further notes:

- **The UK is the only member of the G7 to increase fossil fuel subsidies whilst simultaneously attacking the renewables sector<sup>5</sup>;**
- **London has the lowest amount of installed solar power capacity of any region in the UK<sup>6</sup>;**

---

<sup>1</sup> [The Guardian: UK becomes only G7 country to increase fossil fuel subsidies](#) 12.11.15 (Accessed 14.1.16)

<sup>2</sup> [London Assembly Report "Bring Me Sunshine"](#) 23.10.15 (Accessed 14.1.16)

<sup>3</sup> [The London Infrastructure Plan 2050 \(Consultation\) p.3](#) (Accessed 15.1.16)

<sup>4</sup> [Solar Trade Association Press Release](#) 30.11.15 (Accessed 15.1.16)

<sup>5</sup> [The Guardian: UK becomes only G7 country to increase fossil fuel subsidies](#) 12.11.15 (Accessed 14.1.16)

- **The Mayor's statement in the London Infrastructure Plan that there will be "up to a 20 per cent increase in (energy) demand in the capital by 2050"<sup>7</sup>; and**
- **Analysis by the Solar Trade Association shows that almost 1,800 jobs have been lost in the UK solar industry, with many thousands more expected to go<sup>8</sup>.**

**This Assembly was disappointed the Mayor failed to take a leadership role and stand up for London, by taking forward the Assembly's suggestion of leading a delegation to meet with the Secretary of State.**

**The London Assembly represents the views and interests of over 8.5 million Londoners. The Secretary of State's decision to shun London's democratic institutions by refusing to meet a cross-party delegation of Members and entrepreneurs, sends the strongest message possible that the future sustainability of London's energy supply and its renewables industry are a matter of worryingly low priority to the Government.**

**Although the Government has now made its decision, this Assembly asks that the Mayor consider this request again, so to impress on the Secretary of State the likely impact of these changes."**

was agreed (with 13 votes cast in favour and 9 votes cast against).

7.3 Darren Johnson AM proposed and Valerie Shawcross CBE AM seconded the following motion:

"This Assembly welcomes the construction of sections of high quality cycle superhighway in central London. We also welcome the Mayor's recent comments urging his successor to complete the three Mini Hollands currently in train<sup>9</sup>.

Encouraging more journeys to be made by bicycle could help London's transport network to cope with the pressures of a growing population. It could also help improve the health and wellbeing of Londoners and go some way to cleaning up our polluted air.

We therefore call on the Mayor to work with the Assembly to ensure his successor builds on the consensus on cycling programmes that has been achieved within the Assembly in recent years, with a view to continuing these programmes in his or her Mayoralty."

---

<sup>6</sup> [London Assembly Report "Bring Me Sunshine"](#) 23.10.15 (Accessed 14.1.16)

<sup>7</sup> [The London Infrastructure Plan 2050 \(Consultation\) p.3](#) (Accessed 15.1.16)

<sup>8</sup> [Solar Trade Association Press Release](#) 30.11.15 (Accessed 15.1.16)

<sup>9</sup> The Mayor made this comment at the 16th December 2015 session of Mayor's Question Time. "I hope very much that any future Mayor would want to continue with this work. On Mini Hollands, I think it is vital we deliver the ones that are currently in train."

- 7.4 Andrew Boff AM moved, and Roger Evans AM seconded, the following amendment to the motion:

“Amend the last paragraph to read:

We therefore call on the Mayor to work with the Assembly to ensure his successor **builds seeks genuine public support for Mini Hollands, Cycle Superhighways and Quietways so that he is able to build** on the consensus on cycling programmes that has been achieved within the Assembly in recent years, with a view to continuing these programmes in his or her Mayoralty.”

- 7.5 Upon being put to the vote, the amendment to the motion, namely:

“Amend the last paragraph to read:

**We therefore call on the Mayor to work with the Assembly to ensure his successor ~~builds~~ seeks genuine public support for Mini Hollands, Cycle Superhighways and Quietways so that he is able to build on the consensus on cycling programmes that has been achieved within the Assembly in recent years, with a view to continuing these programmes in his or her Mayoralty.”**

was lost (with 9 votes cast in favour and 13 votes cast against).

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

**“This Assembly welcomes the construction of sections of high quality cycle superhighway in central London. We also welcome the Mayor’s recent comments urging his successor to complete the three Mini Hollands currently in train<sup>10</sup>.**

**Encouraging more journeys to be made by bicycle could help London’s transport network to cope with the pressures of a growing population. It could also help improve the health and wellbeing of Londoners and go some way to cleaning up our polluted air.**

**We therefore call on the Mayor to work with the Assembly to ensure his successor builds on the consensus on cycling programmes that has been achieved within the Assembly in recent years, with a view to continuing these programmes in his or her Mayoralty.”**

---

<sup>10</sup> The Mayor made this comment at the 16th December 2015 session of Mayor’s Question Time. “I hope very much that any future Mayor would want to continue with this work. On Mini Hollands, I think it is vital we deliver the ones that are currently in train.”

was agreed (with 13 votes cast in favour and 9 votes cast against).

7.7 Jenny Jones AM proposed and Darren Johnson AM seconded the following motion:

“This Assembly recognises the important contribution that London’s front garden plant cover provides for flood protection, wildlife habitats, shade and cooling during heatwaves<sup>11</sup>, the alleviation of air pollution, the character and identity of our streets, and for our wellbeing.

However, the Assembly is concerned by the findings in the Royal Horticultural Society report ‘Green Grey Britain’<sup>12</sup> that half of all London’s front gardens are now paved over, marking a 36% increase in the past ten years, with five times as many front gardens with no plants compared to ten years ago. We are also concerned with the use of narrow grilles which allow driveways to be covered with impermeable surfaces, putting further pressure on the drainage system<sup>13</sup>.

This Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor and the Government to review the permeable ‘solutions’ element of the permitted development regulations, including the use of grilles, and to consider promoting lawns, flower beds, rain gardens and other vegetation over other permeable options such as permeable block paving, porous asphalt or concrete.”

7.8 Upon being put to the vote, the motion, namely:

**“This Assembly recognises the important contribution that London’s front garden plant cover provides for flood protection, wildlife habitats, shade and cooling during heatwaves<sup>14</sup>, the alleviation of air pollution, the character and identity of our streets, and for our wellbeing.**

**However, the Assembly is concerned by the findings in the Royal Horticultural Society report ‘Green Grey Britain’<sup>15</sup> that half of all London’s front gardens are now paved over, marking a 36% increase in the past ten years, with five times as many front gardens with no plants compared to ten years ago. We are also concerned with the use of narrow grilles which allow driveways to be covered with impermeable surfaces, putting further pressure on the drainage system<sup>16</sup>.**

**This Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor and the Government to review the permeable ‘solutions’ element of the permitted development regulations, including the use of grilles, and to consider promoting lawns, flower beds, rain gardens and**

---

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.wildlondon.org.uk/sites/default/files/files/London%20Garden%20City%20-%20full%20report.pdf>

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.rhs.org.uk/communities/pdf/Greener-Streets/greening-grey-britain-report>

<sup>13</sup> In [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/7728/pavingfrontgardens.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7728/pavingfrontgardens.pdf)

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.wildlondon.org.uk/sites/default/files/files/London%20Garden%20City%20-%20full%20report.pdf>

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.rhs.org.uk/communities/pdf/Greener-Streets/greening-grey-britain-report>

<sup>16</sup> In [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/7728/pavingfrontgardens.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7728/pavingfrontgardens.pdf)



**other vegetation over other permeable options such as permeable block paving, porous asphalt or concrete.”**

was agreed (unanimously).

7.9 Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM proposed and Stephen Knight AM seconded the following motion:

“This Assembly notes that the cost of childcare is one of the most serious issues facing Londoners. With many nurseries charging a registration fee and expecting one month’s fees in advance, a parent starting a child at nursery fulltime can expect to pay over £1,200 before they even begin. These initial costs alone can prevent parents from being able to return to work.

This Assembly believes that the GLA should set an example in its role as an employer and that greater efforts should be made to adopt family friendly employment practices, such as offering more part-time and flexible roles, to ensure that the barriers that many parents face upon returning to the workplace are reduced. The Mayor would then be in a position to lobby London businesses to make every effort to assist parents within their workforce, pointing to the GLA as a model of best practice.

This Assembly further notes that loan schemes already exist for GLA staff for tenancy deposits, travel season tickets, bicycle purchase and gym membership as part of the wider package of staff benefits yet there is no help for parents with the initial costs of childcare.

This Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor to establish a loan scheme to help GLA staff with initial costs of childcare registration up to the value of £1,500 and encourage the rest of the GLA group and other city employers to take similar steps to ensure they fully support employees with caring responsibilities.”

7.10 Upon being put to the vote, the motion, namely:

**“This Assembly notes that the cost of childcare is one of the most serious issues facing Londoners. With many nurseries charging a registration fee and expecting one month’s fees in advance, a parent starting a child at nursery fulltime can expect to pay over £1,200 before they even begin. These initial costs alone can prevent parents from being able to return to work.**

**This Assembly believes that the GLA should set an example in its role as an employer and that greater efforts should be made to adopt family friendly employment practices, such as offering more part-time and flexible roles, to ensure that the barriers that many parents face upon returning to the workplace are reduced. The Mayor would then be in a position to lobby London businesses to make every effort**

**to assist parents within their workforce, pointing to the GLA as a model of best practice.**

**This Assembly further notes that loan schemes already exist for GLA staff for tenancy deposits, travel season tickets, bicycle purchase and gym membership as part of the wider package of staff benefits yet there is no help for parents with the initial costs of childcare.**

**This Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor to establish a loan scheme to help GLA staff with initial costs of childcare registration up to the value of £1,500 and encourage the rest of the GLA group and other city employers to take similar steps to ensure they fully support employees with caring responsibilities.”**

was agreed (unanimously).

- 7.11 Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM proposed and Tom Copley AM seconded the following motion:

“The Assembly notes the latest revelations about the procurement process for design services for a proposed pedestrian bridge linking South Bank to Temple.

The Assembly regrets that the Mayor has described his publicly funded trip to San Francisco in early February 2013 as merely a private trip. Furthermore, the Assembly expresses its concern that the Mayor was willing to attend meetings seeking sponsorship for one specific design when TfL had not even started the procurement process for the design of the bridge.

The Assembly urges the Mayor to fully comply with any outstanding and further inquiries by the GLA Oversight Committee and to ensure that all Mayoral Questions relating to the Garden Bridge are promptly answered.

The Assembly reiterates that there is no case for any TfL funding to be allocated to the Garden Bridge Trust and urges TfL to now enter into discussions to ensure that existing public money allocated to the project is fully recovered as quickly as possible.”

- 7.12 Upon being put to the vote, the motion, namely:

**“The Assembly notes the latest revelations about the procurement process for design services for a proposed pedestrian bridge linking South Bank to Temple.**

**The Assembly regrets that the Mayor has described his publicly funded trip to San Francisco in early February 2013 as merely a private trip. Furthermore, the Assembly expresses its concern that the Mayor was willing to attend meetings seeking sponsorship for one specific design when TfL had not even started the procurement process for the design of the bridge.**

**The Assembly urges the Mayor to fully comply with any outstanding and further inquiries by the GLA Oversight Committee and to ensure that all Mayoral Questions relating to the Garden Bridge are promptly answered.**

**The Assembly reiterates that there is no case for any TfL funding to be allocated to the Garden Bridge Trust and urges TfL to now enter into discussions to ensure that existing public money allocated to the project is fully recovered as quickly as possible.”**

was agreed (with 12 votes cast in favour and 7 votes cast against).

7.13 Tom Copley AM proposed and Fiona Twycross AM seconded the following motion:

“This Assembly notes that complaints against private landlords in London have risen by 47% since 2008<sup>17</sup> and that nearly a third of privately rented homes in London fail to meet the Decent Homes Standard – by far the worst standards of any housing tenure in Greater London.<sup>18</sup>

This Assembly therefore regrets the Mayor's failure to give his support to an amendment to the Housing & Planning Bill that would have made it a legal requirement for landlords to ensure that the homes they let out are fit for human habitation.

This Assembly believes that at a minimum, homes should be fit for human habitation. We therefore call on the Mayor to reconsider his opposition to this most basic of requirements and to support statutory measures to improve standards in London's private rented sector.”

7.14 Upon being put to the vote, the motion, namely:

**“This Assembly notes that complaints against private landlords in London have risen by 47% since 2008<sup>19</sup> and that nearly a third of privately rented homes in London fail to meet the Decent Homes Standard – by far the worst standards of any housing tenure in Greater London.<sup>20</sup>**

**This Assembly therefore regrets the Mayor's failure to give his support to an amendment to the Housing & Planning Bill that would have made it a legal requirement for landlords to ensure that the homes they let out are fit for human habitation.**

---

<sup>17</sup> ‘Rent reform: Making London's private rented sector fit for purpose’, London Assembly Housing and Regeneration Committee, June 2013, p.23

<sup>18</sup> Housing in London database, London Data Store

<sup>19</sup> ‘Rent reform: Making London's private rented sector fit for purpose’, London Assembly Housing and Regeneration Committee, June 2013, p.23

<sup>20</sup> Housing in London database, London Data Store

**This Assembly believes that at a minimum, homes should be fit for human habitation. We therefore call on the Mayor to reconsider his opposition to this most basic of requirements and to support statutory measures to improve standards in London's private rented sector.”**

was agreed (with 11 votes cast in favour and 8 votes cast against).

## **8 Mayoral Commitments (Item 8)**

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

8.2 **Resolved:**

**That the commitments made by the Mayor, Boris Johnson MP, during London Assembly (Mayor's Question Time) meetings held between January and December 2015 be noted.**

## **9 Future Plenary Meeting (Item 9)**

9.1 **Resolved:**

**That it be agreed, under section 61 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999, that David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive of the London Legacy Development Corporation) and David Edmonds CBE (Chairman of the London Legacy Development Corporation) be required to attend the 2 March 2016 London Assembly (Plenary) meeting, for which notice will be given in accordance with section 62 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 in due course, to answer questions in relation to the policies and work of the London Legacy Development Corporation.**

9.2 At the end of this item the Chair adjourned the meeting, and stated that the meeting would reconvene in the Chamber at 2.30pm.

## **10 Minor Alterations to the London Plan (Item 10)**

10.1 The meeting resumed at 2.30pm.

10.2 The Assembly put questions to Sir Edward Lister, Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Policy and Planning, and Stewart Murray, Assistant Director of Planning, GLA, on the Minor Alterations to the London Plan (MALP) document.

**Greater London Authority  
London Assembly (Plenary)  
Wednesday 10 February 2016**

- 10.3 Also in attendance were GLA Strategic Planning Managers Richard Linton, John Lett and Jennifer Peters, and Peter Wright, Policy Manager, TfL.
- 10.4 The record of the questions put by Assembly Members and the answers given is attached as **Appendix 3**.
- 10.5 At the conclusion of the question and answer session, the Assembly turned to consideration of the Minor Alterations to the London Plan (MALP) as presented to it. The Chair explained that, under Section 42B of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 (as amended), the Assembly could reject either or both of the MALP proposals by a two-thirds majority of Assembly Members present and voting.
- 10.6 The Chair formally moved the motion set out in the agenda in her name, namely:

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

- 10.7 In accordance with the procedure set out at Standing Order 3.19, Darren Johnson AM moved and Stephen Knight AM seconded the following amendment to the motion in the name of the Chair:

‘Following “That the Assembly notes the answers to the questions asked”, insert:

This Assembly notes that TfL predicts an extra five million road trips will be taken per day in London by 2030, on top of the 26 million trips already taking place daily[1]. TfL has ascribed a drop in journey time reliability on London's roads and a sustained drop in bus trips in part to rising traffic and congestion[2]. The availability of parking has been identified by TfL as a key supply change affecting travel trends in London[3].

This Assembly further notes that the land required to accommodate the potential additional parking spaces arising from the Mayor's changes to parking standards could result in the loss of up to 260 homes per year across London[4].

This Assembly believes the Mayor's proposed minor alterations to the London Plan parking standards is likely to worsen London's congestion problem, thereby increasing air pollution and carbon dioxide emissions, and adversely affecting London's economy.

We also believe that an over-reliance on Public Transport Accessibility Level scores fails to account for the shortcomings of this tool, acknowledged in the London Plan (paragraph 6.43). The proposed alterations fail to provide boroughs with the right policy framework with which to improve access to jobs and services, including providing car parking at appropriate levels, improving public transport, and accounting for the potential of improvements to the public realm for walking and cycling.

**Greater London Authority  
London Assembly (Plenary)  
Wednesday 10 February 2016**

This Assembly therefore resolves to reject the alterations made to the London Plan by the MALP: Parking Standards;

The Assembly agrees that only the changes made by the MALP Parking Standards are rejected by the Assembly for the purposes of section 42B (4) and (5) of the GLA Act 1999 (as amended); and

The Assembly notes that the Mayor may publish the London Plan as amended by the MALP Housing Standards.

Following debate, the amendment was put to the vote. With 2 votes cast in favour and 9 votes against, the amendment in the name of Darren Johnson AM did not receive the requisite two-thirds majority to reject the Minor Alterations to the London Plan document. The amendment was therefore deemed not to have been carried.

- 10.8 Nikki Gavron AM then moved, and Darren Johnson AM and Stephen Knight AM seconded, the following amendment to the motion in the name of the Chair:

‘Following “That the Assembly notes the answers to the questions asked”, insert:

However, this Assembly has concerns about a number of the altered policies in the Minor Alterations to the London Plan, including those addressed below.

Housing Standards

This Assembly condemns the decision by Government to force London to abandon its housing standards through the planning system. These standards work for London, and London should have been able to keep them.

The GLA has a well-established and effective series of housing standards which are lauded for improving the condition of housing in the capital. Many of these are designed to be joined-up with other policies, such as on transport, health, and tackling and adapting to climate change, which all contribute to quality of life. The loss of these standards will undermine the ability of City Hall to secure high-quality housing that is spacious, saves Londoners money on their energy bills, and is better for the environment.

Car Parking

This Assembly is concerned by the potential introduction of minimum car parking standards, which would represent a radical departure from current policy and could result in developers being forced to provide more car parking than a scheme requires, reducing the construction of much-needed housing in the capital<sup>21</sup>.

Air Quality

---

<sup>21</sup> Outer London Commission. Fourth Report – Residential Parking Standards. May 2015: paragraph 4.4.14.

This Assembly highlights the finding by the independent planning inspector that the implementation of the car parking alterations will result in a predicted decrease in air quality<sup>22</sup>. Given London is already in breach of the Ambient Air Quality Directive<sup>23</sup>, any further deterioration in air quality is unacceptable.

The inspector puts the onus on the Mayor to clearly demonstrate “through appropriate modelling and monitoring mechanisms” that mitigation measures outweigh the impact on air quality<sup>24</sup>. This Assembly calls on the Mayor to refrain from implementing the proposed alterations until this has been demonstrated.

These policies and the planning decisions they inform will have a major impact on London in coming years. Until there is a new London Plan, the decisions that are taken will lock London into a trajectory that is at odds with key goals of developing a sustainable city.’

- 10.1 Upon being put to the vote, the amendment in the name of Nikki Gavron AM, namely:

**‘Following “That the Assembly notes the answers to the questions asked”, insert:**

**However, this Assembly has concerns about a number of the altered policies in the Minor Alterations to the London Plan, including those addressed below.**

#### **Housing Standards**

**This Assembly condemns the decision by Government to force London to abandon its housing standards through the planning system. These standards work for London, and London should have been able to keep them.**

**The GLA has a well-established and effective series of housing standards which are lauded for improving the condition of housing in the capital. Many of these are designed to be joined-up with other policies, such as on transport, health, and tackling and adapting to climate change, which all contribute to quality of life. The loss of these standards will undermine the ability of City Hall to secure high-quality housing that is spacious, saves Londoners money on their energy bills, and is better for the environment.**

#### **Car Parking**

**This Assembly is concerned by the potential introduction of minimum car parking standards, which would represent a radical departure from current policy and could result in developers being forced to provide more car parking than a scheme requires, reducing the construction of much-needed housing in the capital<sup>25</sup>.**

---

<sup>22</sup> MALP Inspector Report, para 51.

<sup>23</sup> “[UK government failing legal duty on air pollution, supreme court rules.](#)” *Guardian*. 1 May 2013.

<sup>24</sup> MALP Inspector Report, para 52.

<sup>25</sup> Outer London Commission. Fourth Report – Residential Parking Standards. May 2015: paragraph 4.4.14.

## **Air Quality**

**This Assembly highlights the finding by the independent planning inspector that the implementation of the car parking alterations will result in a predicted decrease in air quality<sup>26</sup>. Given London is already in breach of the Ambient Air Quality Directive<sup>27</sup>, any further deterioration in air quality is unacceptable.**

**The inspector puts the onus on the Mayor to clearly demonstrate “through appropriate modelling and monitoring mechanisms” that mitigation measures outweigh the impact on air quality<sup>28</sup>. This Assembly calls on the Mayor to refrain from implementing the proposed alterations until this has been demonstrated.**

**These policies and the planning decisions they inform will have a major impact on London in coming years. Until there is a new London Plan, the decisions that are taken will lock London into a trajectory that is at odds with key goals of developing a sustainable city.’**

was agreed (with 12 votes cast in favour and 9 votes against).

- 10.9 The Chair confirmed that no other motions or amendments had been received and that the Assembly’s consideration of the two sets of MALPs was concluded. The Chair confirmed that, as the proposed rejection of the MALP proposals had not been agreed by the requisite majority, the Assembly was deemed not to have rejected the Minor Alterations to the London Plan as laid before it.

## **11 Date of Next Meeting (Item 11)**

- 11.1 The next scheduled meeting of the London Assembly was the Mayor’s Question Time meeting which would take place at place at 9.00am on Monday 22 February 2016 in the Chamber, City Hall.

## **12 Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent (Item 12)**

- 12.1 There were no items of urgent business.

## **13 Close of Meeting**

- 13.1 The meeting finished at 4.02pm.

---

<sup>26</sup> MALP Inspector Report, para 51.

<sup>27</sup> “[UK government failing legal duty on air pollution, supreme court rules.](#)” *Guardian*. 1 May 2013.

<sup>28</sup> MALP Inspector Report, para 52.



**Greater London Authority  
London Assembly (Plenary)  
Wednesday 10 February 2016**

Chair	Date
<b>Contact Officers:</b>	John Barry Principal Committee Manager GLA Secretariat, City Hall The Queen's Walk, London SE1 2AA
<b>Telephone:</b>	020 7983 4425
<b>Email:</b>	john.barry@london.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank