

# AGENDA

**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 reports and any attachments may be found at  
[www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/whole-assembly](http://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](http://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  
Tuesday 2 February 2016

## **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](mailto: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](mailto: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](http://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](mailto: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 teléfono 020 7983 4100 o por correo electrónico: [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk).

Se você, ou alguém que conheça precisa uma cópia da ordem do dia, anotações ou relatórios 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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk)



Certificate Number: FS 80233

**Agenda  
London Assembly (Plenary)  
Wednesday 10 February 2016**

**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)

**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 - 8)

**The Assembly is recommended to confirm the minutes of the London Assembly (Mayor's Question Time) meeting held on 20 January 2016 to be signed by the Chair as a correct record.**

The appendices to the minutes of the 20 January 2016 (Mayor's Question Time) meeting (including the transcript of the question and answer session) have been circulated to Members separately. Transcripts and written answers for past meetings can be downloaded from <http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/whole-assembly>

## **4 Question and Answer Session - Transport for London** (Pages 9 - 14)

### **Part A:**

The Assembly will put questions to Boris Johnson MP, in his capacity as Chairman of Transport for London (TfL), and Mike Brown MVO, Commissioner, TfL, on the policies and work of TfL.

### **Part B:**

Motion submitted in the name of the Chair:

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

## **5 Petitions** (Pages 15 - 18)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: John Barry, [john.barry@london.gov.uk](mailto:john.barry@london.gov.uk), tel: 020 7983 4425

**The Assembly is recommended to note the petitions listed in the report and to decide whether to refer the petition, and if so where to, and to seek a response to the points raised.**

## **6 Petitions Update** (Pages 19 - 34)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: John Barry, [john.barry@london.gov.uk](mailto:john.barry@london.gov.uk), tel: 020 7983 4425

**The Assembly is recommended to note the responses received to petitions presented at recent Assembly (Plenary) meetings.**

## **7 Motions** (Pages 35 - 38)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: John Barry, [john.barry@london.gov.uk](mailto:john.barry@london.gov.uk), tel: 020 7983 4425

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

## **8 Mayoral Commitments** (Pages 39 - 76)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: John Barry, [john.barry@london.gov.uk](mailto:john.barry@london.gov.uk), tel: 020 7983 4425

**The Assembly is recommended to note commitments made by the Mayor, Boris Johnson MP, during London Assembly Mayor's Question Time meetings held between January 2015 and December 2015.**

The appendix to the report set out on pages 41 to 76 is attached for Members and officers only but is available from the following area of the GLA's website:

<http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/whole-assembly>

## **9 Future Plenary Meeting**

### **London Assembly (Plenary) Meeting – 2 March 2016**

It is proposed that the Assembly uses the 2 March 2016 Plenary meeting principally to hold a Functional Body Question Time with the Chairman and Chief Executive of the London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC).

#### **Recommendation:**

**That the Assembly, under section 61 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999, requires the attendance of David Goldstone CBE (Chief Executive, LLDC) and David Edmonds CBE (Chairman, LLDC) at the 2 March 2015 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.**

## **10 Minor Alterations to the London Plan** (Pages 77 - 156)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Contact: John Barry, [john.barry@london.gov.uk](mailto:john.barry@london.gov.uk), tel: 020 7983 4425

**The Assembly is recommended to:**

**Part A:**

**Put questions to the following on the Minor Alterations to the London Plan:**

- **Sir Edward Lister, Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Policy and Planning; and**
- **Stewart Murray, Assistant Director – Planning, Greater London Authority (GLA).**

**Part B:**

**Receive and, in accordance with Section 42B of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 (as amended), consider its response to the Minor Alterations to the London Plan as set out at Appendices 6 and 8; and**

**Consider the motion submitted in the name of the Chair:**

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

The appendices to the report set out on pages 83 to 156 are attached for Members and officers only but are available from the following area of the GLA’s website:

<http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/whole-assembly>

## **11 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 9.00am on Monday 22 February 2016 in the Chamber, City Hall.

## **12 Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent**

# Subject: Declarations of Interests

**Report to: London Assembly**

**Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat**

**Date: 10 February 2016**

**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 interests<sup>1</sup>;**
- 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:

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<b>Member</b>	<b>Interest</b>
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
Kemi Badenoch AM	
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)
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.

<b>Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985</b>
--

List of Background Papers: None
---------------------------------

Contact Officer: John Barry, Committee Services
---

Telephone: 020 7983 4425
--------------------------

E-mail: <a href="mailto:john.barry@london.gov.uk">john.barry@london.gov.uk</a>
--

# MINUTES

**Meeting: London Assembly  
(Mayor's Question Time)**  
**Date: Wednesday 20 January 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)	Jenny Jones AM
Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman)	Stephen Knight AM
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	Dr Onkar Sahota AM
Len Duvall AM	Navin Shah AM
Roger Evans AM	Valerie Shawcross CBE AM
Nicky Gavron AM	Richard Tracey AM
Darren Johnson AM	Fiona Twycross AM

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

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Gareth Bacon AM, Mayor John Biggs AM and Kit Malthouse AM.
- 1.2 The Chair welcomed to the public gallery students from the *Universidad Europea*.
- 1.3 The Chair placed on record the Assembly's congratulations to those who received Honours in the Queen's New Year's Honours list, in particular those Londoners and Functional Body colleagues who had received Honours. She also placed on record the Assembly's congratulations to Richard Tracey AM's wife, Councillor Kathy Taylor, who had been appointed an Officer of the Order of the British Empire for services to local government.
- 1.4 The Chair additionally placed on record the Assembly's condolences to the families of musician David Bowie and actor Alan Rickman, noting that both had been Londoners.

## **2 Declarations of Interests (Item 2)**

- 2.1 The Assembly resolved 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 16 December 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 3 December 2015 to 6 January 2016 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 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 Date of Next Meeting (Item 6)**

- 6.1 The next scheduled meeting of the London Assembly would be the Plenary (Draft Budget) meeting which will take place at 10.00am on Wednesday 27 January 2016 in the Chamber, City Hall.

## **7 Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent (Item 7)**

- 7.1 The Chair explained that, in accordance with section 100(B)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, she had agreed to introduce an item of business to the agenda regarding future Assembly meetings, in order to seek formal approval from the Assembly to two matters at the earliest opportunity.

### **Future Assembly Meetings**

- 7.2 **Resolved:**

- (a) That the Assembly Plenary meeting on 10 February 2016 additionally be used to consider Minor Alterations to the London Plan, which it is anticipated will be formally submitted to the Assembly at the end of January 2016; and**
- (b) That the start time of the London Assembly Mayor's Question Time (Final Draft Budget) meeting on 22 February 2016 be amended to 9am.**

## 8 Close of Meeting

8.1 The meeting closed at 12.56pm.

---

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

**Assembly Plenary, 10 February 2016****PRIORITY ORDER PAPER****Report No: 4****Subject: Questions and Answer Session – Transport for London****Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat****Polluting buses in London****Question No: 2016/0381**[Jenny Jones](#)

Why are you leaving thousands of old diesel buses to run on heavily polluted roads around inner London?

**Congestion in London****Question No: 2016/0378**[Caroline Pidgeon](#)

Does the Congestion Charge need to change to tackle congestion in central London?

**Transport Legacy****Question No: 2016/0380**[Valerie Shawcross](#)

What are you leaving in the in-tray for your successor?

**Future of London Transport****Question No: 2016/0370**[Richard Tracey](#)

What will London's Transport look like in 2050?

*Questions not asked during the meeting will be given a written response by Monday, 15 February 2016.*

## **London Buses Wage Structure**

**Question No: 2016/0371**

[Richard Tracey](#)

If a future Mayor were to introduce a single wage structure for all of London's bus companies, and the level of services remained the same as today, how much would bus fares need to go up to pay for it?

## **CIRAS, coaches and TfL**

**Question No: 2016/0372**

[Caroline Pidgeon](#)

In response to question 2015/4220 (CIRAS introduction for coaches operating in London) the Mayor said: "TfL has limited jurisdiction over coaches operating in London. Unlike bus operators, coach operators are not contracted by TfL".

However, under the GLA Act 1999 any coach operating in London must have a London Service Permit (LSP) issued by TfL. S.187 GLA Act 1999 gives TfL very broad authority to attach conditions to the LSP, and specifically mentions public safety as an example of an area where conditions could be introduced. The only area the legislation says a condition can't be attached to an LSP is with regards to fares. It also says that the LSP conditions can be varied at any time.

So despite your previous response, TfL does have the regulatory power to make CIRAS a mandatory requirement for coaches operating in London. Why are you so reluctant to use it?

## **Promoting free cycling training in London**

**Question No: 2016/0373**

[Caroline Pidgeon](#)

In October 2015 I asked (2015/3115) about the annual take up of TfL's free cycling training and the steps being taken to promote it. The figures showed that since 2010 take up of the training has remained stagnant, with 8,350 adults trained in 2010/11 and 7,910 in 2014/15. Given London's very large and ever-increasing population and given relatively low take up rates of cycling among women and black and minority ethnic groups, surely there is room for improvement on this front.

What new measures could TfL take to increase public awareness of the training and to encourage higher levels of take up?

## **Cycling safety**

**Question No: 2016/0374**

[Caroline Pidgeon](#)

The Department for Transport runs a series of Think! campaign videos about road safety. Would TfL look into emulating this approach for cycling safety? It could be aimed at both motorists and cyclists.



## **Flexible season tickets**

**Question No: 2016/0375**

[Caroline Pidgeon](#)

A drawback with the season ticket system is that it is only relevant to people with conventional working patterns, whereas increasingly in London people work more flexibly. It can also discourage people who have paid for a season ticket from using alternative forms of transportation, such as cycling.

A flexible season ticket system, where people could buy a set number of days within an annual or monthly timeframe at an advantageous rate, could help part time and flexible workers and at the same time encourage more Londoners to cycle to work. Southern Railways has run a trial along these lines. Has TfL looked at building on their work? If not, will you direct it to do so?

## **Piccadilly Line overcrowding**

**Question No: 2016/0376**

[Caroline Pidgeon](#)

The Piccadilly Line suffers from serious overcrowding, particularly the route from Heathrow Airport to central London. This problem may be alleviated by the opening of Crossrail services in 2019, but what plans do you have in the interim to reduce overcrowding on this line?

## **Credit card payments in taxis**

**Question No: 2016/0377**

[Caroline Pidgeon](#)

Under the proposals to require black taxis to have credit cards as a payment method, how much will the drivers have to pay to have the payment machines installed?

## **Garden Bridge**

**Question No: 2016/0379**

[Caroline Pidgeon](#)

In answer to freedom of information requests (MGLA41215 - 1959 and MGLA211215 - 1781) it has been clarified that the Mayor attended San Francisco in early February 2013 to meet senior representatives of Apple. Can you list everyone who was present at all of the meetings conducted by the Chair of Transport for London during this trip, particularly whether Joanna Lumley or any representatives of Heatherwick Studios were present?

## **Confidential Incident Reporting and Analysis System and coaches**

**Question No: 2016/0382**

[Darren Johnson](#)

Transport for London, through the issuance of London Service Permits, has regulatory authority over local bus services that run outside its own network within the Greater London area. Section 6 of the London Service Permit guidance document states "The proposed service must not prejudice the safety of, or cause delay or inconvenience to, other road users in Greater London, including pedestrians and cyclists." Will you make issuance of a London Service Permit to coach companies conditional on their adoption of the Confidential Incident Reporting and Analysis System, CIRAS, so that the safety of road users in London is not prejudiced?

## **Deaths from HGVs Contracted by TfL or Crossrail**

**Question No: 2016/0383**

[Darren Johnson](#)

Please provide a list of fatal collisions involving HGVs or lorries that have been contracted to TfL or Crossrail from 2008-15, including, for each collision, the date, borough, mode of transport of the victim, and the victim's sex and age.

## **TfL bus subcontractor data on TfL website**

**Question No: 2016/0384**

[Darren Johnson](#)

Bus route information pages on the TfL website do not specify the bus subcontractor operating the buses on each route or the contact information about that subcontractor. Could you please make this information available?

## **Double decker buses on route 42**

**Question No: 2016/0385**

[Darren Johnson](#)

TfL is consulting on extending bus route 42 to East Dulwich Sainsbury's and replacing single deck buses with double deckers. Will TfL specify in the terms of the contract for the new route 42 that the buses are at least Euro VI vehicles?

## **Silvertown Tunnel consultation process**

**Question No: 2016/0386**

[Darren Johnson](#)

Why were the TfL finance and policy committee recommended to approve your Silvertown Tunnel plan before TfL finished analysing the results of the final, statutory consultation on the scheme, and before it published a report of its findings?

## **EU funding for research and development of green taxis**

**Question No: 2016/0387**

[Darren Johnson](#)

Why has TfL not sought EU funding to reduce the costs of research and development of zero emission taxis?

## **Outer London cycling potential analysis**

**Question No: 2016/0388**

[Darren Johnson](#)

When in 2016 will TfL publish the research on cycling in outer London referred to in your response to question number 2015/3257?

## **Removal of Bow flyover**

**Question No: 2016/0389**

[Darren Johnson](#)

Will TfL meet with those who cycle into London using Bow flyover and those who prefer to use Bow roundabout and take into account their views before consulting on future options for the road layout there?

This page is intentionally left blank

# Subject: Petitions

**Report to: London Assembly (Plenary)**

**Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat**

**Date: 10 February 2016**

**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 section 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. Petitions to be presented**

4.1 Notice of the following petitions has been received:

4.2 A petition, received by **Steve O'Connell AM**, is to be presented to the London Assembly, in accordance with Standing Orders 3.20 to 3.21, saying:

**'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!.'**

The petition has 683 signatories.

The contact person for this petition is Hannah Pemberton, 25 Rothesay Road, London SE25 6NY.

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

**'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.'**

The petition has 1,639 signatories.

The contact person for this petition is Chris Lenon, 17 Oakley Street, London SW3 5NT.

## **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.

<b>Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985</b>
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: 10 February 2016**

**This report will be considered in public**

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 The Assembly is asked to note the responses received to a number of petitions presented at recent Assembly (Plenary) meetings.

## 2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Assembly notes the responses received to petitions presented at recent Assembly (Plenary) meetings.**

## 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 **Appendices 1 to 7** are the responses received to seven petitions presented at recent Assembly (Plenary) meetings.

## 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 regarding Lordship Lane Petition, dated 23 October 2015

**Appendix 2** – Letter from the Mayor regarding Baker Street/Gloucester Road Two Way Proposal Petition, dated 28 October 2015

**Appendix 3** – Letter from the Mayor regarding Dingwall Road Loop Petition, dated 2 December 2015

**Appendix 4** – Letter from the Mayor regarding Oxford Street Pedestrianisation Petition, dated 22 December 2015

**Appendix 5** – Letter from the Mayor regarding Police Community Support Officers Petition, dated 13 January 2016

**Appendix 6** – Letter from the Mayor regarding Caledonian Road Station Petition, dated 15 January 2016

**Appendix 7** – Letter from the Mayor regarding Chamberlayne Road Petition, dated 15 January 2016

<b>Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985</b>
List of Background Papers: None.
Contact Officer: John Barry, Principal Committee Manager
Telephone: 020 7983 4425
Email: <a href="mailto:john.barry@london.gov.uk">john.barry@london.gov.uk</a>

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM**

City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
More London  
London SE1 2AA

**Our ref:** MGLA160915-4697**Date:****23 OCT 2015**

Dear Jennette

**London Assembly (Plenary) Meeting 8 September 2015 - Petition**

Thank you for your letter of 11 September about the petition to tackle issues relating to prostitution in Lordship Park N16.

Let me reassure you that I take seriously anything that blights local communities, and the prostitution and kerb crawling issues raised here are clearly doing just that. Addressing prostitution is a priority in my Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) strategy and I remain committed to ensuring that the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) and partners are working to tackle this in an appropriate way.

The MPS also recognises how damaging these issues can be to the quality of residents' lives in Hackney and are taking a proactive approach to address and reduce this. I am assured that they are working to balance enforcement and support. First and foremost, local police are targeting kerb crawlers using a range of tactics from plain clothed operations to using CCTV to identify vehicles and subsequently send warning letters to the owners' homes. In addition, Hackney police have made use of new anti-social behaviour dispersal zones in an effort to take back areas for the residents and divert prostitution activity away. In partnership with Hackney Council, the MPS have also worked to develop a diversion course for those found kerb crawling. To date, none of the individuals that have attended this course have reoffended.

I acknowledge that this is a sensitive and challenging issue for those in your community and thank you for bringing it to my attention.

I would suggest that, if you have not done so already, you raise this petition at the Hackney Safer Neighbourhood Board who I am sure will want to keep abreast of the issue and ensure there is a continued focus on this at a local level.

Yours ever,



**Boris Johnson**  
Mayor of London

This page is intentionally left blank

**MAYOR OF LONDON****Murad Qureshi AM**

City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
More London  
London SE1 2AA

**Our ref:** MGLA160915-4696**Date:****28 OCT 2015**

Dear Murad

Thank you for the petition presented to the London Assembly plenary meeting on 8 September about the Baker Street/Gloucester Place Two-Way traffic scheme.

The proposed removal of the Baker Street gyratory is a Westminster City Council project. Westminster is designing and constructing the proposed scheme on both the borough and also the Transport for London (TfL) managed sections of these roads, with a financial contribution of £10m from TfL towards the total estimated cost of £15m. As you may be aware, Westminster has recently completed its consultation with residents and other interested parties on the proposals to improve Baker Street and Gloucester Place. There is a mixed response to the consultation. The issues raised in the consultation are currently being addressed by Westminster's design team, which intends to share its revised design with the public in early 2016.

I have asked TfL to keep you informed of progress as the Baker Street scheme develops over the coming months.

Thank you again for writing to me.

Yours ever,



**Boris Johnson**  
Mayor of London

Cc: Jennette Arnold OBE, AM

This page is intentionally left blank

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

**Our ref:** MGLA121115-9005

**Date:** 02 DEC 2015

Dear Jennette

**Re: London Assembly (Plenary) Meeting 4 November 2015 – Petition**

Thank you for your letter of 6 November enclosing the petition presented by Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM.

The tram system has revolutionised travel in South London. The current network has some constraints that need to be resolved to allow sustainable expansion to meet demand.

Ridership has more than doubled since 2000 and is expected nearly to double again by 2030. However, current capacity bottlenecks at various places on the network prevent Transport for London (TfL) from running more trams. An example of this is on the line to Wimbledon, where the recent opening of the second platform and double tracking will increase the service by 50 per cent from early next year.

To run more trams and accommodate new developments in the area, such as at the Whitgift Centre, TfL set out proposed improvements to both the network infrastructure and the tram fleet in its Trams 2030 investment strategy, published last year.

Following on from the Wimbledon works, the Dingwall Road Loop is a fundamental part of the strategy. It will provide capability to serve central Croydon with additional tram services to and from the eastern branches of the network, opening up the highly-constrained town centre. Trams using the Dingwall Road Loop would stop at Lansdowne Road, approximately a 150-metre walk to the proposed Westfield development. In addition, TfL is proposing to expand the existing Wellesley Road stop, directly across from the development.

Trams from the west will continue to serve the town centre as they do now, including shopping and transport links at Centrale, West Croydon, Wellesley Road and East Croydon. From the eastern branches, there will still be 'through' services to West Croydon.

## MAYOR OF LONDON

The completion of projects in the strategy would allow for the gradual increase of trams on the network, including the potential for longer trams. Running more trams prior to unblocking bottlenecks would mean either turning more trams around on the periphery of where people want to get to in Croydon or running more trams on the existing Croydon town centre route, which is already congested, undermining service performance for customers.

Indeed, with the introduction of the higher frequency on the Wimbledon route, the existing town centre loop will be at its capacity.

Longer trams are included as an aspiration towards the end of the period covered by the strategy. As the network was designed for 30-metre trams, there are a number of significant engineering challenges, particularly in Croydon town centre, where much of the street running is constrained. Operating longer trams would require substantial re-engineering of existing tracks and stops at many locations as well as power supply upgrades and addition stabling. There would also be an impact on other road traffic as the trams would take longer to clear junctions and some pedestrian crossings would need to be altered so that they were not blocked by trams.

The capital investment to change the infrastructure for longer trams is likely to cost around £150m. This does not include the increased operational costs and the purchase of the longer trams themselves, which TfL estimates would add around £100m, depending on the size of the fleet. However, further feasibility work is underway, which will provide firmer cost estimates.

As a result, although longer trams are not ruled out, TfL believes they are only appropriate when other options for increasing capacity have been exhausted.

Thank you again for writing to me.

Yours ever,



**Boris Johnson**  
Mayor of London



**Stephen Knight AM**

City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
More London  
London SE1 2AA

**Our ref:** MGLA121115-9006**Date:** 22 DEC 2015

Dear Stephen

Thank you for the petition presented to the London Assembly plenary meeting on 4 November about calling for the pedestrianisation of Oxford Street by 2020.

Transport for London (TfL) and Westminster City Council are, on behalf of the West End Partnership, examining a range of options for improving the environment for pedestrians on Oxford Street. Crossrail provides a unique opportunity to reconsider how transport serves Oxford Street and the wider West End. Options aimed at providing additional, better quality space for pedestrians include, reducing traffic, widening footways, reducing and relocating bus stops and pedestrianisation.

This work is considering the effectiveness of each option, including how it affects accessibility for people and freight as well as the potential impact on residents and businesses. It will also be presented to the West End Partnership Board early next year. The West End Partnership Board, Westminster City Council and TfL will review the analysis of options and take measures forward accordingly.

Any changes to the working of Oxford Street would be subject to public consultation.

Yours ever,



**Boris Johnson**  
Mayor of London

Cc: Jennette Arnold OBE AM, Chair of the London Assembly

This page is intentionally left blank

**MAYOR OF LONDON****Jennette Arnold OBE AM**

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

**Our ref:** MGAL071215-0737**Date:****13 JAN 2016**

Dear Jennette

Thank you for your letter of 3 December 2015 about the petition presented to the Assembly (Plenary) meeting on 2 December, relating to Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs).

Following the recent CSR announcement, I am very pleased to be able to confirm, as I said at MQT on 16 December, that there will remain at least one PCSO and Police Constable dedicated to each ward for at least the next year.

I have prioritised this because neighbourhood policing is at the heart of my Police and Crime Plan, integral to intelligence gathering for crime and counter-terrorism and because it is clearly important for Londoners.

The CSR was a very positive announcement for us. We will not, however, know the full details of the settlement for London until all of the elements of grant from the Home Office have been finalised.

However, the funding settlement does not mean that we can be complacent. I am determined to ensure that the Metropolitan Police Service continues to deliver great service and great value to Londoners and I will continue the reform of policing that has been so successful in London, reducing crime whilst reducing costs and transforming how we work.

I have repeatedly stated my commitment to maintain officer numbers at about 32,000 during my term in office and to support neighbourhood policing and am very happy to be able to reaffirm this.

Yours ever,



**Boris Johnson**  
Mayor of London

This page is intentionally left blank

## MAYOR OF LONDON

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM**

City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
More London  
London SE1 2AA

**Our ref:** MGLA071215-0738

**Date:** 15 JAN 2016

Dear Jennette

**Re: London Assembly (Plenary) Meeting 2 December 2015 - Petition**

Thank you for your letter of 3 December enclosing the petition about the closure of Caledonian Road station.

I understand that Transport for London (TfL) has been in contact with you to explain the reasons for the closure and these have also been communicated to local residents and users of the station.

Every effort has been made during the planning, and will continue to be made during the works, to complete this vital refurbishment in the shortest possible time.

To ensure the council is aware of potential future works at a much earlier stage, TfL has sent the local council an update on the conditions of the lifts at each of the Underground stations within Islington.

The petition refers to the closure of the station from 4 January 2016. As you are aware, following your feedback and that from a variety of local stakeholders, TfL has rescheduled the temporary closure of Caledonian Road station to start on 14 March 2016 to avoid any overlap with the closure of Tufnell Park. I hope this is a welcome development to the petitioners.

Thank you again for writing to me.

Yours ever,



**Boris Johnson**  
Mayor of London

This page is intentionally left blank

## MAYOR OF LONDON

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM**

City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
More London  
London SE1 2AA

**Our ref:** MGLA041215-0690

**Date:** 15 JAN 2016

Dear Jennette

**Re: London Assembly (Plenary) Meeting 2 December 2015 - Petition**

Thank you for your letter of 3 December enclosing a petition about low emission hybrid buses on bus routes travelling through Chamberlayne Road.

Considerable work has already been undertaken to reduce oxides of nitrogen (NOx) across London including this important corridor. NOx is made up of nitric oxide (NO) and nitrogen dioxide (NO2) but ultimately oxides to NO2 in the atmosphere.

In terms of the six principal routes (6, 28, 52, 187, 302 and 452) that use Chamberlayne Road, Transport for London (TfL) forecasts tailpipe emissions from these vehicles has fallen 44 per cent compared to 2012 and will be 55 per cent lower by 2018.

This process will continue as part of the fleet replacement plans and preparations for the Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) in 2020.

Improving performance has been achieved through retrofitting Euro III buses with selective catalytic reduction equipment which reduces tailpipe NOx by up to 88 per cent, and introducing newer vehicles including the ultra-low emission Euro VI engine which can reduce NOx up to 95 per cent compared to a standard Euro III vehicle.

TfL's forecasts are based on the number, type and mileage of buses allocated to the routes during peak times. Emission figures are based on the independent Millbrook test cycle which shows what NOx buses would emit per mile and provides accurate benchmark comparisons.

The decline in emissions outlined above highlights the scale of progress made to date. As ever, we can always do more and I am committed more than ever to ensuring we drive emissions down further. This phased approach is also a much more cost efficient solution than breaking contracts mid-term and ensures investment is targeted at achieving the greatest overall impact for all parts of London.

# MAYOR OF LONDON

Thank you again for writing to me.

Yours ever,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Boris', with a stylized flourish at the end.

**Boris Johnson**  
Mayor of London

Cc: Navin Shah AM



# Subject: Motions

**Report to: London Assembly (Plenary)**

**Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat**

**Date: 10 February 2016**

**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 motions submitted by Assembly Members as set out below.**

## 3. Issues for Consideration

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

“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

<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)

- 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."

- 3.2 The following motion has been proposed in the name of Darren Johnson AM and will be seconded at the meeting:

"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>5</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."

- 3.3 The following motion has been proposed in the name of **Jenny Jones AM** and will be seconded by Darren Johnson AM:

"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>6</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>7</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>8</sup>.

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

<sup>5</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."

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.wildlondon.org.uk/sites/default/files/files/London%20Garden%20City%20-%20full%20report.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.rhs.org.uk/communities/pdf/Greener-Streets/greening-grey-britain-report>

<sup>8</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)

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.”

- 3.4 The following motion has been proposed in the name of **Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM** and will be seconded by Stephen Knight AM:

“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.”

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

“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.”

- 3.6 The following motion has been proposed in the name of **Tom Copley AM** and will be seconded at the meeting:

“This Assembly notes that complaints against private landlords in London have risen by 47% since 2008<sup>9</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>10</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.”

---

**List of appendices to this report:** None.

<b>Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985</b>
--

List of Background Papers: None.
----------------------------------

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

---

<sup>9</sup> ‘Rent reform: Making London's private rented sector fit for purpose’, London Assembly Housing and Regeneration Committee, June 2013, p.23

<sup>10</sup> Housing in London database, London Data Store

# Subject: Mayoral Commitments

**Report to: London Assembly (Plenary)**

**Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat**

**Date: 10 February 2016**

**This report will be considered in public**

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 This report provides a summary of the commitments made by the Mayor, Boris Johnson MP, in response to queries or requests made by Assembly Members during London Assembly (Mayor's Question Time) meetings held between January 2015 and December 2015.

## 2. Recommendation

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

## 3. Background

- 3.1 The Assembly questions the Mayor at Mayor's Question Time meetings, in public, ten times a year as part of its role of holding him to account. Questions put to the Mayor by the Assembly Members cover the full range of the Mayor's responsibilities (including policing, the fire service, regeneration and transport) and can also range into almost any issue of concern to Londoners. The appendix to this report reflects the Mayoral responsibilities, being ordered by subject, and then by date.
- 3.2 During the course of Mayor's Question Time meetings, the Mayor may make commitments in response to queries or requests raised by Assembly Members and these are reported to the Assembly on a quarterly basis.

## 4. Issues for Consideration

- 4.1 The commitments made by the Mayor at Mayor's Question Time meetings between January 2015 and December 2015 are set out at **Appendix 1**.
- 4.2 This Appendix is attached for Members and officers only but is available from the following area of the GLA's website:  
[www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/whole-assembly](http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/whole-assembly)

## 5. Legal Implications

5.1 The Assembly is able to receive and note this report.

## 6. Financial Implications

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

---

### List of appendices to this report:

**Appendix 1** – Commitments made by the Mayor at Mayor's Question Time meetings since January 2015.

<b>Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985</b>	
List of Background Papers: None	
Contact Officer:	John Barry, Principal Committee Manager
Telephone:	020 7983 4425
E-mail:	<a href="mailto:john.barry@london.gov.uk">john.barry@london.gov.uk</a>

## Transport

### 24 hour tube service

Question Number: 2015/1259

12 May 2015

Joanne McCartney AM

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Thank you. Will you actually then personally take up the issue of no single staffing between outer London stations with Peter Hendy [Commissioner of Transport for London], and will you come and chat to me?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** What I undertake to do, because I really ought to talk to the experts about how they see safety in outer London stations, is that I will get back to you with an explanation of how we see the Night Tube service working to make sure that it is as safe as possible both for passengers and for our staff.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Thank you. The other issue that I have raised with you on a regular basis has been the rise in sexual assaults and harassment that have been reported on the Tube network, and obviously the running of the Night Tubes will mean that lots more people will be coming back in the early hours of the morning. You, I noticed yesterday, have started a consultation on reducing some of the night bus services in my area, for example. How will you be factoring in the risk, particularly to women, of sexual assaults and harassments that this policy may result in?

[...]

**Joanne McCartney AM:** OK. Mr Mayor, if you cannot tell me today, could you write to me? Have TfL talked to either the BTP or the MPS about having visible police officers, particularly in outer London, when you go live with 24-hour trains? It will have implications for their organisations as well.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I will genuinely get back to you about the ways in which we are going to ensure that the Night Tube is safe both for passengers and for staff, and I will give you a broad and full answer. Hello?

## Cycle Superhighways

Question Number: 2015/1639

08 Jun 2015

Caroline Pidgeon AM

[...]

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** When will you see Cycle Superhighway 6 if you have a long list? As far as I am aware, it has been cancelled. That was in an answer from you back in September.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Caroline, would you forgive me? I am looking at this chart and I do not see Cycle Superhighway 6. I assume that you are right. I am going to have to get back to you about Cycle Superhighway 6.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** In one of your answers, you confirmed that it has been cancelled and I want to know why and what on earth this reason means if it is to do with deliverability constraints within the supply chain?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I am so sorry. I cannot give you further information about that because I simply do not have it with me now. What we are doing is proceeding with a huge amount of investment in cycling infrastructure. It is the thick end of £1 billion. It is having a massive impact on the carriageway. You should see the letters I get from

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** I am sure.

## Cycle Superhighways

Question Number: 2015/1639

08 Jun 2015

Caroline Pidgeon AM

**Kit Malthouse AM MP:** Just on that point, Mr Mayor, do you think it would be more effective if cyclists who were caught going through red lights had their bikes impounded immediately so that their mode of transport is removed and they have to then go somewhere to recover it and pay a fine to get their bike back? As a cyclist myself, the most inconvenient thing is to lose your bike in the middle of a journey and to have to then clack off in boots and Lycra to get the Tube. Cyclists are much more likely to think twice about that than about a fine? Not that I wear Lycra when I cycle, just to calm everybody down.

[...]

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I would have to think about that. It is a very interesting idea. It is a custom pretty much alien to English law to take away people's property unless you absolutely have to.

**Kit Malthouse AM MP:** Of course, that is not correct. We clamp cars all the time. Cars get clamped all the time.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** It is worth looking at. Actually, characteristically, Kit, you might have come up with a rather interesting idea. I will talk it over with Bernard [Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM, Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis] and see what the options are. I do not know how we would introduce it. I do not know what regulations we would need in order to make it possible. It is something that certainly would act as a considerable deterrent and you are spot-on in your analysis.

**Kit Malthouse AM MP:** Certainly cars that are uninsured are immediately impounded.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes. I will take it up and I will get back to you.



## Noisy Tubes

Question Number: 2015/1743

08 Jun 2015

Murad Qureshi AM

[...]

**Murad Qureshi AM:** I am glad that I have brought it up, but I do think that there is a wider issue about mitigating the impact of 24-hour Tube. I am not saying people in central London are against it. You need to certainly work with local authorities and the MPS because I do not see any evidence of that in Westminster.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Let me get back to you with what we are doing to muffle, baffle, mitigate and do whatever we have to do to make sure that when we run a 24-hour Tube it does not keep people up at night. We are going to have a 24-hour Tube but we cannot be rattling people's teacups at 3.00am and so we will sort that out.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** Yes, that is the reassurance the residents want.

## Increase in proportion of cyclist casualties

Question Number: 2015/1745

08 Jun 2015

Valerie Shawcross AM

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM:** The one thing we have political consensus on is that we want to see cycling safety. We have a programme that is kind of half through. It is really still only phase one of the cycling revolution. It is incredibly important that there is a detailed continuity plan and that you can show not just how we are going to continue the programme for Cycle Superhighways but that a new Mayor can pick up projects in development.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes, absolutely.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM:** Will you actually give us a continuity plan in some detail so that we can see into the next administration exactly how this cycling revolution will roll forward?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes, I will. Yes, I shall, of course.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM:** It is not in your business plan at the moment. It is very vague.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** No, I do not accept that, Val. If you look at the action plan for cycling or the cycling revolution plan, it contains a huge raft of things, all of which are very detailed and all of which require specific interventions and specific costs. They are funded and they are going ahead. The Quietways, the Mini-Hollands, the expansion of the Cycle Superhighways, the expansion of the cycle hire scheme: all of that will continue. Yes, there will come a moment in 2017 or 2018 when the thing will need a great new surge of energy and funding and I hope very much that the next Mayor will see what a priority this is. There is a very clear roadmap.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM:** Will you publish that roadmap for us to see? For example, at the moment, I could not find a date for the completion of the three Mini-Hollands. We were really pleased that you are actually finally doing some 20mph-zone pilots on red routes, which is hugely important. The red routes are enormously dangerous and people have lobbied for this for years. What we want to see are some completion dates. We want to know there is some design work in progress and we are not going to have an interregnum while a new Mayor has to completely start from scratch?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** No. I would be very happy to share absolutely everything.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM:** Will you publish a continuity plan for us, Mr Mayor?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes. Obviously, my objective is to lay out the tram tracks for the next Mayor as far into the future as I possibly can in the hope that he or she will not deviate from the path of common sense.

[...]

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM:** We would all agree that one death is one death too many and it is still true to say that all pedal-cyclist accidents have gone up by about 2,000 since 2008. There is an issue and what we want is for you to not just keep your foot on the gas but give us a really good

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I think you mean ‘foot on the pedal’!

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM:** Keep your foot on the pedal, then. Give us a really good, clear technical plan for how an incoming Mayor can actually continue this without a break. That is all we ask for. Thank you, Mr Mayor.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes. You certainly shall have that.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM:** Thank you.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** You have that already.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM:** You will write to me with that, will you?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I would be happy to get Andrew [Andrew Gilligan, Mayor’s Cycling Commissioner] to talk to you.

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair):** OK. We understand that you are going to exchange information. Let us move to the next question.

## **Compensation for train delays and cancellations**

**Question Number: 2015/1961**

**08 Jun 2015**

**Richard Tracey AM**

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Thank you. My final question, then. A resident has suggested to me that the reason for this issue with the carriages is because TfL was not able to inspect them before it inherited the rolling stock. Do you know if that is correct?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I do not, but I would be happy to get back to you about that.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Thank you. It appears to me that in future, if TfL is to inherit other lines, we cannot have this situation occurring again.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes. I completely understand the point that is being made and I just repeat the message to passengers in that part of northeast London. It will get better. We are on it. Our objective is to invest in these stations, invest in these services and invest in new trains, which is what we are going to do. They have already seen a reduction in their fares, to be fair.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** A reduction in capacity as well, which is not good.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** It is not good. I accept that.

## Compensation for train delays and cancellations

Question Number: 2015/1961

08 Jun 2015

Richard Tracey AM

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Thank you. The other thing I want to ask is about the issue of compensation. At the moment, looking at the TfL website, it says:

*"Apply for a refund. At the moment you can't apply online for a service delay refund if your delayed journey was on TfL Rail or London Overground services between Liverpool Street and Enfield Town, Cheshunt and Chingford ..."*

I am going to ask you if you would make sure that every station on that line has a notice clearly displayed apologising to customers and telling them exactly how they can apply for refunds, given that online it is not available.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** If they are delayed, yes, I will make sure that we do something to that effect.

## Cyclists killed by HGVs

Question Number: 2015/2042

03 Jul 2015

Caroline Pidgeon AM

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** I would like that to be soon but what about the trial of a rush-hour ban? Is it something you will consider?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Sorry, on peak hour lorries, I will look at this. I have to tell you that this is something that, as you rightly say, TfL has traditionally rejected because it would just drive lorries into the surrounding periods of the day and you would have real congestion. You would have all sorts of unseen consequences. You would have lorry drivers flooring it

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** You will look at it?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** flooring it to beat the ban and causing even more accidents. All sorts of objections like that are raised. However, we are actively studying that option now. I can tell you that.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** Fantastic. I really go with that.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Whether it leads to a trial I cannot promise, but we are actively looking at it.

## The Night Tube

Question Number: 2015/2225

06 Jul 2015

Valerie Shawcross AM

**Andrew Dismore AM:** Can you tell me why there was no consultation with residents whose homes back on to the Northern line about the additional noise problems that emanate overnight?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** It has been drawn to my attention that one of the impacts of the Night Tube may be extra noise. We are looking into that, particularly at Baker Street. In that type of area, I have been alerted to possible consequences. Murad [Murad Qureshi AM] drew it to my attention last time and we are working very hard to mitigate all such impacts and to make sure that the unquestioned benefits of the Night Tube do not disadvantage some people in the city.

**Andrew Dismore AM:** You did not actually answer my question about why there was no consultation with residents.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I cannot say. I am not certain there was no consultation.

[...]

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** The answer will turn out to be that TfL was not aware of a very substantial number of residents who might be so affected. We are now getting reports of this and thank you for drawing the complaints of your constituents to my attention. We will obviously be doing whatever we can to mitigate it. I have to say that in eight years of being Mayor, this is the first time I have ever had any protest from any of you about nocturnal noise from the Tube. Not in this in this Question Time.

**Andrew Dismore AM:** Frankly, I find that answer incredible, Mr Mayor. Are you simply telling me that TfL had no thought about the impact on people who back on to the many miles of over ground Tube line where they are going to be disturbed at night?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** What I have been saying

**Andrew Dismore AM:** Are you seriously telling me that the TfL had no thought about it? It presumably had no thought about it because it made no attempt to consult people in the first place. If it had done, it would have heard.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I cannot tell you about the consultations that were made.

**Andrew Dismore AM:** There were not any.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I would be happy to get back to you on that. What I can tell you is that in the course of doing this job for a long time, Night Tube noise is not something that has really been raised with me, but I am listening to you now and I am going to do what I can to sort it out. It is not something that has been raised with me before.

**Stephen Knight AM:** Can I ask you this? What assessment has TfL made of the possibility in the short to medium term of converting diesel buses to run on compressed natural gas, a much cleaner fuel than diesel, in order to rid our streets of diesel buses as soon as we possibly can?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** What is happening on buses is that they are all going to be

**Stephen Knight AM:** No, I asked specifically about converting to natural gas.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I am not aware, particularly.

**Stephen Knight AM:** None at all?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** The plan is to go for Euro 6 standards or better

**Stephen Knight AM:** Will you ask TfL to look at this option?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** They have. Believe me, they have and

**Stephen Knight AM:** You just said that no consideration has been given to it.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I do not believe that there are plans to go forward with the conversion of our current fleet of buses to liquid gas or natural gas

**Stephen Knight AM:** Please could you write to me with a copy of what assessments have been done?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** because we think that we can achieve the air quality benefits in other ways. I have spelled out some of them. When you get the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) in

**Stephen Knight AM:** Could you ask TfL, please?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** you will have much cleaner buses running in the centre of London.

**Stephen Knight AM:** Mr Mayor, the current plans seem to leave our streets dominated by diesel buses for many years to come. You have said that TfL has looked at gas bus conversions and has dismissed it. Please could you publish or ask TfL to publish its assessment of doing that?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I would be very happy, Stephen, to do that.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** Then what I wanted to ask you about. Given that there is a lack of availability at the moment of zero-emission taxis and that could be a barrier to adoption and also the cost of them I have heard that the new ones are looking good, but the cost of them would you consider TfL looking at procuring a replacement fleet of zero-emission-capable taxis directly and then leasing them to taxi drivers, much the same way

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Like the bus, yes.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** you have with the New Bus for London, in order to get the prices down to get that real hit early on of clean vehicles on our streets?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** It is a very interesting idea. As you know, we have £65 million from the Office for Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV) that we are intending to use to subsidise the acquisition of these new vehicles. It might be worth considering whether we can use our finance and borrowing ability to do just that. I will certainly not see a problem with looking at that. It may not be possible but it is certainly worth considering.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** It seems that you have done it for buses and, from memory, New York do this for its taxi fleet. It leases them out. It would be a way that you could buy them quickly. It would help get through the system. Otherwise, we are going to be looking at 2033 before the taxi fleet is completely zero-emission-capable. I would like you to seriously put this to TfL and see if it can find a way to make this work.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes, I shall. I did not know it was being done in New York and we will certainly look at that possibility, although, as I say, I would not want to commit to it right now.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** It seems a good option to try to clean the fleet as quickly as possible. Thank you, Mr Mayor.

## Increasing cycling in London

Question Number: 2015/3560

09 Nov 2015

Caroline Pidgeon AM

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** Also, on construction vehicles, are you actively considering banning construction vehicles in the rush-hour lorry ban if you bring one in?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** That would be, again, very difficult in many ways for some parts of the economy. Also, you would have the risk of a great rush at either end of the ban. Cyclists use the roads at all times of the day, speaking entirely personally. We are there the whole time. If you had loads more lorries at the end of the morning peak, you might have a perverse and negative event.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** Will you work to ensure that the construction industry adopts the Construction Logistics and Cyclist Safety standards across the board? Although, you do have your Safer Lorries Scheme, a lot in there is not fully required. It has lots of nice words, but the industry can opt out of things like retrofitting lorry cabs with glass doors to ensure full vision.

Will you look to review those and to tighten up those standards so that we can really improve safety on our roads?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** As you know, Caroline, we are already. These standards must be agreed at a European level and that is just it, I am afraid. Take whatever view of that you want, but that is the reality. We are now working not just with the manufacturers but with the Commission on legislative change. You speak rightly about the new types of cabs that we want to see. It can make a huge difference if you get the driver down to the kind of level of a bus driver with a transparent door so that they can see vulnerable road users much more easily.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** I would be grateful if you could write to me with further details of what you are doing around lorry safety and we will formally present this petition to you. Thank you very much.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I would be very happy to do that. I could tell you a lot more about it now, but I would be very happy to write.

## South West Trains

Question Number: 2015/4359

07 Dec 2015

Richard Tracey AM

**Steve O'Connell AM:** However, in the meantime, I would urge you to use your offices through TfL and you can bring yourself up to speed about the details to express your displeasure at the service that is being delivered to Londoners. It was absolutely disgraceful yesterday.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I am obliged to you for pointing it out. I have not had a report from TfL about that

**Steve O'Connell AM:** Can you get a report please, Mr Mayor?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** but I will find out what happened at London Bridge yesterday. In fact, I did meet a discontented passenger who had come from that area yesterday morning. I was cycling at the time. I was aware of irritation. Let me find out exactly what happened.

**Steve O'Connell AM:** Could you do so?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I will, yes.

**Steve O'Connell AM:** Thank you.

## Environment

### Supreme Court Judgement against the UK government over breaches of EU air pollution limits

Question Number: 2015/1498

12 May 2015

Jenny Jones AM

**Nicky Gavron AM:** Yes. Good morning. I agree with Assembly Members Jones and Qureshi that we need to expand the ULEZ and I am glad you are now considering that but we cannot wait. There are some measures that we absolutely have to have very, very soon. It is not just cars. I want a bit of a preamble; only one question. It is not just cars that use roads. It is schoolchildren. It happens to be National Walk to School Week. All over London now, more and more children are walking to school. It is a great initiative.

However, the issue is that we have over 1,000 schools on or near polluted roads. There is new scientific evidence done in London with 800 children at 23 schools, longitudinally, that shows that just the daily walk to and from school for half an hour damages children's lungs and stunts their growth. We used to push safer routes to school and quite rightly, but now we need safe, clean-air routes to school.

On behalf of the Labour Group - and coming to the question - I put forward an amendment to your budget [2015-16], which you did not take up. It said that this year you should be piloting clean-air routes to school with a view to putting a much bigger budget line in next year. My question is: will you now commit to supporting some pilots this year for clean-air routes to school for schoolchildren in primary schools?

[...]

**Nicky Gavron AM:** The point is that children are walking along very polluted roads. They have to find other routes. That has to be worked out. TfL should have a role in that. Will you support clean-air routes to school?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes, of course. Just going back to what I was saying, TfL

**Nicky Gavron AM:** It is not doing it now. Will you do it? Will you support it?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** will be, I am sure, happy to give you a full briefing on what we do, but Surface Transport has a massive programme of engagement with schools. If there is something we can learn from your programme, then I would be very happy to do so, Nicky. I do not in any way wish to dismiss it.

### GLA Energy Supply Licence

Question Number: 2015/3733

09 Nov 2015

James Cleverly AM

**James Cleverly AM MP:** Will you ensure that the work that is done through the Licence Lite and these decentralised energy suppliers is plugged into your wider plans to clean London's air, reduce bad air episodes and so on, to ensure that we do not fall foul of future European Union (EU) fines with regard to this?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes. The whole initiative is very interesting and I thank you for the interest and energy you are committing to it.



## Planning and Housing

### Carlton Tavern

Question Number: 2015/1486

12 May 2015

Steve O'Connell AM

**Steve O'Connell AM:** We need to congratulate Westminster Council and the Members across both parties to support that enforcement action in giving a particularly bloody nose to the developer. Particularly I know Tom [Tom Copley AM] and myself are very keen to protect pubs. I know Tom has a written question in to you. I have probably no doubt that the developer may try to appeal against this enforcement, and my first point to you is could you try to ensure that any support you can give, through this building, in support of Westminster Council in rebuffing any potential appeal, will be made properly available?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes.

**Steve O'Connell AM:** In other words, would you be able to support Westminster Council in any given way?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Absolutely. I will support them morally and intellectually. They are completely right and we should all agree to make use of this pub ourselves in order to keep it going.

### Paving over front gardens

Question Number: 2015/1669

08 Jun 2015

Jenny Jones AM

[...]

**Jenny Jones AM:** It is not just about that; there are also things you can do just as Mayor. For example, you could in fact set up a GLA website where you could urge people not to pave over their gardens and you could give them advice about other methods of creating a flat surface if that is what they want. Would you be prepared to do that?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Look, we have campaigned a huge amount on greening up London, protecting green space and creating more green space and, as you know, by 2025 25% of London will be under a canopy of leaves.

**Jenny Jones AM:** Will you do what I am asking?

[...]

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Your idea of helping people with some sort of website is a good one. I will look at what we already have and possibly what would be most useful is if we had some traffic offline about this, Jenny. If you want to do a joint initiative on this, I am very receptive.

**Jenny Jones AM:** OK. Great. You could use the advertising on London buses, for example, to draw people's attention to this.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes. Everybody always wants that advertising for almost every good cause, but I will look at it. I will look at it.

**Jenny Jones AM:** I will be writing to you. Thank you.

## Viability in planning decisions

Question Number: 2015/2221

06 Jul 2015

Nicky Gavron AM

**Andrew Boff AM:** Would you take action to end the confidentiality of viability assessments?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I would have to take advice on the effect of that and whether it would have the benign effects that we want.

**Andrew Boff AM:** You will try?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I will certainly discuss it. I do not know whether it would have the positive effect that we want.

**Andrew Boff AM:** There are no good arguments for confidentiality of viability assessments that I have heard. I would welcome you submitting some to me that make any sense whatsoever.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I am willing to look into it. What I do not want to do is introduce into the whole planning process, unwittingly, things that give developers an excuse not to go ahead, and that is always the problem. I would not want to see that.

## Policing

### Cuts to Policing

Question Number: 2015/0912

16 Mar 2015

Joanne McCartney AM

**Andrew Dismore AM:** The last question was this. What percentage of burglaries in Barnet resulted in a criminal prosecution last year?

[...]

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** The answer is that I am very happy to write to you, Andrew, with the detail and the breakdown of criminal prosecutions of burglaries in Barnet. However, overall crime in Barnet, as indeed crime in London, has come down very substantially not just over the last four years but over the last seven years and you

**Andrew Dismore AM:** That is not what your figures show.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** No, that is not true.

## **Public order police officers and Body-worn video cameras**

**Question Number: 2015/1482**

**12 May 2015**

**Roger Evans AM**

**Andrew Dismore AM:** On the issue of public order, I wrote to you yesterday about the plans of anti-Semitic and far-right groups to hold a rally in Golders Green in January specifically aimed against the Jewish community. It is clearly very provocative and threatening in the wake of what happened in Paris and Copenhagen and the significant rise in anti-Semitic attacks in London over the last year. There has to be a real risk of disorder and violence against Jewish community businesses and the local community. What will you do to try to deal with this, and in particular to try to stop the rally taking place?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Thank you for writing to me and thank you for taking it up. I will get on to it immediately and we will see what we can do. As you know, we do not generally like to ban public demonstrations or rallies except where absolutely necessary, though in the case of inciting anti-Semitic hatred or violence, that is plainly intolerable in our city, and we will see whether it meets those criteria.

## **Knife crime in London**

**Question Number: 2015/1562**

**19 May 2015**

**Caroline Pidgeon AM**

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** [...] I have asked you, Mr Mayor, previously about ensuring accident and emergency (A&E) departments in London share non-confidential data with the police to help reduce violent crime.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes, I remember you saying this.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** After I questioned you last year, you wrote to all the chief executives of London hospital trusts to encourage them to adopt this model. I am wondering how satisfied you were with the responses you received and perhaps you can let us know now how many A&E departments are now sharing this data with the police?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Caroline, I would be very happy to. First of all, perhaps I could just say how very strongly I support what the Commissioner has said and his general approach is right. It is important to stress with knife crime that we are doing better than we were, but it is absolutely vital not to be complacent about this. There will be a lot of action now on this front to make sure that what the Commissioner described, rightly, as a blip does not become a trend and that we really get a handle on this.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** In terms of the A&E departments

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I am sure that the Commissioner will be wanting to use the full panoply of measures that he brought very powerfully into effect with Operation Big Wing in 2011.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** OK. We are talking, firstly, specifically about the A&E departments.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** On A&E, another point about VWI is that the police figures that we are seeing are not necessarily being corroborated by the A&E statistics and by the numbers of victims presenting at A&E. That is an anomaly that we are trying to get to the bottom of. On your specific question about the number

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** Yes, that is what I asked.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** of hospitals that have responded, I am afraid I do not have that data with me now. I would be very happy, Caroline, to get back to you on that.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** OK, but given I do not think yet we have all A&E departments sharing this data

and given knife crime at the moment is slightly starting to increase and we are concerned about it and given 1,000 people a month are victims of knife crime in London, will you now call a summit to get together at City Hall all the key hospital trusts and the partners to find a way forward on this? We have talked about this for years. We know the Cardiff model works. Sharing this data led to a 42% reduction in violent crime. It would be great if you could take a lead on this.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes. As you know, we have written to them all and, if you had given me specific notice of that aspect

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** I am surprised your office did not pick up on that.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** of the problem that you wish to be enlightened about, I could certainly have provided it. However, you are going to have to forgive me. I will get back to you later about the exact responses that we have had.

[...]

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Could you make sure you have that conversation with the Commissioner the next time you meet him? It is vital.

The other thing we have heard is that funding from the Government for ISVAs actually ended this year with only five organisations in London receiving Government funding directly. Given that ISVAs are highly recommended as economically viable, particularly because they ensure that cases actually proceed to Court and perpetrators are actually caught and hopefully prevented from further crimes, would you support increasing their number, firstly?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Yes? Excellent.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I have told you. The Rape Crisis Centres also, by the way, help to support ISVAs and those going through the criminal justice system. The London Crime Prevention Fund is there to help local authorities. We are putting money into this at the moment. What I will undertake is to talk to Bernard [Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM, Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis] about his remarks to you about the

**Joanne McCartney AM:** It was actually his response in writing to Dame Elish's report.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Forgive me; I will talk to him about his response to Dame Elish Angiolini's report. I will see how he would quantify that need and what he would like us to do by way of funding to meet this and what sort of a priority we need to give it.

[...]

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Yes. ISVAs deal particularly with the trauma of very serious rape and sexual violence and they are very particular. Will you agree to do that review through MOPAC?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** So do IDVAs, to be fair.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Exactly, yes. There is overlap but you do need those specialist ones as well. Will you commit to doing that review?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I am grateful to you for raising it. I will certainly commit to ensuring that we are spending enough on ISVAs and IDVAs and everybody in that field and I will make sure that MOPAC writes to you, Joanne. I will write to you with an account of how we are doing and what we are doing and whether I think it is adequate.

## Police Funding

Question Number: 2015/2750

07 Sep 2015

Joanne McCartney AM

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Yes, we entirely agree with that, Mr Mayor. In the consultation that the Home Office is doing about replacing the policing formula, under various scenarios it has the MPS budget reducing by up to 43%, which obviously decimates London's police as we know it. These figures are not being given out as part of the consultation. Therefore police forces are being asked to respond to a consultation where the Home Office is refusing to release the data that lies behind the changes.

The Police and Crime Commissioners Treasurers' Society has come up with possible scenarios that lead to that 43% possibility for the MPS. The Police and Crime Commissioners of the West Midlands and Northumbria have stated that this indicates a shift away from city policing to rural.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes --

**Joanne McCartney AM:** They have said that they are investigating the possibility of legal action against the Home Office. Obviously, in your position as Police and Crime Commissioner of the major police force in the country, would you talk to those two Police Commissioners and others who are like minded and talk about what you can do together, perhaps resorting to legal action? Otherwise, unless you take the lead in this, we could be looking at a disaster for our police funding.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I share that concern. You may have had a copy of the letter I have written to Theresa May [Rt Hon Theresa May MP, Home Secretary] on this.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** No, I have not.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** We are certainly very happy to email that to you. We can send that letter.

## Police Funding

Question Number: 2015/2750

07 Sep 2015

Joanne McCartney AM

**Joanne McCartney AM:** A final question: will you talk to the [Police and Crime] Commissioners of the West Midlands and Northumbria and any other like minded Commissioner who wants to come together? A powerful group would be very helpful.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I certainly will ensure that we have contact. MOPAC is already in contact with Tony Lloyd [Police and Crime Commissioner, Greater Manchester] and with the Commissioner of the West Midlands.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Vera Baird [Police and Crime Commissioner, Northumbria], yes.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** We are not yet at the stage of taking legal action. I do not exclude it but I want to make it clear that at this point in time that this is something that we think is an urgent political concern at the moment.

## **DBS Checks - MPS Vacancies**

**Question Number: 2015/2752**

**07 Sep 2015**

**Valerie Shawcross AM**

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM:** Mr Mayor, I am not pleading for deregulation. We are talking about people who have been operational in their professional roles, some of them for a very long time.

The taxi drivers who were here - and they were not here at our behest; they organised this - had an international day of protest by taxi drivers going on. One of the things they issued in their press release this morning - which I had this morning - is that they would like to see a resumption of the issuing of temporary licences to existing taxi drivers who are waiting for their DBS check to come through, through no fault of their own. That used to be the practice within TfL. They find it, understandably, incredibly unsympathetic of TfL to have taken away that temporary cover facility in a way that causes them problems. There may be technical issues but it could be something under the current legislation that you could do to ease the situation for people who are literally running into problems.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Frankly, that sounds like an extremely positive idea.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM:** It was one of their proposals.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I will immediately ask the MPS to see if it can issue temporary DBS licences. It may be one of those things where TfL needs the MPS to give the go-ahead. I will have to get onto that straightaway.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM:** As a temporary measure. Thank you, Chairman. Thank you.

## **The Impact of Money Laundering on Housing in London**

**Question Number: 2015/2753**

**07 Sep 2015**

**Murad Qureshi AM**

**Murad Qureshi AM:** Can I make my final point? Will you, as Mayor, support Transparency International's recommendation that estate agents should also exert due diligence checks on the purchasers of properties and not just sellers? That is one thing it thinks is useful. At the moment estate agents only do a due-diligence check on sellers. It wants to see this being done on purchasers at the top end of the market at least.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Due diligence done by estate agents?

**Murad Qureshi AM:** Yes. It is actually supported by the National Estate Agency.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Again, what you really need to have is transparency about who is buying these properties. You need to know who they are. If it can be done without completely burdening estate agents with the kind of detective work for which they are simply not equipped then, yes, I would certainly support it.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** That is what I think Transparency [International] need from you.

## Anonymous masked demonstrations

Question Number: 2015/3736

09 Nov 2015

Kemi Badenoch AM

**Kemi Badenoch AM:** Thank you, Mr Mayor. My particular concern is about the people who are covering their faces to avoid prosecution. Like you say, there were 50 arrests. Three individuals refused to reveal their identities, yet they were given unconditional bail by Westminster Magistrates Court. Is there any chance of them ever appearing before the Court and how can we stop what is, quite frankly, a ridiculous situation from happening again, where people go to court and refuse to give their names and we have no idea who they are?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** It is very interesting that the Magistrates Court gave them unconditional bail even without giving their identities. Surely they have to give their identities. I am surprised by that. It is a long time since you were able to give a false identity in a court of law in this country or not to give your identity. I will look into that. I do not understand what happened.

The police do have powers under the Public Order Act 1994 to ask people to remove their masks. That is obviously an operational matter for them. Obviously, if they think it appropriate to get people to take masks off in order to make the march safer, then they should get on and do that.

## MPS Capability

Question Number: 2015/3768

09 Nov 2015

Joanne McCartney AM

**Joanne McCartney AM:** The MPS Commissioner [of Police of the Metropolis, Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM] has said publicly at one of my local meetings and also publicly to the Home Affairs Select Committee that some of the work that the MPS may have to stop doing or will need to review is, for example, the cases of missing people and doing welfare checks on people who have come out of hospital and, perhaps most concerning, about whether the police will be able to monitor and check addresses of over 7,000 registered sex offenders in London. I am just wondering whether you have had those concerns expressed to you and if you

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** No. I am very interested by all those points. I will ask. Those are not points that have been made to me, but I will make sure I bring that up with the committee.

## MPS Capability

Question Number: 2015/3768

09 Nov 2015

Joanne McCartney AM

**Fiona Twycross AM:** Last year - about this time last year, actually - when I asked you about the lack of prosecutions, you said that there were people who are simply getting away with it and, as long as they get away with it and as long as there is not a successful prosecution, then people have a sense it is not taken as seriously as it should be.

How long will people simply be getting away with it? For example, in Southwark, one in ten babies is born to a woman who has been a victim and survivor of FGM. This is not a marginal problem. How long will people simply be getting away with it?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I cannot give you the answer to that, Fiona. I would be happy to supply you afterwards with any information I have about investigations that are underway or arrests that have been made. I do not know the state of any of our particular inquiries into it. All I know is what you have just said, which is that there was a very disappointing business earlier this year when we failed. This has been illegal since 1981 in this country and we still have not produced a successful conviction. It is a great, great shame that that has not happened, although it does not mean we are not determined to do it, and we will.



## Knife Crime in London

Question Number: 2015/3989

07 Dec 2015

Joanne McCartney AM

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Picking up on the point that Caroline raised about schools engaging with pupils on the dangers of carrying knives, I know that it is something you agree with. However, we have heard in our Police and Crime Committee on a number of occasions that because of the piecemeal nature of the supervision of schools – because we now have academies and we now have free schools – it is increasingly difficult to make sure that there is a consistent approach to this issue.

Therefore, I was going to ask you. Will you write to all secondary schools in London and urge them to make sure that they deal with knife crime during school time

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** No, I will not. I will certainly support good projects like the Kinsella [Trust] project.

I have to say that I remember in 2007/08 when we had this discussion a lot around this place. There are a lot of complicated psychological factors at work here, particularly in the imaginations of young people. What slightly concerns me – and I must be very honest with you – is the glamorisation of knife crime and the escalation of knife crime in the imaginations of young people to the point where it is simply inflaming their curiosity about what is going on. I do not want knife crime to become, as it were, part of the daily curriculum of schools in this city.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Yes, but it is about destroying those myths and

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I understand exactly what you are saying. I am just hesitant about some of the methods that could be used.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** We had evidence from the police in some of our sessions to say that they did have difficulty getting into some schools. A very powerful letter from you urging schools to do this and, if I can just say, certain boroughs, for example, if you would think about it

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Let me think about it, Joanne. If you could send me a version of what you think might be useful, I would be very happy to study that.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** The other thing is that certain boroughs had an exponential increase. For example, Islington had a 79% increase in knife crime with injury involving under-25s in the last year. In my own borough of Haringey it was 31% and Tower Hamlets had a 103% increase. It seems to me that if you wanted to target you could target those specific boroughs

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** You could. Look, I do not want to sound negative about suggestion or proposal. I just have long memories of this now and

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Eight years ago

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Certainly, if you look at the movement of offences overall and, indeed, knife crime with injury, it is way down on seven or eight years ago.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** It is going up and it seems to be a trend.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** It is up on 2013/14 but it is down from a peak. It peaked, as Caroline [Pidgeon MBE AM] was saying, around about 2011/12. As Kit [Malthouse AM MP, former Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime] used to say, it is like going down a ski slope. You go down and down like that

**Joanne McCartney AM:** It is going back up again.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** and we have had peaks and troughs on the way down. There is a mixture of solutions. I would be very happy to look at your proposal. If you send it in, I will see what I can do with it.

[...]

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Can I ask my final question, then, on the availability of knives? In Scotland, all shops that sell knives or any weapons over 8.9 centimetres long have to be licensed and a record has to be kept that has to be kept for three years as to who bought that knife. Is that something that you think we should have in this country?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I will look at what has happened in Scotland and whether that has worked. We have to go with what works and what is practical.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** You will look at it. Thank you.

## Knife Crime in London

Question Number: 2015/3989

07 Dec 2015

Joanne McCartney AM

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM:** Chair, thank you for bringing me in. Mr Mayor, we have touched on this briefly but I did not have time to really put a full call to you. You talked earlier about the mixture of solutions. Can I just say that I welcome the support that you have given to the Ben Kinsella Trust and the work that it does in terms of the education package it delivers across London? Members will remember that Ben was tragically murdered in the week of his 16th birthday on 28 June 2008.

I am calling on you for a knife amnesty. If you cannot commit to seeing it across London, let me just say why it should be targeted and let me speak firstly about my constituency. In the last year, what we have seen in my constituency is we have seen seven young people under 25 murdered on our streets because of knife crime. That is certainly by itself an awful number that we all regret, but there have been 15 murders across London so far this year. In 2014, there was a total of just 11. It is not 'just' because every life matters but there were 11 deaths.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** That is right. It was eight the year before.

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM :** We know that when we have had these amnesties they do work in that we get a sense there. Can you see that as a response?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes. I am not against that, Jennette.

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM :** If you are not against it, then will you give your full support to it?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Can I make a proposal that I respond in more or less the same way as I have to Joanne [McCartney AM] and take it away? I will look at what area, whether it is your constituency or Islington or Hackney, and what the most appropriate way of doing that might be. I will talk to Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe [QPM, Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis] about whether he thinks it would be of real practical benefit right now. If he does, I have absolutely no problem with that at all. We have done it before; I see no reason why we should not do it again.

[...]

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** It is important to see the figures in context and to recognise that murders in London are currently running at about 100 a year and they were running at 150 a year. Overall, crime continues to be well down.

Listen. The amnesty proposal is something that should be considered. We do not want a ludicrous situation in which people are handing in the wrong types of weapons and all of that sort of thing.

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM:** No, that does not happen.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Let us see what practical steps we can take and what geographical zone would be most appropriate.

## Knife crime in London

Question Number: 2015/4243

07 Dec 2015

Caroline Pidgeon AM

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** What I wanted to pick up on was - you are aware because I sent it to you - that I produced a report last month looking at the issue of how we could try to reduce knife crime in London. I have three specific asks for you today.

One is around the issue of education and engagement with young people. Chief Superintendent John Sutherland [MPS] last week on the *Today* programme said, "We can't just talk about enforcement. We have to look at education". When I have spoken to various charities, it is clear that many schools are choosing to opt out of having any kind of knife crime education programmes because they want to avoid a stigma. Actually, we probably need to have this rolled out to all schools so that there is not then a stigma and it is just something that routinely happens in every school in London.

Will you ask MOPAC to look at funding and developing knife crime education programmes that can be rolled out to every school in London?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I will certainly consider that, Caroline. There was excellent work done by, for instance, the Ben Kinsella Trust

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** Yes, absolutely.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** which you are familiar with. I am sure you will have been around the amazing exhibition and educational experience that they offer and

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** That is one of the charities that raised this with me.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I have been to see it myself. MOPAC has given that organisation funding on at least one occasion and we are looking at giving it some more.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** You will consider that? Thank you for that. Secondly, we have mentioned the Cardiff Model and A&E departments sharing this non-confidential data to reduce violent crime. Yesterday, coincidentally, I had a nice long letter from MOPAC arrive in the afternoon updating me on this issue. It is a year since I raised this with you last, yet still a third of A&Es in London are not taking part.

Will you now get the Chief Executives of hospital trusts into City Hall to get this resolved once and for all so that we can share this anonymised data and start to make progress?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes, I totally agree with you. I will find out what is going on with the Chief Executives and why some of them have not agreed. Clearly, the priority has to be the care of our population.

[...]

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** You are going to get the Chief Executives in to sort that? That is fantastic.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** We have made a great deal of progress on it already.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** Finally, MOPAC has just started recently funding Red Thread, which is an organisation that has youth workers in major trauma centres in London. They are doing some great work diverting young people at that crossroads when they come in.

Would you consider extending this further and helping other similar projects such as groups like Oasis Youth, which has youth workers in St Thomas' A&E, where they are able to reduce the escalation of violence? Will you look at that issue?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes. Look, when you say “reduce the escalation of violence”, it is very important to say that violence has been diminishing in any event

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** It is to help these young people steer away from

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** and so possibly a more felicitous way of saying it is “accelerate the de-escalation of violence” or “keep violence coming down faster”.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** Will you consider looking at other funding? Just a simple yes or no. Will you consider that?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes, in that case.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM:** Fantastic. Thank you very much for your support of those suggestions this morning.

### **Advice for Londoners in the event of a Paris style attack**

**Question Number: 2015/4353**

**07 Dec 2015**

**Kemi Badenoch AM**

**Kemi Badenoch AM:** Is it time to introduce gunfire detectors? They have been shown to significantly police response times and to save lives. You may remember that my colleague Roger Evans [AM] recently proposed that the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) should introduce them.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I am very happy to look at that proposal and to see whether it would add value. I am aware that Roger has tabled that proposal for gunfire detectors. They have been used in some places in the United States (US).

**Kemi Badenoch AM:** Yes.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** If it can be made to work here, then we will certainly have a look at it.

**Kemi Badenoch AM:** Thank you.

## Breathalyser tests

Question Number: 2015/4371

07 Dec 2015

Steve O'Connell AM

**Steve O'Connell AM:** The idea here is that the door supervisors are now empowered very much, if they have the kit and if they identify someone coming along in the queue who does look particularly worse for wear, to ask them to breathe into a breathalyser. The level of that breathalyser is something like three times the drink-drive [limit] and so it is going to hit people who are heavily preloading. The door supervisors are then allowed to eject those people and also to notify the police that these guys and girls are out there. It is a scheme that has a lot of value. It is used, as I said, in several district centres.

Mr Mayor, you said that you think this is a good idea, but is this something that you could ask MOPAC and also other boroughs to enforce? It is a pilot at the moment but it does have worth particularly at this time of year when there are obviously a lot of people enjoying themselves. Is this something that you think we could roll out in the New Year?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Let us see how it goes, Steve. It is very interesting. I am not certain that I want to be breathalysed every time I walk into a pub but

**Steve O'Connell AM:** Me neither. Mr Mayor, what we are talking about is using it post 1.00am in the morning, say, outside clubs in the district centres when people have already had the opportunity to have a good evening out drinking. It gives the possibility to reduce the antisocial behaviour that also imposes upon our police resources and our district centres. It has been very successful across Haringey and Croydon and in other cities.

I would ask you to look very seriously at the project and to instruct colleagues in MOPAC and elsewhere to implement it in other parts.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Look, I am very grateful to you for your initiative in this area. Let me see whether we think it can deliver the value, the costs, the benefits and the extra imposition upon businesses. It might be something that late-night entertainment businesses would welcome. Some of them might think it would be burdensome. Let us see how it works.

# Business and Enterprise

## Outer London small business premises

**Question Number:** 2015/1258

**12 May 2015**

**Nicky Gavron AM**

**Nicky Gavron AM:** That is very good to hear. There is a saving grace – you know that, do you not – because this policy is due to expire in 2016. It is a three-year policy. Unfortunately, the Government came in last summer with a new consultation, saying that they wanted to turn over the CAZ exemption and they wanted to make permanent office permitted development right across the country, and of course including the whole of London. You are now in a better position even than you were before: you are now in Government you are a member of the Government; you are in the political Cabinet. You have a great opportunity, because that has not been brought forward. That consultation has not been answered.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I will look at it.

**Nicky Gavron AM:** Wait a minute. It has not been brought forward, and we are all very concerned that it will be. It is going to be absolutely catastrophic for London's economy if this goes through, and you absolutely have to make sure that it is ruled out in London, that we do not have permitted development from office to residential. Will you end it? Will you fight to end it?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I will see what I can do. I will study the implications for outer London in more detail. I am concerned about some of the reports I am getting from outer London town centres, and I will see what I can do. I will get back to you on that, Nicky.

## Pressure on small businesses

**Question Number:** 2015/4392

**07 Dec 2015**

**Jenny Jones AM**

**Jenny Jones AM:** My problem is that there is a squeeze on existing businesses. It is all very well to develop an area and say, "The number of jobs is going up", but what is happening in several places is that businesses that have been there sometimes for many years are being squeezed out because of the rent rises that you are talking about.

Here is one example. TfL has a lot of space that it is redeveloping. At Parsons Green Depot, TfL is clearing out about a dozen very successful businesses of all kinds including furniture makers, photographers and so on. They are offering them places

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Where is this, Jenny?

**Jenny Jones AM:** Parsons Green. I would like to ask you perhaps to work with TfL to see if anything can be done about this.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes, I will. I am not aware of that.

**Jenny Jones AM:** It is not good enough to say, "There are more jobs and these people can be relocated nine miles away". It is just not good enough when it is a local workforce quite often and there are people working locally. Will you speak to TfL about this particular issue? You have some influence with TfL.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes, I certainly shall. I am not aware of the Parsons Green problem. You may remember that there was a great deal of concern about buildings in Hackney Wick and we were

**Jenny Jones AM:** Yes.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Actually, there is a huge amount of new space that has been created there for businesses of sizes

**Jenny Jones AM:** Yes, but I have visited there as well and you are driving out businesses that are there already, brewers and all sorts of people who have

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Perhaps you are right, but my impression was that we had created a huge amount of extra space and that is what I want to achieve. I will look at the Parsons Green problem.

**Jenny Jones AM:** I would be very grateful. One of the things that you could do is to stabilise rents in some way on TfL's commercial premises and to perhaps link them to inflation or something like that so that the businesses can project what their costs will be over the next few years. At the moment, just as you said, rents are rising exponentially and it would help the businesses there already to stay put.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I will certainly look at that. Do not forget, folks, that we have all these conflicting objectives. TfL is also told that it is the biggest landlord in London with space the size of Hyde Park. Why does it not get on and develop these sites for residential [use]? Yet of course it has conflicting obligations towards worthwhile businesses that are perhaps obstructing the creation of the very residential [space] that the city needs.

**Jenny Jones AM:** I do understand that, but

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** What I am saying to you, Jenny, is that it is possible for TfL to be between a rock and hard place and it will be damned either way, but I will certainly look at it.

**Jenny Jones AM:** For example, you have supported Tech City, where offices are being turned into flats and so on. People there as well are struggling because of rents. Another constituent, Tom, runs a small web design company. It took him a year to find a new office and his rent has doubled. It just does not seem logical when you have a creative business that is a good business, functions well and has local people to drive it out because of the rents.

I do not know if you have spoken already to the Federation of Small Businesses, but perhaps talk to them about how to stabilise rents to some extent so that such businesses do not get pushed away. I understand about the competing priorities but the fact is that if you drive some businesses out, you are losing the character of a place as well as local jobs.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I completely agree. We have just established something called the Open Workspace Providers Group, which is looking at this whole problem. We have set up quite a lot of hub spaces. You will be familiar with the 639 Enterprise Centre in the Tottenham High Road. The Camden Collective is providing co working space and pop-up retail in vacant shops and ex-office buildings. We have funded something called the Blackhorse Workshop from the Outer London Fund. The Outer London Fund has put a lot of money into this kind of thing and

**Jenny Jones AM:** No, I know that you are doing good work and I accept that it is very difficult, but at the same time it is good to understand where things are getting squeezed out.

Your officers at the moment are putting together all sorts of evidence for the new London Plan for the new Mayor and the Federation of Small Businesses could do some research into this specific thing for those officers for the next London Plan. Would you consider some sort of approach to do that? Then you would have the facts and figures and it would not just be me lobbying you here at Mayor's Question Time.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Of course, this is something that City Hall takes incredibly seriously. As I said right at the beginning, I believe that this is one of the real challenges that we are facing as a result of the colossal economic success of London. It is just that the pressure on workspace is overwhelming. Yes, we are totally focused on it.



If we can supply you, Jenny, with a clearer picture of what is happening, the spaces that are being lost and the plans we have to redeem that, we would be very happy to do so. Talk to Eddie [Lister] and we will keep you informed.

## Health

### Sexual Health

**Question Number:** 2015/4341

**07 Dec 2015**

**Andrew Boff AM**

**Andrew Boff AM:** According to the ChemSex study that is referred to by the RCGP, the practice has become popular in the boroughs of Lewisham, Lambeth and Southwark. What work do you think should be done to tackle the practice specifically in those boroughs?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** At this stage, we would really want to try to understand the extent of the problem. What I will do, if you will forgive me, is I will consult Yvonne on how we could be most useful. There are two basic problems in this. One is the extent to which consent may or may not be given to various activities and the second is the spread of HIV. On both issues we may have points to make and there may be useful things we could contribute, but before we do that we would really need to understand better exactly what the problem is.

**Andrew Boff AM:** I hope you could copy me in on the communication that you get from your advisors because it is something that the public feels is probably getting out of hand. Thank you.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** All right. Well, thank you. I will certainly do that without delay.

**Andrew Boff AM:** Thank you.

## Other

## Food poverty

Question Number: 2015/0109

11 Jan 2015

Fiona Twycross AM

**Fiona Twycross AM:** In one case I heard recently of a delay of over a year for somebody to get their Personal Independence Payment. If this is the case, we have a real issue with people actually having access to the money they are entitled to.

I wondered on the specific point what more you would do to lobby the Government to make sure that it is running the benefit system effectively to make sure it does not let down Londoners who are down on their luck, and whether you would personally write to the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions to highlight concerns raised by the report, raised by the all party investigation and raised by Oxfam and the Child Poverty Action Group on how the benefits system is operating and the impact it has on Londoners.

[...]

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** What I would need to do is to work in concert with an MP on particular cases to help draw the issue to the attention of the Secretary of State. I am more than happy to do so. I am just trying to draft the letter in my head. I would need to have specific cases that I would

**Fiona Twycross AM:** We can find you plenty of specific cases.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** That would be kind. That is what I am really asking for.

**Fiona Twycross AM:** I will find an MP who will come forward with dozens of cases that you can raise.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** I would be more than happy to support in that case, but we need to have a bit of chapter and verse. That is all I am saying.

**Fiona Twycross AM:** Yes, thank you.

## Young people in London

Question Number: 2015/3764

09 Nov 2015

Fiona Twycross AM

**Fiona Twycross AM:** It was reported in *The Standard* and in *The Guardian* earlier this year. The Director of Spareroom.co.uk said that they had seen a 71% rise in searches for bedroom shares over two years, and another website said that in 2014 there were over 93,000 adverts placed for shared rooms, twin or triple bedrooms. Has your team done any research on this and will you ask it to do so?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I have not. Look, Fiona, I am not aware of any research specifically about sharing rooms. I would be very happy to ask the Housing team whether they know of anything and I will be very

**Fiona Twycross AM:** Will you ask them to do some research on this trend and the impact on housing for young people?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** pleased to share it with you. Look, no one could deny the massive pressures that there are on young people trying to live and work in this city. It is hugely expensive and everybody understands that.

We have done what we can. Obviously, for people in full-time education, there is a benefit in terms of free travel that people do not get anywhere else in the country, which is very, very important and of huge value to Londoners. For people in search of work, there are reductions

## Report of the Mayor

Question Number: 2015/1601

19 May 2015

Roger Evans AM

**Kit Malthouse AM:** Is there any chance you could ask the Commissioner to increase capacity on the Dangerous Dogs Unit?

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** I will certainly look. We have this Dangerous Dogs Unit which we set up, as you know, and I totally agree with you about the air of menace and the intimidation that one of those dogs can bring with it. I do not like it. I want them properly controlled. I think the difficulty is that one man's dangerous dog is another man's beloved old pooch, and that is the problem. We had that problem, if you remember, with the original dangerous dogs legislation in the 1980s.

**Kit Malthouse AM:** It is quite clear. There are illegal breeds of dog which are still openly paraded on the streets of London with no enforcement. If someone was wandering around with a revolver, the police would be there like a shot, but the fact that this thing is a dog does not seem to attract the same level of importance, even though it is not nearly as frightening.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** When I refer to a dangerous dog being a beloved old pooch, some of the dogs that have been involved in attacks, as far as I understand it, are not illegal breeds. It is very difficult to produce perfectly drafted legislation on this. I will certainly make enquiries, Kit --

**Kit Malthouse AM:** Thanks.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** -- about whether the MPS feels that it could do more about dangerous dogs and weapon dogs.

**Kit Malthouse AM:** That would be very kind. Thank you.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** They are a scourge.

## Report of the Mayor

Question Number: 2015/1601

19 May 2015

Roger Evans AM

**Richard Tracey AM:** Indeed. A couple more possible savings that we suggest. You will remember that we made a proposal to fund a rollout of 1,000 GPS panic buttons to protect front line TfL staff.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Yes. I had forgotten that.

**Richard Tracey AM:** Bearing in mind that the purchase of these would cost under a fifth of what workplace violence costs TfL every year, it is clearly a worthwhile investment and a sensible one.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** I am interested in that idea. As you will know, we now have CCTV on all buses. Crime on buses is down now by 45% since I was elected and continues to fall. When I was campaigning in 2007 and 2008, it was a thing that people were bringing up everywhere, argy-bargy on the buses. That is now well down. The Tube is now the safest metro system anywhere in Europe. We should be very proud of that. If we can drive crime down still further -- we have spoken a little bit about sexual harassment; I am concerned about that -- against our employees with panic buttons, I will have a look at it. What happens is you have a button about your person and you just press it.

## Mayor's Oral Report

Question Number: 2015/1603

21 May 2015

Jennette Arnold AM

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I have received one particular question from Jenny [Jenny Jones AM] about the tragic accident involving a lorry driver. I want to offer my deep condolences to the family and friends of Alan Neve, who died. Jenny, the difficulty is I cannot comment on why the MPS or the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) have made the individual decisions that they have in that case, although I understand people's deep feelings of anxiety and outrage. What I can propose and what I will offer is that the MPS contacts you directly for a briefing about that, although clearly the intention and our ambition is to make cycling ever safer. That is the purpose of our current investments.

[...]

**Jenny Jones AM:** Thank you for the offer of the briefing from the MPS about the cyclist's death and I will say yes to that, but I want a bit more than that. This is the second time recently that the MPS has backed off from prosecuting a driver who has actually killed somebody. This particular driver should never have been employed in the first place. The judge actually said, "Heavens know why the lorry owners let you drive that vehicle without checking you had a valid

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Sorry, I could not hear that, Jenny.

**Jenny Jones AM:** Basically, the judge in the case said that the licensed operators were at fault. Could you please ask the MPS Commissioner next time you see him for a personal explanation of why they will not pursue that licensed operator?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I shall, but you will understand the difficulty I have in relaying now any details that I may have to you about the thinking. It is better if they brief you directly.

## Mayor's Oral Report

Question Number: 2015/1996

17 Jun 2015

Jennette Arnold AM

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Thanks very much, Joanne, and you are quite right to take this up, frankly. On the first point on what the police are doing, I do not know the extent to which the police have so far detected illicit use of these scanners. You are right in what you say about the possibility of buying them on the market. I cannot give you any information about that, but I would be happy to write to you and of course I will be taking it up with Sir Bernard [Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM, Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis].

On the second point, it is absolutely correct. To the best of my memory, in the old days when everybody used landlines, if the police or the security services wanted to intercept a phone conversation, they had to get an individual warrant from the Home Secretary for the wiretap. What seems to be at least plausible from this account is that the police and the security services are able to listen in randomly, as it were, to all the conversations that may be taking place in a certain vicinity of this 'stingray' scanner.

If that is going on, it is clearly unacceptable. That is *Stasi*-like monitoring of people's private conversations and transactions in a way that I do not think we would want to see in London. I very much share your concerns about that and I would want to establish that it was not going on. On the other hand, if they are validly in pursuit of known suspects, people who might mean us serious harm who are making use of mobile telephony or other means of communication to plan outrages against this city and this country, then clearly they are right to do what they do. In either event, there needs to be proper judicial supervision or some proper accountability and control of what is going on.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Mr Mayor, therefore, as Mayor of London and as the Member of Parliament (MP)

now for a London constituency, would you be able to write to the Home Office expressing that concern and the concern that has been expressed by the Independent Reviewer and saying that there needs to be some legal framework for the oversight of this apparatus?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Do you mean following David Anderson's words?

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Yes.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes. What I will perhaps do, if I may, is wait until I get an answer back from Sir Christopher Rose, see exactly how he accounts for what is going on and see whether he is willing to share information. Then, depending on his account of it, we will definitely take it up with the Home Secretary.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Mr Mayor, when you get that response, will you send it to the Chairs of the --

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I will make sure to. It will all be obtainable under the Freedom of Information Act (FOI) and transparent. You will get it all.

## Mayor's Oral Report

Question Number: 2015/1996

17 Jun 2015

Jennette Arnold AM

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Good morning, Mr Mayor. Thank you for your response in regard to my request about these fake mobile phone towers or 'stingrays', as they are known colloquially. Sky News undertook an investigation and said that it found 20 in London that appeared to be intercepting Londoner's phone calls before they reached the official mobile phone towers, which obviously gives great concerns for Londoner's security of their personal information. There are two main issues with this.

Firstly, I understand that they can be bought for about £1,000 and so they are relatively cheap. I understand that criminals can use them to intercept personal data. My first question is: what are the police doing about ensuring that criminals are not using this bit of equipment?

Secondly, of course, the police and security services may be using them for counterterrorism purposes. Mr Mayor, you may not be aware that David Anderson QC, the Government's Reviewer of Counterterrorism Legislation, [Independent Reviewer of Terrorism Legislation] brought out a report last week that cited that these surveillance instruments in particular - and I quote him here - "do not have a clear and explicit basis in legislation". There were concerns about the judicial or otherwise oversight of these. I wondered whether you can just answer those two questions.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Thanks very much, Joanne, and you are quite right to take this up, frankly. On the first point on what the police are doing, I do not know the extent to which the police have so far detected illicit use of these scanners. You are right in what you say about the possibility of buying them on the market. I cannot give you any information about that, but I would be happy to write to you and of course I will be taking it up with Sir Bernard [Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM, Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis].

## Mayor's Oral Report

Question Number: 2015/1996

17 Jun 2015

Jennette Arnold AM

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Thanks very much, Joanne, and you are quite right to take this up, frankly. On the first point on what the police are doing, I do not know the extent to which the police have so far detected illicit use of these scanners. You are right in what you say about the possibility of buying them on the market. I cannot give you any information about that, but I would be happy to write to you and of course

I will be taking it up with Sir Bernard [Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM, Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis].

On the second point, it is absolutely correct. To the best of my memory, in the old days when everybody used landlines, if the police or the security services wanted to intercept a phone conversation, they had to get an individual warrant from the Home Secretary for the wiretap. What seems to be at least plausible from this account is that the police and the security services are able to listen in randomly, as it were, to all the conversations that may be taking place in a certain vicinity of this 'stingray' scanner.

If that is going on, it is clearly unacceptable. That is *Stasi*-like monitoring of people's private conversations and transactions in a way that I do not think we would want to see in London. I very much share your concerns about that and I would want to establish that it was not going on. On the other hand, if they are validly in pursuit of known suspects, people who might mean us serious harm who are making use of mobile telephony or other means of communication to plan outrages against this city and this country, then clearly they are right to do what they do. In either event, there needs to be proper judicial supervision or some proper accountability and control of what is going on.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Mr Mayor, therefore, as Mayor of London and as the Member of Parliament (MP) now for a London constituency, would you be able to write to the Home Office expressing that concern and the concern that has been expressed by the Independent Reviewer and saying that there needs to be some legal framework for the oversight of this apparatus?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Do you mean following David Anderson's words?

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Yes.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes. What I will perhaps do, if I may, is wait until I get an answer back from Sir Christopher Rose, see exactly how he accounts for what is going on and see whether he is willing to share information. Then, depending on his account of it, we will definitely take it up with the Home Secretary.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Mr Mayor, when you get that response, will you send it to the Chairs of the --

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I will make sure to. It will all be obtainable under the Freedom of Information Act (FOI) and transparent. You will get it all.

## Public Houses

Question Number: 2015/2189

06 Jul 2015

Steve O'Connell AM

**Steve O'Connell AM:** Exactly. My last point - and this is really something that you do have some responsibility around - is talking about the Great Beer Festival this year, which we had upwards of 50,000 people enjoying. It was a fantastic event in London. TfL this year decided not to run the Earls Court-to-Olympia Tube line during that beer festival. It has done it in previous years. This is something that is very disappointing. There are upwards of 50,000 Londoners going and enjoying themselves. Apparently TfL has made the decision not to run it this year. I have written to TfL and to you. Can I urge you to look at that decision and see if you can rescind that?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Sorry, a decision?

**Steve O'Connell AM:** Each year, there is an extra shuttle service during the CAMRA beer festival to run the Earls Court-to-Olympia Tube line. TfL has decided - on cost reasons, apparently, I am told - not to do it this year and I am appealing you to review that decision.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Let me look into it. I am sorry. I will not give you that guarantee now but I will certainly raise it with TfL.

**Steve O'Connell AM:** I would like you to look into it.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I certainly will.

**Steve O'Connell AM:** That is all I need.

## Summer Budget

Question Number: 2015/2216

06 Jul 2015

Len Duvall AM

**Len Duvall AM:** Can you also give an undertaking that as part of your renewed commitment to the real London Living Wage, you will undertake a study through the Greater London Authority (GLA) Living Wage Unit of what the National Living Wage in London will need to be set at to compensate for the cuts in in-work benefits announced by the Chancellor in 2015

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes. I understand, Len, yes.

**Len Duvall AM:** because that must have a say in terms of where you are coming from about the real London Living Wage?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Len, you are right that we should be looking into whether there should be a National London Living Wage weighting. The trouble is that this conversation is now going to get so complicated that people will cease to follow which living wage we are talking about. We could get to a new National London Living Wage weighting, just as there is under the existing Minimum Wage. There is a London weighting and I think that is what you are driving at. That is one conversation.

[...]

**Len Duvall AM:** Mr Mayor, I am under pressure on time. I take it that somewhere in that answer was a yes to the study that you will do with the GLA unit to help us with the lobbying.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes.

**Len Duvall AM:** Then there is one further group that I would ask you to consider lobbying for. In London's

demographics, we have approximately 50% more 20-to-24-year-olds than the national average. Will you also lobby for a full or partial exemption for London from the rule that only people aged over 25 will receive the National Living Wage? There does seem to be a big problem here for London and for that section of our community and it makes no sense at all.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I understand that.

**Len Duvall AM:** Is that a simple yes or no?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes.

**Len Duvall AM:** Will you look into it? Maybe there might well be some further support from the Assembly for these particular areas because they will have a major impact on our young people.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** What I certainly will undertake, Len, is to look at the particular impacts of the Budget on under-25s. That is reasonable. People should bear in mind that on the whole in London, in spite of the costs of living here, people do better. They are paid more. There are more opportunities here in London. To put it mildly, there are considerable advantages of living in London, which we should not neglect as well. However, given the threshold that was established in the Budget for the National Living Wage of only over-25s, it is reasonable that we should look at the impacts for under-25s as well.

**Len Duvall AM:** Thank you.

## **Summer Budget**

**Question Number: 2015/2216**

**06 Jul 2015**

**Len Duvall AM**

**Fiona Twycross AM:** Can you tell me how many of the 3 million families whom the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) has said will be hit by this change live in London?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I cannot give you that.

**Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair):** You should know.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I would be happy to write to you with the details. I do not have that figure off the top of my head.

**Fiona Twycross AM:** If you could establish it? Obviously, we know that previous changes to welfare disproportionately hit Londoners and about half of those affected lived in London.

## **Questions to the Mayor on his Final Draft Consolidated Budget**

**Question Number: 2015/0816**

**26 Feb 2015**

**Jenny Jones AM**

**Joanne McCartney AM:** We asked you to look at having a victims' champion at MOPAC and to look at having an independent advocacy pilot for those with learning disabilities and mental health issues.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Yes. I am interested in this kind of thing.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Would you write to me about this, Mr Mayor?

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** I certainly will write to you, Joanne.

**Joanne McCartney AM:** Thank you.



## Questions to the Mayor on his Final Draft Consolidated Budget

Question Number: 2015/0816

26 Feb 2015

Jenny Jones AM

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM:** Did you know that London is now the highest fare city in the world?

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** No, it is not.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM:** Independent studies have shown that.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** It is not true.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM:** London is the highest fare city in the world.

[...]

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM:** If you will write to me and tell me which city in the world is more expensive to travel in than London

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** I certainly will. There are several more expensive and you are talking total tripe.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM:** I will write to you with a full account of the £500 million of Londoners' money that you have wasted. Thank you, Chairman.

## Food poverty

Question Number: 2015/3991

07 Dec 2015

Fiona Twycross AM

**Fiona Twycross AM:** What I would ask you to look at would be whether you could establish some sort of taskforce in London to look at the issue of malnutrition in older people – as you say, the estimate is around 100,000 older people in London suffering from malnutrition – and specifically to look at how you can address the issue of the almost complete loss of Meals on Wheels and look at a 21st-century solution to this.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Thanks. On Meals on Wheels, Rosie [Boycott, Chair, London Food Board] and the London Food Board are producing some guidance and a plan to try to help local authorities to come up with innovative ways of retaining the Meals on Wheels service. That might be working with supermarkets or working with schools to keep the facilities going. What I had probably better do, as I do not have a very full briefing on it here now, is give you some more details about what that involves and how we are trying to keep food getting to people who need it in that way. You will be familiar with the work of the social supermarkets and all those efforts, but there is a particular effort now being made on Meals on Wheels and I would be happy to share it with you.

## Oral Update on the Report of the Mayor

Question Number: 2015/4451

16 Dec 2015

Jennette Arnold AM

**Steve O'Connell AM:** Mr Mayor, back on the subject of protecting green spaces, thank you for your earlier comments. Your London Plan does have significant protections around back garden development. I would like to see it strengthened but, at the moment, it is strong.

Mr Mayor, would you be instructing your planners to ensure that any submissions on draft changes to borough plans that specifically weaken the protection of back gardens are looked at and to object to those sorts of proposals?

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Yes, if there are any such proposals, Steve, of course we will make sure that we object to them. The loss of back gardens is particularly detrimental to the character of London and outer London in particular.

**Steve O'Connell AM:** Also, Mr Mayor, if you have such a draft plan in front of you that looks at re designating swathes of green MOL back down and reducing the protection, I would again ask you to instruct your planners to look at those deeply and to consider objecting to such proposals.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** I will certainly look at that. I am not aware of the de designation of MOL, but I will certainly have a look at it. Are you thinking about Croydon?

**Steve O'Connell AM:** There are some plans submitted by one of my boroughs that I have spoken to Sir Edward [Lister] about and I expect your very professional planners to give them due close attention.

**Boris Johnson MP (Mayor of London):** Thank you very much, Steve. We will make sure that we follow up.

**Steve O'Connell AM:** Thank you very much, Mr Mayor.

# Subject: Minor Alterations to the London Plan

**Report to: London Assembly (Plenary)**

**Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat**

**Date: 10 February 2016**

**This report will be considered in public**

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 This report presents the Mayor of London's Minor Alterations to the London Plan for the Assembly's consideration and decision of whether to use its powers under Section 42B of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 to reject the Plan.

## 2. Recommendations

**The Assembly is recommended to:**

**Part A:**

- 2.1 **Put questions to the following on the Minor Alterations to the London Plan:**

- **Sir Edward Lister, Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Policy and Planning; and**
- **Stewart Murray, Assistant Director – Planning, Greater London Authority (GLA).**

**Part B:**

- 2.2 **Receive and, in accordance with Section 42B of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 (as amended), consider its response to the Minor Alterations to the London Plan as set out at Appendices 6 and 8;**

- 2.3 **Consider the motion submitted in the name of the Chair:**

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

## 3. Background

- 3.1 Under Section 42B of the Greater London Authority Act (GLA) 1999 (as amended), the Mayor must lay before the London Assembly any strategies or draft revisions to the strategies set out in Section 41 of that Act. The Mayor's spatial development strategy, known as The London Plan, is listed in Section 41 of the Act.

- 3.2 The current London Plan was formally published and adopted in July 2011. Since then, a number of alterations have been made to the Plan including early alterations formally published on 11 October

2013 (those revisions having been formally considered by the London Assembly at its Extraordinary Plenary meeting on 3 September 2013) and Further Alterations to the London Plan formally considered by the London Assembly at its Plenary meeting on 6 February 2015.

- 3.3 On 11 May 2015, the Mayor published for public consultation two sets of Minor Alterations to the London Plan (MALP) – on Housing Standards and on Parking Standards. These minor alterations were proposed to bring the London Plan in line with new national housing standards and car parking policy.
- 3.4 In summary, these changes affected:
- Housing: new national space standards for new homes and ‘optional’ building regulations on water and access standards;
  - Parking: maximum residential parking standards in parts of outer London with low public transport accessibility.
- 3.5 On 19 May 2015, the Chair of the London Assembly wrote to the Chair of the Planning Committee asking the Committee formally to respond to the consultation on the Assembly’s behalf. On 16 June 2016, the Planning Committee discussed with a range of experts various aspects of the Mayor’s proposals to revise the London Plan. The Committee submitted its response the consultation on 22 June 2015.<sup>[1]</sup>
- 3.6 An Examination in Public on both sets of minor alterations took place in City Hall from 21-22 October 2015 to allow a Planning Inspector (appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government) to examine matters arising from the public consultation. The Assembly was represented at the Examination by the Chair of the Planning Committee.
- 3.7 On 15 December 2015, the Inspector published his report to the Mayor. The report concluded that the Mayor’s final proposals (as amended by changes tabled before and during the Examination), along with the Inspector’s recommendations, made the Mayor’s proposals acceptable.
- 3.8 On 16 December 2015, the Mayor considered the Inspector’s report, agreed to accept all of its recommendations and approved ‘intend to publish’ versions of the Housing Standards and Parking Standards MALPs for submission to the Secretary of State and to the London Assembly.

## 4. Issues for Consideration

- 4.1 The Mayor published and laid before the Assembly the Minor Alterations to the London Plan (as detailed below) on 25 January 2016 for formal consultation.
- 4.2 The Mayor submitted to the Assembly the following documents as his final proposals to amend the London Plan, attached as appendices to this report:
- Letter from Sir Edward Lister on behalf of the Mayor in which he formally ‘lays before’ the London Assembly a copy of the Minor Alterations to the London Plan, **Appendix 1**;

---

<sup>[1]</sup> <https://www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/documents/s48314/15-06-22-Appendix%201%20-FINAL-Assembly-MALP-response.pdf>

- The MALP EiP Inspector's Report, **Appendix 2**;
- The Mayor's response to the EiP Inspector's recommendations, **Appendix 3**;
- Letter from the Mayor to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government dated 16 December 2015, **Appendix 4**;
- The Minor Alterations to the London Plan in relation to Housing Standards, as intended to be published (with alterations marked) **Appendix 5**;
- The Minor Alterations to the London Plan in relation to Housing Standards, as intended to be published ('clean' version) **Appendix 6**;
- The Minor Alterations to the London Plan in relation to Parking Standards, as intended to be published (with alterations marked) **Appendix 7**;
- The Minor Alterations to the London Plan in relation to Parking Standards, as intended to be published ('clean' version) **Appendix 8**.

4.3 At this meeting, the Assembly will put questions to the following in relation to the MALP:

- Sir Edward Lister, Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Policy and Planning; and
- Stewart Murray, Assistant Director – Planning, Greater London Authority (GLA).

4.4 They will be accompanied by Strategic Planning Managers John Lett, Jennifer Peters and Richard Linton.

4.5 Following the question and answer session the Assembly will consider and debate the proposals.

4.6 In accordance with Section 42B of the GLA Act, the London Assembly has the power to reject draft strategies within 21 days of their submission to the Assembly. The 21 day period includes the date on which the draft strategy is laid before the Assembly. Although a formal motion to reject the Proposal is not included in the Recommendations to this report, such a motion may be moved by way of an amendment to the motion set out at Recommendation 2.3 or by way of a separate, standalone motion, without notice, by any single Assembly Member during the meeting.

4.7 The full, current London Plan is available from the GLA website: <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/london-plan/current-london-plan>

## 5. Legal Implications

5.1 Under the provisions of Section 42 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 (as amended), the Assembly has the power to consider and potentially reject draft strategies within 21 days of their publication, including the date the draft strategy is laid before the Assembly. The 21 day period from 25 January 2016 ends on Thursday 16 February 2016.

5.2 A motion for the Assembly to reject a draft strategy must be considered at a meeting of the Assembly throughout which members of the public are entitled to be present and is not carried unless it is agreed to by at least two thirds of the Assembly Members voting.

5.3 Standing Order 3.19 (Assembly Consultation on the Mayor's Strategies and the Assembly's Power to Reject) is as follows:

A. In accordance with section 42(1) of the GLA Act, the Mayor is required to consult the Assembly when preparing or revising all those strategies listed at section 41 of the Act. Before publishing a strategy (or, in the case of the housing strategy, before submitting the draft to the Secretary of State) the Mayor must lay a copy of the draft strategy before the Assembly by submitting a paper copy of the draft strategy to the Chair of the London Assembly (copied to the Executive Director of Secretariat) [1].

B. The Mayor should submit a draft strategy to the Assembly in accordance with Standing Order 3.19 by not less than midday on the day that is six clear working days in advance of the relevant Assembly or committee meeting.

C. Noting that only the London Assembly itself may properly exercise the power to reject a strategy (as provided for at (F) below), the Assembly, or any relevant ordinary Committee of the Assembly to which the necessary authority has been granted by the Assembly (either through its terms of reference or otherwise through a formal decision), may provide a response to a consultation referred to in Paragraph A above.

D. The Mayor must not publish any final strategy that is relevant to this Standing Order (or, in the case of the housing strategy, submit the draft to the Secretary of State) if, within the period of twenty-one days beginning with the day on which the copy is provided to the Assembly in accordance with Standing Order 3.19B above, the Assembly resolves formally to reject the draft.

E. Any motion for the Assembly to reject a draft strategy must be considered at a meeting of the Assembly throughout which members of the public are entitled to be present.

F. If the Assembly votes by at least two-thirds of the Members present and voting, for the following motion:

*The Assembly hereby resolves to reject Mayor's draft xxxxx strategy*

the Mayor must not publish that strategy (or, in the case of the housing strategy, submit the draft to the Secretary of State), other than by way of providing a further revised version of that document to the Assembly.

G. The motion set out at (F) above may be moved by the Chair of the Assembly as part of the formal agenda for the relevant meeting of the London Assembly or, without notice, by any Member at a meeting of the London Assembly at which a draft strategy is considered. Standing Orders 3.3(A) and 3.12 shall be suspended in relation to such motions. However, the remaining rules set out at Standing Orders 3.3 to 3.15 in relation to the consideration of motions shall apply in the usual way. The motion, if moved, must be seconded prior to its consideration.

H. The Assembly may, during the debate, agree to amend the text of the original motion (as set out in paragraph F above) to include its reasons for passing the motion and any other relevant commentary that it wishes the Mayor to consider.

## Notes and definitions

[1] This Standing Order applies where the Mayor has prepared, and is ready to publish, a draft of any of the strategies to which section 41 of the GLA Act applies (including a revised version of the strategy), but not to a revised version of a strategy containing only revisions which(a) are specified in a direction as to the contents of the strategy which is given to the Mayor under this Act (or which the Mayor considers are necessary in consequence of any revisions so specified); or are not so specified but the Mayor considers to be necessary to comply with such a direction (section 42B(1) and (2)).

[2] As required by section 42B(5), abstentions do not count as a vote against, and so are excluded from the calculation of the two-thirds majority.

## 6. Financial Implications

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

---

### List of appendices to this report:

**Appendix 1** - Letter from Sir Edward Lister on behalf of the Mayor in which he formally 'lays before' the London Assembly a copy of the Minor Alterations to the London Plan

**Appendix 2** - The MALP EiP Inspector's Report

**Appendix 3** - The Mayor's response to the EiP Inspector's recommendations

**Appendix 4** - Letter from the Mayor to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government dated 16 December 2015

**Appendix 5** - The Minor Alterations to the London Plan in relation to Housing Standards, as intended to be published (with alterations marked)

**Appendix 6** - The Minor Alterations to the London Plan in relation to Housing Standards, as intended to be published ('clean' version)

**Appendix 7** - The Minor Alterations to the London Plan in relation to Parking Standards, as intended to be published (with alterations marked)

**Appendix 8** - The Minor Alterations to the London Plan in relation to Parking Standards, as intended to be published ('clean' version)

<b>Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985</b>	
List of Background Papers: None.	
Contact Officers:	John Barry, Principal Committee Manager
Telephone:	020 7983 4425
E-mail:	<a href="mailto:john.barry@london.gov.uk">john.barry@london.gov.uk</a>

This page is intentionally left blank



## MAYOR OF LONDON

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

**Our ref:** MALP/Assembly/EL  
**Your ref:**  
**Date:** 25<sup>th</sup> January 2015

**[by email and internal mail]**

Dear Jennette

**Minor Alterations to the London Plan (MALP) Housing Standards and Parking Standards  
– laying drafts before the London Assembly, under S.42B of the Greater London  
Authority Act 1999 (as amended)**

I write on behalf of the Mayor to formally 'lay before' the London Assembly copies of the Minor Alterations to the London Plan (MALP) as the Mayor intends to publish them. Please note there are two sets of Minor Alterations:

- Housing Standards
- Parking Standards

Under the provisions of S.42B of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 (as amended), the Mayor cannot publish (that is to say 'adopt') the MALPs if within 21 days from the date of this letter the Assembly resolves to reject the draft. This 21 day period expires on Thursday 16 February 2016. I understand that the Assembly intends to consider the MALPs at Plenary on 10 February. I and my officers will be pleased to attend this meeting to answer any questions from Members.

In May 2015 the Mayor published the draft Housing Standards and Parking Standards MALPs for public consultation. These minor alterations were prepared to bring the London Plan into line with the Government's new national housing standards and car parking policy, making good a commitment the Mayor had made in the March 2015 London Plan. In response to issues raised in consultation, the Mayor published in August and September a number of 'suggested changes' to the MALPs.

An examination in public was held into the MALPs on 21 and 22 October 2015, and on 15 December 2015 the Mayor received the report of the EiP Inspector. In his report to the Mayor, the Inspector concluded that the Housing Standards and Parking Standards MALP could be adopted provided all the suggested changes put forward by the Mayor were incorporated and that the Inspector's recommendations were accepted.

On 16 December the Mayor considered the Inspector's report and agreed to accept all of its recommendations. He also approved 'intend to publish' versions of the Housing Standards and Parking Standards MALPs for submission both to the Secretary of State and to the London Assembly.

As required under SDS Regulation 8 (8) of the Town and Country Planning (London Spatial Development Strategy) Regulations 2000, 'intend to publish' versions of the MALPs were submitted to the Secretary of State CLG on 16 December 2015, together with a schedule giving the Mayor's response to the Inspector's recommendations, and in accordance with Regulation 8 (9), on 4 January 2016 the Mayor published the Inspector's report.

The Secretary of State has six weeks within which to consider the MALPs in terms of their compliance with national planning policy and their impact on neighbouring regions, and may direct the Mayor to make further changes. If no direction is received, the Mayor may publish (ie adopt) the MALPs providing the London Assembly has not rejected them. The six week period is due to expire this Thursday 28 January. I will send you a copy of the Secretary of State's response as soon as I receive it.

For the purposes of laying the Housing Standards and Parking Standards MALPs before the Assembly, I enclose:

- the Inspector's report to the Mayor
- a schedule giving the Mayor's responses to the Inspector's recommendations
- the Mayor's letter of 16 December 2015 to the Secretary of State
- the Housing Standards Minor Alterations to the London Plan as the Mayor intends to publish them (in two versions – one showing the alterations, and the other a 'clean' copy, as for publication)
- the Parking Standards Minor Alterations to the London Plan as the Mayor intends to publish them (in two versions – one showing the alterations, and the other a 'clean' copy, as for publication)

I look forward discussing the MALPs with the Assembly at your Plenary Meeting on 10 February.

Yours sincerely



**Sir Edward Lister**

Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Policy & Planning

*Enclosures:*

- MALP EIP Inspector's report
- Mayor's response to the Inspector's recommendations
- letter 16 December 2015 Mayor to the Secretary of State Communities and Local Government
- intend to publish Housing Standards MALP (copy showing the alterations)
- intend to publish Housing Standards MALP (clean copy)
- intend to publish Parking Standards MALP (copy showing the alterations)
- intend to publish Parking Standards MALP (clean copy)

*cc by email with attachments:*

- John Barry, Principal Committee Officer
- Paul Watling, Scrutiny Manager (Planning)

---

# Report to the Mayor of London

**by David Hogger BA MSc MRTPI MCIHT**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Date: 15<sup>th</sup> December 2015**

---

GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY ACT 1999

PART VIII

## **REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC INTO THE MINOR ALTERATIONS TO THE LONDON PLAN**

Examination Hearings held on 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2015

File Ref: SDS0025

## Abbreviations Used in this Report

EiP	Examination in Public
EU	European Union
GLA	Greater London Authority
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
IIA	Integrated Impact Assessment
m	Metre
MALP	Minor Alterations to the London Plan
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance
PTAL	Public Transport Accessibility Level
TfL	Transport for London

### NON TECHNICAL SUMMARY

This Report concludes that the London Plan, as changed by the Minor Alterations, provides an appropriate basis for the strategic planning of Greater London provided the Suggested Changes<sup>1</sup> ; the Further Suggested Changes<sup>2</sup>; the deletion of the proposed alterations to policy 5.2<sup>3</sup>; and my recommendations in this Report, are all accepted.

The recommendations can be summarised as follows:

#### Housing:

- Clarification of the types of residential development to which the relevant Building Regulations apply;
- Clarification of the consequences if the provision of lifts is found to be not viable; and
- Deletion of references to The Lifetime Homes Standards.

#### Parking:

- Inclusion of a more specific reference to the consideration of air quality implications.

<sup>1</sup> Library documents MA/SC/01 and MA/SC/02

<sup>2</sup> Library document MA/SC/04

<sup>3</sup> Library document MA/SC/03

## Introduction

1. This report contains my assessment of the Minor Alterations to the London Plan (MALP) in accordance with the terms of the Greater London Authority (GLA) Act 1999 (as amended) and the Town and Country Planning (London Spatial Development Strategy) Regulations 2000 (the Regulations). The Minor Alterations relate to Housing Standards and Parking Standards only.
2. The London Plan should be consistent with national policy<sup>4</sup> and this is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which is supported by the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). Although the NPPF refers primarily to local plans I consider it reasonable to apply the principles of soundness to the London Plan and note that this is the approach adopted by other Inspectors who have undertaken similar Examinations. The MALP should therefore be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy (paragraph 182 of the NPPF).
3. The starting point for the examination is the assumption that the Mayor considers that the MALP do not have an adverse effect on the soundness of the London Plan. The MALP were published for consultation on 11<sup>th</sup> May 2015 and the Mayor published two Schedules of Suggested Changes (one for each topic) on 21<sup>st</sup> August 2015<sup>5</sup> (including a Suggested Change deleting the proposed alterations to Policy 5.2 and its supporting text<sup>6</sup>, for which an explanatory note was issued on 24<sup>th</sup> August 2015); and Further Suggested Changes (Housing) on 29<sup>th</sup> September 2015<sup>7</sup>. All these changes were considered alongside the ‘original’ Minor Alterations at the hearing sessions. Unless otherwise highlighted in this Report, **I recommend that the GLA adopts all the suggested changes put forward by the Mayor (prior to the hearing sessions) in the four documents<sup>8</sup> referred to above, unless they have been superseded by further changes following the hearings. For the avoidance of doubt, where there has been a series of changes to the same text, the most up-to-date version should be adopted.**
4. Unaltered London Plan policies, supporting text, tables and maps are not subject to this Examination and I have not attached weight to responses regarding issues outside the scope of the proposed Minor Alterations. This Report does not comment on all the representations made, although they have all been considered. The focus is on the issues that I consider to be crucial to the soundness of the MALP. The changes instigated and recommended by me primarily stem from the discussion at the hearings and my consideration of the post-hearing submissions. They are identified in bold in the Report (**IRC**) and are set out in full in the Appendix.

## Format of the Report

5. At the request of the Mayor I have divided the Report into two sections – one for each topic and I have used the prefix H (Housing) or P (Parking) as

---

<sup>4</sup> Section 41 of the GLA Act

<sup>5</sup> Library documents MA/SC/01 and MA/SC/02

<sup>6</sup> Library document MA/SC/03

<sup>7</sup> Library document MA/SC/04

<sup>8</sup> Library documents: MA/SC/01; MA/SC/02; MA/SC/03; and MA/SC/04

appropriate. I have considered whether or not there are any ‘links’ between the housing and parking standards that should be addressed but I have concluded that no such links exist that would have implications for the soundness of the MALP.

### **Procedural Requirements and the Duty to Co-operate**

6. The GLA Act establishes the statutory requirements in relation to the preparation of the MALP and confirms that the Mayor (amongst other things) must have regard to the need to ensure that the London Plan is consistent with national policies and other statutory strategies. The GLA has published separate Integrated Impact Assessments (IIA)<sup>9</sup> for the Housing and the Parking documents. These cover, for example, Strategic Environmental Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal, community safety, health impacts and equality impacts. A Habitats Regulation Assessment has been carried out in relation to the Parking Standards MALP<sup>10</sup>.
7. In terms of consultation and the duty to co-operate, the Note to the EiP Inspector dated 21 August 2015<sup>11</sup>, sets out the approach adopted by the GLA and I am satisfied that it is in general conformity with the statutory requirements. The Mayor has satisfactorily undertaken the procedural requirements and the duty to co-operate and no evidence has been submitted that would lead me to a different conclusion.

### **THE HOUSING STANDARDS MALP**

#### **Main Issues**

8. The purpose of the Housing Standards MALP is to bring them up-to-date with Government policy. Against this background and taking into account all the representations, written evidence and the discussions that took place at the examination hearing I have identified five main issues upon which the soundness of the MALP, in terms of Housing Standards, depends. I have considered whether or not the Housing Standards MALP have any significant implications for other policies in the London Plan but on the evidence before me I conclude that they do not and therefore that is not identified as a main issue.

#### **Issue H1 – Is the Evidence on which the Housing Standards MALP are based sufficiently robust, in particular the Integrated Impact Assessment; the Evidence of Need; and the Viability Assessment<sup>12</sup>?**

9. The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) establishes 16 sustainability objectives against which the policy topics of: water efficiency; residential space; and accessibility, are assessed. Bearing in mind the Mayor is only reviewing the Housing Standards, then this is an appropriate approach to take because it is proportionate and relevant to the alterations being considered. The Mayor has made it clear from where the baseline information has been sourced and what other plans and programmes have been taken into account.

---

<sup>9</sup> Library documents MA/CD/03 and MA/CD/04

<sup>10</sup> Library document MA/CD/05

<sup>11</sup> Library document MA/EX/01

<sup>12</sup> Library documents MA/CD/03, MA/KD/03 and MA/KD/04

It is also clear where there are gaps in the evidence (for example no information was found regarding the levels of accessibility in existing London housing stock)<sup>13</sup> but I am satisfied that there are no omissions of such fundamental importance that the Mayor’s policies would be put at risk. In any event there is a commitment to monitoring and up-dating the evidence as necessary, thus ensuring that the Mayor can re-act appropriately should there be a significant change in circumstances.

10. In terms of the evidence of need<sup>14</sup> it is clear that consideration has been given to a range of information relating to internal space, access, water efficiency and carbon dioxide reduction targets. In terms of internal space, the need for good design (which encompasses space) is a fundamental requirement and the NPPF makes it clear that high quality and inclusive design should be sought. Although the optional space standard is just that – optional, the NPPG advises that the justification for requiring any such standards should be provided<sup>15</sup>. The Mayor has satisfactorily achieved this through the Evidence of Need document.
11. Similarly in terms of the optional access requirements a wide range of evidence has been assessed, including with regard to meeting the needs of the elderly, infirm and families with young children. I consider that the evidence is robust and proportionate and that it provides sufficient justification for the inclusion of M4(2) and M4(3) optional access requirements.
12. The Viability Assessment addresses the potential impact of the standards on the current London housing market and assesses a number of scheme types across 43 locations. It concludes that the implementation of the housing standards would not have significant consequences for the viability and delivery of housing in London and I agree that this is a reasonable conclusion to draw on the evidence before me.
13. No changes are proposed to policy 5.15 on Water Use and Supplies (only to the supporting text which is amended to refer to the application of the optional requirement set out in part G of the Building Regulations). The evidence supports such an approach and I note that no significant objections were submitted regarding the proposed textual change.
14. I conclude that the evidence on which the Housing Standards MALP are based is proportionate and sufficiently robust.

## **Issue H2 – Do the Proposed Alterations to the Housing Standards Sufficiently Reflect National Advice?**

15. The Written Ministerial Statement dated 25 March 2015 sets out the approach to be taken towards setting technical standards for new homes. In essence the system is streamlined, with reliance being placed on the existing mandatory Building Regulations plus additional optional Regulations on water and access, and a new optional national space standard. The optional standards should only be introduced if they address clearly evidenced need and where the impact on viability has been considered.

---

<sup>13</sup> Paragraph 7.2 of IIA

<sup>14</sup> Library document MA/KD/03

<sup>15</sup> Paragraph 020 (ID: 56-020-20150327)



16. There would be no benefit in repeating national advice in this Report, suffice to say that the NPPF establishes the broad approach to be taken in terms of, for example, the provision of quality homes, meeting the challenge of climate change and ensuring the viability of sustainable development. More detailed advice can be found in the NPPG<sup>16</sup>.
17. I have already concluded, under H1 above, that the evidence in terms of need and viability is robust. It demonstrates that the Mayor has a clear understanding of the housing needs in London and seeks to promote inclusion and community cohesion. The requirements established in national advice, for example in relation to design, climate change and viability, are satisfactorily reflected in the Housing Standards MALP.

### **Issue H3 – Are the Proposed Housing Standards Adequately Justified?**

18. It is not clear to the lay person whether or not the ‘requirements’ referred to in policy 3.5C apply to both residential new build and conversions. The Mayor confirmed that that dwellings delivered as a result of a conversion or change of use are not generally required to meet Part M of the Building Regulations. In all other respects, however, the policy does apply to all new dwellings, including conversions and change of use. In the interests of the proper application of the policy the Mayor has agreed to clarify the situation and I agree that this is necessary to ensure that the LP remains justified and effective. I therefore recommend **IRC H1**, **IRC H3**, and **IRC H4**.
19. A number of concerns were expressed by respondents regarding the level of precision in some of the terminology used by the Mayor, for example how would it be determined whether or not a room is ‘functional and fit for purpose’ (policy 3.5C). Although I am mindful that NPPF paragraph 154 advises that only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a proposal should be included in the plan, it is clear that this reference in policy 3.5C should be interpreted as a broad objective, especially as further guidance is available elsewhere in the London Plan and in the Mayor’s Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance. I am satisfied that the Mayor has achieved an appropriate balance between precision and flexibility in the MALP (Housing Standards).
20. The justification for strongly encouraging higher ceiling heights of 2.5m (Note 3 to Table 3.3) was questioned by some respondents. The Mayor confirmed that higher ceilings would ensure that dwellings (many of which are high density flats) would achieve appropriate quality, particularly in terms of light, ventilation and sense of space. They would also contribute to reducing overheating in homes during the summer months. The NPPF supports aspiration (albeit within the confines of realism) and I consider the Mayor’s approach, in the circumstances, to be appropriately aspirational and justified. The fact that this aspiration is embedded in what is essentially supporting text and is not an explicit requirement of the policy, adds weight to my conclusion on this matter.
21. The Notes to Table 3.3 refer to ‘studio’ development. In the interests of consistency with the Table itself the reference should be to ‘one person dwelling’ and I recommend **IRC H2** accordingly.

---

<sup>16</sup> Reference ID: 56-001-20150327



22. The adopted London Plan currently requires 100% of new dwellings to be built to ‘Lifetime Homes’ standards (see also paragraph 29). However, under the revised approach only one optional standard can be required for any given dwelling<sup>17</sup>. The Mayor is therefore proposing that 90% of new homes meet the M4(2) standard (accessible and adaptable dwellings) and that 10% meet the wheelchair user dwellings standard as set out in M4(3).
23. The Mayor has considered a wide range of matters in coming to his conclusion that a 90%/10% split is justified<sup>18</sup>. There was no significant dispute regarding the Mayor’s evidence on this matter and I am satisfied that the approach being followed is sound. There is, however, a lack of clarity in terms of the type of development the accessibility standards would apply to. In order to ensure that the most appropriate strategy is followed **IRC H4** is recommended.
24. Concerns were raised regarding the adaptation and retention of wheelchair user dwellings. Whilst I understand these concerns, other measures are available to address these issues (for example legal agreements) and other advice is available. It would not be reasonable to expect the London Plan to embrace every eventuality or address every policy permutation but these are issues which should be monitored in order to ensure that the Mayor’s accessibility objectives in this regard are being achieved.
25. Historically lifts have only been required in dwellings in London of five or more storeys but to comply with Building Regulation M4(2) step free access is required. Consequently there are implications, particularly in terms of viability, for blocks of four storeys or less. The Mayor has undertaken viability testing for this scenario (as explained at the Technical Session) and concludes that overall the provision of lifts in these circumstances would not have a significant impact on viability or delivery. No substantive evidence was submitted that would lead me to conclude that there would be a significant risk to development as a result of this requirement. In any event paragraph 3.48A makes it clear that the ‘requirement’ may be subject to viability assessments and consideration of on-going maintenance costs, so there is sufficient flexibility to enable any unforeseen circumstances to be addressed. Nevertheless further clarification regarding viability and service charges is required and I recommend **IRC H5** accordingly. It was suggested that this approach may discourage the provision of dwellings that require step free access but no evidence was submitted to clearly substantiate this claim and I have therefore afforded it little weight.
26. I conclude that the proposed housing standards are adequately justified.

**Issue H4 – Would the Proposed Housing Standards result in any Significantly Adverse Implications?**

27. It was suggested by participants that the Mayor’s approach could lead to a reduction in the overall provision of housing (primarily for reasons of viability). However, the IIA indicates that taken as a whole there would be no significant adverse implications of the Housing Standards MALP and the Viability

---

<sup>17</sup> Building Regs 2010: Approved Document M

<sup>18</sup> See page 25 of the Mayor’s Statement on Matter 1

Assessment<sup>19</sup> concludes that the Mayor’s approach does not represent a significant determinant in the viability and delivery of housing in London. In terms of affordability no evidence was submitted to satisfactorily demonstrate that the consequences of the MALP (Housing Standards) would have a significant detrimental impact on the affordability of properties in the capital. Similarly I am satisfied that there is little cogent evidence to show that there would be significant adverse implications for the private rented sector or for the provision of starter homes. I am satisfied that there is sufficient flexibility in the Mayor’s approach to ensure that there would be little risk to the delivery of housing and that consequently the requirement to meet objectively assessed housing need in London would not be threatened. In any event the monitoring mechanisms are in place to enable appropriate action to be taken should circumstance so dictate.

28. It was suggested by respondents that the emphasis on step free housing would be at the expense of achieving high quality urban design. However, several of the policies of the London Plan (for example policy 7.4: Local Character and policy 7.6: Architecture) emphasise the need for new development to assimilate well within the existing streetscape and there is no reason to doubt that the Mayor (and the London Boroughs) will continue to require appropriate high quality design, in accordance with the NPPF.

#### **Issue H5 – Is the Mayor’s Approach to Transition, Monitoring and Review Sound?**

29. The transition period will only extend up to the date the MALP (Housing Standards) are adopted. The ‘Housing Standards Policy: Transition Statement’<sup>20</sup> does not form part of the document before me for examination but provides sufficient advice for prospective developers in the interim. After the adoption of the MALP it is important that appropriate monitoring and review mechanisms are in place to ensure delivery. In this regard there is no reason to challenge either the role of the Annual Monitoring Report in providing appropriate up-dates or the commitment of the Mayor to review the policy position should it be required. The Mayor’s approach is sound.

#### **Other Matters**

30. Paragraph 7.5 refers to the Lifetime Homes Standards. These have now been superseded and in order to ensure that the Mayor is following the most appropriate strategy, I recommend in **IRC H6**, that the reference be deleted.
31. The Mayor is proposing a small number of further minor changes to the text which although they do not relate specifically to matters of soundness, I nevertheless endorse in the interests of clarity and being up-to-date.

#### **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE HOUSING STANDARDS MALP**

32. The consultation version of the Housing Standards MALP has a number of deficiencies, many of which have been rectified by the Suggested Changes published in August 2015, prior to the hearing. Nevertheless I have set out a

---

<sup>19</sup> Library document MA/KD/04

<sup>20</sup> Library document MA/KD/02

small number of further changes in the Appendix which are needed to ensure soundness and I recommend, for the reasons set out above, that those changes are included in the adopted version of the MALP (Housing Standards).

## **THE PARKING STANDARDS MALP**

### **Main Issues**

33. The purpose of the Parking Standards MALP is to review parking standards in outer London, especially where public transport accessibility levels are lower. Against that background and taking into account all the representations, written evidence and the discussions that took place at the examination hearing I have identified five main issues upon which the soundness of the MALP, in terms of Parking, depends. I have considered whether or not the Parking Standards MALP have any significant implications for other policies in the London Plan but on the evidence before me I conclude that they do not and therefore that is not identified as a main issue.

### **Issue P1 - Is the Evidence on which the Parking Standards MALP are based sufficiently robust, in particular the Integrated Impact Assessment<sup>21</sup> and the Habitats Regulations Assessment<sup>22</sup>?**

34. The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) document clearly sets out the methodology used by the Mayor and addresses the Mayor’s legal requirements to carry out environmental, social, economic, health, equality and community safety impact assessments. Key sustainability objectives are identified and three options are assessed against the objectives. There was some criticism that none of the three options precisely mirror what is now proposed in the MALP (Parking Standards). However, it would not be realistic for every potential option to be considered – a proportionate approach is required. In any event I consider that the ‘preferred option’ in the IIA sufficiently reflects the approach now being advocated. Much of the flexibility that is being introduced by the Mayor (which was not explicit in the preferred option that was appraised) is expressed in the supporting text and not in policy 6.13 itself. I therefore conclude that, in the circumstances, a pragmatic and proportionate approach has been taken towards the gathering, up-dating and analysis of the evidence in this respect.
35. Table 6.1 of the IIA provides a summary of the impact of the three options and identifies that for the preferred option there may be a small number of consequences that ‘detract from the achievement of the IIA objective, although not significantly’. These ‘non-significant’ impacts, however, must also be seen within the context of the London Plan as a whole, which includes a range of policies, for example on air quality and open space, which are directed towards addressing such impacts. Taken as a whole I am satisfied that the evidence in the IIA is sufficiently robust and proportionate.
36. In terms of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) the main sensitivities of, and key threats to, European protected nature conservation sites have

---

<sup>21</sup> Library document MA/CD/04

<sup>22</sup> Library document MA/CD/05

been identified. It is concluded that the Alterations would have no likely significant effect on such sites and no evidence was submitted that would enable me to draw any conclusions to the contrary.

### **Issue P2 – Do the Proposed Alterations to the Parking Standards Sufficiently Reflect National Policy?**

37. Paragraph 39 of the NPPF sets out a number of factors to be considered in the formulation of parking standards and the Written Ministerial Statement dated 25<sup>th</sup> March 2015 provides further advice that 'local planning authorities should only impose local parking standards for residential and non-residential development where there is a clear and compelling justification that it is necessary to manage their local road network'<sup>23</sup>.
38. The modelling undertaken by Transport for London (TfL) was based on the assumption that by 2031 there will be an additional 24,000 car owning households with an average of 1.4 cars per household. Past trends (2004-2014) show that in inner London there is an average of 0.77 spaces per dwelling and in outer London it is 1.14 spaces<sup>24</sup>. It can reasonably be assumed that the future increase in households and the relative under-supply of off-street parking will further increase the pressure for on-street parking with consequent implications for the safety of local road network. This situation was reflected in a letter to the Mayor from the Minister of State for Housing and Planning dated 27<sup>th</sup> January 2015 in which he expresses the view that in London 'more parking spaces should be provided alongside new homes that families want and need ..... an insufficient number of parking spaces risks creating a vicious cycle where clogged up streets leave motorists to run a gauntlet of congestion, unfair fines and parking restrictions'.
39. Policy 6.13Ee (as amended by Parking Suggested Change 1<sup>25</sup>) specifically refers to paragraph 39 of the NPPF, as does paragraph 6.42j (as amended by Parking Suggested Change 2) of the supporting text. Furthermore, the adopted London Plan itself (for example in paragraph 0.16H and in the supporting text to policy 6.13: Parking) provides confirmation that the Mayor has given due weight to national policy on parking standards.
40. Concerns have been expressed about the impact of the Parking Standards MALP on air quality and health and I address these in paragraphs 48 to 64. In broad terms, however, I am satisfied that appropriate account has been taken of national policy in the proposed alterations relating to parking standards.

### **Issue P3 – Is the Balance that would be achieved between Car Parking Provision and the Promotion of Sustainable Means of Movement Appropriate?**

41. Paragraph 29 of the NPPF states that 'the transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes'. This approach is tempered, however, by the acknowledgement that 'different policies and measures will be required in different communities'.

---

<sup>23</sup> Written Statement To Parliament, Rt Hon Eric Pickles March 2015

<sup>24</sup> Summarised in the Notes of the Technical Session

<sup>25</sup> Library document MA/SC/02

42. It must be remembered that I am examining the Parking Standards MALP within the context of the London Plan as a whole and the Mayor’s response to my Final Matters question 2b clearly summarises the framework provided by that Plan. I need to weigh the amount of ‘new’ car parking that would be provided (and the consequent increase in car travel) against the availability of sustainable means of movement. TfL confirmed that the number of additional car trips resulting from the MALP (Parking Standards) would be very small<sup>26</sup> and I was given no evidence to the contrary. At the same time it is clear that the Mayor is placing significant emphasis on the provision of improved public transport and schemes to encourage more cycling and walking<sup>27</sup>. I am satisfied that an appropriate balance will be achieved, particularly as the opportunity to increase parking provision will mainly only be available in areas of comparatively poor public transport provision.

#### **Issue P4 – Is the Reliance Placed on Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTALs) Justified?**

43. PTALs (as defined in the document’s Glossary) are a well-established and well-understood approach to measuring connectivity. The PTAL methodology is subject to review and updating and although the Mayor recognises there may be some limitations (for example in terms of the effect new rail services may have on bus services) he considers that there is currently no justification for re-assessing the approach taken. A number of respondents did raise concerns about the accuracy of PTALs but no feasible alternatives were suggested and there was a general acceptance at the hearing, that although not perfect, PTALs should continue to form the basis of the Mayor’s approach and I agree.
44. In terms of the specific wording of policy 6.13 I am satisfied that the use of the word ‘generally’ in front of PTALs 0-1 is justified. This adds a degree of flexibility which will enable outer London Boroughs to assess whether or not there are specific circumstances that may justify more generous parking provision in specific proposals outside PTALs 0-1. The description of a PTAL level of 0-1 being ‘low’ is a frequent and recognised approach which I consider to be appropriate in the circumstances.
45. Reference is made in the supporting text (paragraph 6.42j) to ‘a more flexible approach’ being acceptable in some limited parts of PTAL2. The intention is that it will be up to the outer London Boroughs to determine where it might be appropriate to adopt a more flexible approach. On balance, and bearing in mind the advice is not within the policy itself, I consider this to be justified because it will enable the relevant Borough to take into account the particular circumstances of a particular proposal.

#### **Issue P5 – Would the Proposed Parking Standards result in any Significantly Adverse Implications?**

##### **Delivery of Dwellings**

46. It is estimated that that the land required to accommodate the potential additional parking could result in the loss of between 100 and 260 dwellings a

---

<sup>26</sup> TfL Statement P010

<sup>27</sup> Table 6.1 of the London Plan



year<sup>28</sup> across London. This represents no more than 1% of the total number of dwellings proposed and I do not consider that this represents a significant threat to the need to significantly boost housing supply or to meeting objectively assessed need.

## Urban Design

47. National policy (for example NPPF paragraph 56) and the London Plan (for example policies 7.2 on Inclusive Design and 7.4 on Local Character) establish a strong framework for the provision of high quality design. Whilst the Mayor acknowledges that the provision of additional parking could result in an unattractive environment, he confirms that if parking is fully integrated into a development and a high standard of materials and planting is achieved, then high quality is attainable. I was given no evidence to demonstrate that the MALP would result in a material deterioration in the quality of urban design and conclude that no further changes are required in this regard.

## Air Quality

48. The issue of air quality is clearly of great significance and I have considered the wide range of views regarding the approach that the Mayor should take, including two legal opinions<sup>29</sup> to which I have attached significant weight. Before addressing the evidence before me, however, it is clear to me that the Mayor recognises the national importance to be attached to the issue of air quality (as embodied in a number paragraphs in the NPPF and the NPPG). The NPPF establishes the fact that the reduction of air pollution is a key planning principle<sup>30</sup> and the NPPG sets out the issues to be addressed in the consideration of a planning application<sup>31</sup>. The accompanying Table in the NPPG sets out the steps a local planning authority might take in considering air quality and I note that there are two references to including ‘mitigation’ in any deliberations.
49. Compliance with national policy is evident in the adopted London Plan and in particular policy 7.14 which establishes the planning framework through which air quality in London can be improved. In terms of the Parking Standards MALP, the significant amount of modelling work that has been undertaken<sup>32</sup> (which was explained at the Technical Seminar) further demonstrates the Mayor’s commitment to addressing the issue.
50. Of particular relevance is the EU Directive on Ambient Air Quality 2008/50/EC (the Directive)<sup>33</sup>. In summary this obliges the UK to ensure that levels of NO<sub>2</sub> are below a defined level (limit value) and once the level has been attained it should not be exceeded. This should have been achieved by 2010. Several objectors to the Mayor’s approach (in summary) argue that air pollution limits are absolute and that any deterioration in air quality, at whatever level, would render a proposal unsound. They consider that the delivery of mitigation measures should not be counted in favour of a proposal because such

---

<sup>28</sup> Outer London Commission Fourth Report – Residential Parking Standards May 2015 (para 4.4.14)

<sup>29</sup> Library documents MA/EX/08 and MA/RD/20

<sup>30</sup> NPPF paragraphs 17 and 110

<sup>31</sup> Under Air Quality Ref: ID: 32-005-20140306

<sup>32</sup> Using TfL’s Strategic London Transport Studies Model and the Emissions Assessment Tool

<sup>33</sup> For example Articles 2, 12, 13, 22, 23 and 30

measures should already be being implemented.

51. Balanced against that argument is the fact that the predicted decrease in air quality would be only 0.5%, a figure that I do not consider to be unduly significant. Also any relaxation in parking standards would not be mandatory and in any event a local planning authority would be obliged to have regard to national policy in the decision-making process. There is also the opportunity to improve air quality through mitigation measures, which I consider to be a reasonable way forward because the consequent cumulative improvement could be substantial. This matter was the subject of a written question I forwarded to the Mayor<sup>34</sup> on 7<sup>th</sup> October 2015. In his response<sup>35</sup> he confirmed that there is a wide range of measures that are being (or will be) taken, either on-site or at Borough or London-wide level. They include:

- the introduction of the Ultra Low Emission Zone in 2020, which is estimated will decrease emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> by about 50% within the Zone and by about 14% London-wide;
- the availability of the Mayor’s Air Quality Fund to support London Boroughs in tackling local air quality hotspots;
- the identification of Low Emission Neighbourhoods which could contribute to reducing overall vehicle kilometres and encouraging the use of low-emission vehicles;
- the promotion of the Ultra Low Emission Vehicle Delivery Plan;
- the implementation of London Plan policy 7.14 which states that all major developments should be ‘at least air quality neutral’;
- retrofitting homes and other buildings with energy efficient measures; and
- investing in green infrastructure.

52. In weighing up the conflicting views I am mindful that the overarching objective is to improve air quality and there is no reason to conclude that mitigation measures would not contribute significantly to achieving that objective. Therefore, provided it can be clearly demonstrated, through appropriate modelling and monitoring mechanisms, that mitigation measures outweigh the predicted 0.5% decrease in air quality that may arise from the implementation of the MALP (Parking Standards), I consider that the way forward being espoused by the Mayor is reasonable. Nevertheless the onus is on the Mayor, in co-operation with the London Boroughs, to undertake the necessary measures, including monitoring and review, to ensure that the overarching objective is achieved as soon as possible.

53. In order to strengthen the requirement to include the consideration of air quality when a decision is being taken on whether or not more generous parking standards should be applied, and to ensure that appropriate weight is attached to the issue of air quality, I recommend that a specific reference to the matter is included in paragraph 6.42k (**IRC P1**).

---

<sup>34</sup> Library document MA/EX/05

<sup>35</sup> Library document MA/EX/08

## **Activity Levels**

54. It is likely that the small increase in the number of car journeys will result in a small reduction in journeys undertaken on foot, by bike or on public transport. TfL estimate that there could be a daily decrease in such movement of about 0.3%<sup>36</sup>. However, this has to be balanced against the fact that increased mobility by car may have benefits in terms of social inclusion. In any event if it could be demonstrated that a proposal would have significant implications in terms of activity levels, then this would be a material consideration that would be taken into account in the determination of any such planning application.

## **Consequences for Inner London Boroughs**

55. There is a complex relationship between parking provision, car ownership and car use. The number and purpose of trips are influenced by many factors. However, TfL estimate that the number additional trips resulting as a consequence of the MALP (Parking Standards) would be very small in the context of existing and projected increases in journeys and that the consequences would be minimal<sup>37</sup>. The percentage increase of traffic in inner London Boroughs would not be significant. Taking into account the high number of uncertainties in any calculations I am satisfied that the consequences of the MALP (Parking Standards), particularly for inner London Boroughs, could be satisfactorily assimilated. Even if circumstances were to change there is no reason to doubt that this would be identified in the Annual Monitoring Report and that if necessary the Mayor would take appropriate action to address any issues that might arise.

## **Conclusion on Issue P5**

56. I am satisfied that the proposed parking standards would not result in any significant adverse implications that could not be appropriately addressed. The Mayor’s approach is justified.

## **OTHER MATTERS**

57. At my request the Mayor considered three minor issues raised at the hearing, relating to the clarity of policy 6.13; referencing NPPF paragraph 39 in the document; and making specific reference to air quality issues (see library document MA/SC/09). I am satisfied with the Mayor’s response in all regards. A small number of other matters were raised by respondents, for example relating to Car Parking Zones and the future provision of public transport but none of them have significant implications in terms of the soundness of the Parking Standards MALP.

## **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE PARKING STANDARDS MALP**

58. The consultation version of the MALP (Parking) has a number of deficiencies,

---

<sup>36</sup> IIA Sustainability Appraisal, Section 3, page 21 (MA/CD/04)

<sup>37</sup> TfL Statement P010



many of which have been rectified by the Suggested Changes published prior to the hearing. Nevertheless I have set out one further change in the Appendix which is needed to ensure soundness and I recommend, for the reasons set out above, that the change is included in the adopted version of the MALP (Parking Standards).

*David Hogger*

Inspector

This report is accompanied by an Appendix containing the Inspector’s Recommended Changes

## Appendix

# Minor Alterations to the London Plan: Inspector’s Recommended Changes

## 1. HOUSING STANDARDS MALP

Change Number	MALP Reference	Recommended Change. <u>New text is underlined</u> and <del>deleted text is struckthrough</del>
IRC H1	Title of Table 3.3  Add new footnote	Table 3.3 Minimum Space Standards for new <del>development</del> <u>dwelling</u> s*  <u>*new dwellings in this context includes new build, conversions and change of use</u>
IRC H2	Note 1 of Table 3.3	*where a <del>studio</del> <u>one person dwelling</u> has a shower room instead of a bathroom .....
IRC H3	Policy 3.8 Bc and policy 3.8Bd	Add the same footnote to both elements of the policy to read:  <u>Unlike the other standards in this Plan, Part M of the Building Regulations generally does not apply to dwellings resulting from a conversion or a change of use. Additional guidance on the applicable requirements of the Building Regulations (amended 2015) can be found in: Approved Document M Access to and Use of Buildings Volume 1: Dwellings.</u>
IRC H4	Paragraph 3.48	.... 90% of London’s <del>future housing</del> <u>new build housing</u> should be built to Building <u>Regulation</u> requirement ‘M4(2): Accessible and adaptable dwellings’ and <del>the remaining 10% of new build housing*</del> <u>should be .....</u>  Add a footnote to read: <u>Unlike the other standards in this Plan, Part M of the Building Regulations generally does not apply to dwellings resulting from a conversion or a change of use.</u>
IRC H5	Paragraph 3.48A	..... Generally this will require a lift where a dwelling is accessed above or below the <del>entry</del> <u>entrance</u> storey.....

		Boroughs should seek to ensure that <del>units</del> <u>dwelling</u> s accessed above or below the <del>entry</del> <u>entrance</u> storey in buildings of four storeys or less have step-free access. However, <del>for these types of buildings</del> this requirement may be subject to development-specific viability assessments and consideration should be given to the implication of ongoing maintenance costs on the affordability of service charges for residents. <u>Where such assessments demonstrate that the inclusion of a lift would make the scheme unviable or mean that service charges are not affordable for intended residents, the units above or below the ground floor that cannot provide step free access would only need to satisfy the requirements of M4(1) of the Buildings Regulations. All other standards should be applied as set out in this Plan.</u> Further guidance <del>will be</del> <u>is</u> provided in the <del>revised 2015 Draft Interim</del> Housing SPG.
IRC H6	Paragraph 7.5	<del>..... This can be achieved by extending the inclusive design principles embedded in The Lifetime Homes Standards (see Policy 3.8) to the neighbourhood level.</del>

## 2. PARKING STANDARDS MALP

Change Number	MALP Reference	Recommended Change.  New text is <u>underlined</u> and deleted text is <del>struckthrough</del>
IRC P1	Paragraph 6.42k	Consideration should be given to the <u>implications for air quality and the</u> impact of on-street parking measures such as CPZs .....

This page is intentionally left blank

**Schedule of the Mayor of London's responses to the recommendations of the EiP Inspector for the Housing Standards and Parking Standards MALP (Minor Alterations to the London Plan) 16 December 2015**

<b>EiP Insp's rec</b>	<b>MALP ref</b>	<b>MALP EiP Inspector's recommended change</b>	<b>Mayor of London's response</b>
		New text is <b>bold with yellow highlight</b> and deleted text is <del>struckthrough with yellow highlight</del>	

**1. HOUSING STANDARDS MALP**

IRC H1	Table 3.3 title new footnote	Table 3.3 Minimum Space Standards for new <b>development dwellings*</b> <b>*new dwellings in this context includes new build, conversions and change of use</b>	Accept
IRC H2	Table 3.3 note 1	where a <del>studio</del> <b>one person dwelling</b> has a shower room instead of a bathroom ...	Accept
IRC H3	Policy 3.8Bc and Policy 3.8Bd	Add the same footnote to both elements of the policy to read: <b>Unlike the other standards in this Plan, Part M of the Building Regulations generally does not apply to dwellings resulting from a conversion or a change of use. Additional guidance on the applicable requirements of the Building Regulations (amended 2015) can be found in: Approved Document M Access to and Use of Buildings Volume 1: Dwellings.</b>	Accept
IRC H4	Para 3.48	.... 90% of London's <del>future housing</del> <b>new build housing</b> should be built to Building <b>Regulation</b> requirement 'M4(2): Accessible and adaptable dwellings' and <b>the remaining 10% of new build housing*</b> should be ..... Add a footnote to read: <b>Unlike the other standards in this Plan, Part M of the Building Regulations generally does not apply to dwellings resulting from a conversion or a change of use.</b>	Accept
IRC H5	Para 3.48A	... Generally this will require a lift where a dwelling is accessed above or below the <del>entry</del> <b>entrance</b> storey... Boroughs should seek to ensure that <del>units</del> <b>dwellings</b> accessed above or below the <del>entry</del> <b>entrance</b> storey in buildings of four storeys or less have step-free access. However, <b>for these types of buildings</b> this requirement may be subject to development-specific viability assessments and consideration should be given to the implication of ongoing maintenance costs on the affordability of service charges for residents. <b>Where such assessments demonstrate that the inclusion of a lift would make the scheme unviable or mean that service charges are not affordable for intended residents, the units above or below the ground floor that cannot provide step free access would only need to satisfy the requirements of M4(1) of the Buildings Regulations. All other standards should be applied as set out in this Plan.</b> Further guidance <del>will be</del> <b>is</b> provided in the <del>revised 2015</del> <b>Draft Interim</b> Housing SPG.	Accept
IRC H6	Para 7.5	... This can be achieved by extending the inclusive design principles embedded in The Lifetime Homes Standards (see Policy 3.8) to the neighbourhood level....	Accept

**Schedule of the Mayor of London's responses to the recommendations of the EiP Inspector for the Housing Standards and Parking Standards MALP (Minor Alterations to the London Plan) 16 December 2015**

<b>EiP Insp's rec</b>	<b>MALP ref</b>	<b>MALP EiP Inspector's recommended change</b>	<b>Mayor of London's response</b>
		New text is <b>bold with yellow highlight</b> and deleted text is <del>struckthrough with yellow highlight</del>	

**2. PARKING STANDARDS MALP**

IRC P1	Para 6.42k	Consideration should be given to the <b>implications for air quality and the</b> impact of on-street parking measures such as CPZs ...	Accept
--------	------------	--	--------

## MAYOR OF LONDON

**Rt Hon Greg Clark MP**  
Secretary of State  
Communities and Local Government  
2 Marsham St  
London SW1P 4DF

**Date:** 16 December 2015

Dear Greg

### **Housing Standards and Parking Standards Minor Alterations to the London Plan Notice of Intention to Publish**

In May of this year I published consultation drafts of Minor Alterations to the London Plan (MALP) on Housing Standards and Parking Standards. These fulfilled the commitment I gave in March in the Further Alterations to the London Plan (paragraph 0.16H) to bring forward early alterations to reflect Government housing standards and to review parking standards in outer London.

These Minor Alterations have been through the statutory procedures of public consultation and Examination in Public (EiP). The EiP sat for two days' hearings on 21 and 22 October 2015, and on 15 December 2015 I received the report of the EiP Inspector.

In accordance with section 337 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 (as amended) and regulation 9 of the Town and Country Planning (London Spatial Development Strategy) Regulations 2000, I have pleasure in sending you the text of the Housing Standards and Parking Standards MALPs as I intend to publish them, together with a schedule showing the Inspector's recommendations and my response to them. I have accepted all seven of the Inspector's recommendations. For ease of understanding, I enclose two versions of each of the Minor Alterations – one shows the changes to the text involved in the alterations, and the other (clean) version shows the text as altered and as I intend to publish it.

I understand that I must not publish the Minor Alterations within the next six weeks in order to give your officials time to consider the proposed changes in terms of their compliance with national planning policy and any possible adverse impacts on the neighbouring regions, and any consequential direction arising from this.

Under section 42B of the GLA 1999 Act, I must also submit the Minor Alterations to the London Assembly before I can publish them. As I aim to complete this process and publish the MALPs before the GLA's pre-election period commences in late March, my intention is to submit the Minor Alterations to the Assembly in the New Year. I would thus be extremely grateful if I could have an early indication of your views.

To expedite the smooth passage of the MALPs at this final stage, my officers are standing by to work closely with yours to reach agreement. I would be grateful if your officers could contact John Lett (email: [john.lett@london.gov.uk](mailto:john.lett@london.gov.uk) , telephone: 020 7983 4281) or Richard Linton (email: [richard.linton@london.gov.uk](mailto:richard.linton@london.gov.uk) , telephone: 020 7983 4278) to progress matters swiftly.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours ever

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Boris', with a stylized flourish at the end.

**Boris Johnson**  
Mayor of London

Enclosures:

- schedule of the Mayor of London's responses to the MALP EiP Inspector's recommendations
- 'intend to publish' Housing Standards MALP (version showing changes)
- 'intend to publish' Housing Standards MALP (clean version)
- 'intend to publish' Parking Standards MALP (version showing changes)
- 'intend to publish' Parking Standards MALP (clean version)



# HOUSING STANDARDS

## MINOR ALTERATIONS TO THE LONDON PLAN THE SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR LONDON CONSOLIDATED WITH ALTERATIONS SINCE 2011

### INTEND TO PUBLISH

[showing alterations and suggested/further suggested changes]

DECEMBER 2015

MAYOR OF LONDON

## COPYRIGHT

### Greater London Authority

Published by  
Greater London Authority  
City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
More London  
London SE1 2AA  
[www.london.gov.uk](http://www.london.gov.uk)  
enquiries 020 7983 4100  
minicom 020 7983 4458

Copies of this report are available from  
[www.london.gov.uk](http://www.london.gov.uk)

# HOUSING STANDARDS

## MINOR ALTERATIONS TO THE LONDON PLAN THE SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR LONDON CONSOLIDATED WITH ALTERATIONS SINCE 2011

### INTEND TO PUBLISH

This version shows the original consultation draft Minor Alterations published in May 2015, together with the suggested changes published in August 2015, the further suggested changes published in September and October 2015 and the EiP Inspector's recommendations December 2015.

The sources of the alterations are as follows:

- **MINOR ALTERATIONS TO THE LONDON PLAN CONSULTATION DRAFT 11 May 2015**  
<http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/MALP%20HOUSING%20STANDARDS%20-%20CONSULTATION%20DRAFT%20May%202015web.pdf>  
new or altered text is shown in **purple bold**  
deleted text is shown in ~~purple strikethrough~~
- **SUGGESTED CHANGES 21 August 2015**  
<http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Suggested%20changes%20to%20the%20Housing%20Standards%20MALP.pdf>  
new or altered text is shown in **green bold**  
deleted text is shown in ~~green strikethrough~~
- **FURTHER SUGGESTED CHANGES 29 September 2015**  
[http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/MASC04\\_MALP%20housing%20standards%20further%20suggested%20changes.pdf](http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/MASC04_MALP%20housing%20standards%20further%20suggested%20changes.pdf)  
new or altered text is shown in **blue bold**  
deleted text is shown in ~~blue strikethrough~~
- **FURTHER SUGGESTED CHANGES 28 October 2015**  
[http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/MASC06\\_MALP\\_Housing\\_standards\\_further\\_suggested\\_changes\\_HFSC3-9.pdf](http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/MASC06_MALP_Housing_standards_further_suggested_changes_HFSC3-9.pdf)  
new or altered text is shown in **orange bold**  
deleted text is shown in ~~orange strikethrough~~  
changes listed by the MALP EiP Inspector in his recommendations are shown in **orange with yellow highlight**

DECEMBER 2015

## HOUSING QUALITY AND DESIGN POLICY

### POLICY 3.5 QUALITY AND DESIGN OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS

#### Strategic

- A Housing developments should be of the highest quality internally, externally and in relation to their context and to the wider environment, taking account of strategic policies in this Plan to protect and enhance London's residential environment and attractiveness as a place to live. Boroughs may in their LDFs introduce a presumption against development on back gardens or other private residential gardens where this can be locally justified.

#### Planning decisions and LDF preparation

- B The design of all new housing developments should enhance the quality of local places, taking into account physical context; local character; density; tenure and land use mix; and relationships with, and provision of, public, communal and open spaces, taking particular account of the needs of children, **disabled** and older people.
- C LDFs should incorporate **requirements for accessibility and adaptability**<sup>1</sup>, minimum space standards<sup>2</sup> ~~that generally conform with~~ **including those set out in** Table 3.3, **and water efficiency**.<sup>3</sup> The Mayor will, and boroughs should, seek to ensure that new development reflects these standards. The design of all new dwellings should also take account of factors relating to 'arrival' at the building and the 'home as a place of retreat'. **New homes should** have adequately sized rooms and convenient and

efficient room layouts **which are functional and fit for purpose**, meet the changing needs of Londoners over their lifetimes, address climate change adaptation and mitigation and social inclusion objectives and should be conceived and developed through an effective design process<sup>4</sup>.

- D Development proposals which compromise the delivery of elements of this policy, may be permitted if they are demonstrably of exemplary design and contribute to achievement of other objectives of this Plan.
- E The Mayor will provide guidance on implementation of this policy that is relevant to all tenures.

- 3.32 Securing new housing of the highest quality and protecting and enhancing residential neighbourhoods are key Mayoral priorities. The number of new homes needed to 2036 will create new challenges for private developers and affordable homes providers, but also brings unique opportunities for new housing which will be remembered as attractive, spacious, safe and green and which help to shape sustainable neighbourhoods with distinct and positive identities.

- 3.32A **Since 2011 the London Plan has provided the basis for a range of housing standards that address the housing needs of Londoners and these are brought together in the Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). The options and process recently provided by Government aim to improve the quality of housing nationally<sup>5</sup> and**

<sup>1</sup> Requirements M4 (2) and M4 (3) of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010. HM Government 2015.

<sup>2</sup> Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard. DCLG 2015

<sup>3</sup> London Plan Policy 5.15

<sup>4</sup> Mayor of London, **Interim Draft Housing SPG Supplementary Planning Guidance 2015**

<sup>5</sup> New national technical standards, Eric Pickles written statement to Parliament 25 March 2015: "Steps the government is taking to streamline the planning system, protect the

**provide an opportunity to reinforce the status of the standards already in place for London. They have been consolidated and tested to ensure that they are sound in terms of need and viability.**

- 3.33 New housing development should address the wider concerns of this Plan to protect and enhance the environment of London as a whole. New development, including that on garden land and that associated with basement extensions, should avoid having an adverse impact on sites of European importance for nature conservation either directly or indirectly, including through increased recreation pressure on these sites. New development should also take account of the Plan's more general design principles (policies 7.2 to 7.12) and those on neighbourhoods (Policy 7.1), housing choice (Policy 3.8), sustainable design and construction (Policy 5.3), as well as those on climate change (Chapter 5), play provision (Policy 3.6), biodiversity (Policy 7.19), and flood risk (Policy 5.12).
- 3.35 The quality of individual homes and their neighbourhoods is the product of detailed and local design requirements but the implementation of these across London has led to too many housing schemes in London being of variable quality. ~~Only a small proportion of recent schemes have been assessed by CABE<sup>6</sup> as being 'good' or 'very good'. There is clearly scope for improvement.~~ The cumulative effect of poor quality homes, and the citywide benefits improved standards ~~would~~ bring, means this is a strategic issue and properly a concern of the London Plan. Addressing these issues ~~will be~~ **is** an important element of

achieving the Mayor's vision and detailed objectives for London and its neighbourhoods set out in Chapter One.

- 3.36 The Mayor regards the relative size of all new homes in London to be a key element of this strategic issue **and therefore has adopted the Nationally Described Space Standard<sup>7</sup>**. Table 3.3 ~~therefore~~ sets out minimum space standards for dwellings of different sizes. This is based on the minimum gross internal floor area (GIA) required for new homes relative to the number of occupants and taking into account commonly required furniture and the spaces needed for different activities and moving around, ~~in line with Lifetime Home Standards.~~ This means developers should state the number of bedspaces/occupiers a home is designed to accommodate rather than, say, simply the number of bedrooms. These are minimum standards which developers are encouraged to exceed. ~~When designing homes for more than six persons/bedspaces, developers should allow approximately 10 sq m per extra bedspace/person.~~ **When designing homes for with more than six eight persons/bedspaces, developers should allow approximately 10 sq m per extra bedspace/person.** Single person dwellings of less than 37 square metres may be permitted if the development proposal is demonstrated to be of exemplary design and contributes to achievement of other objectives and policies of this Plan.

**environment, support economic growth and assist locally-led decision-making."**

<sup>6</sup> Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE). Housing Audit 2004: London, the South East and East of England. CABE, 2004

<sup>7</sup> **Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard. DCLG 2015**

**Table 3.3 Minimum space standards for new development dwellings<sup>8</sup>**

	Dwelling type (bedroom (b)/persons bedspaces (p))	GIA (sq.m)
Flats	1p	37
	1b2p	50
	2b3p	61
	2b4p	70
	3b4p	74
	3b5p	86
	3b6p	95
	4b5p	90
	4b6p	99
2-story houses	2b4p	83
	3b4p	87
	3b5p	96
	4b5p	100
	4b6p	107
3-storey houses	3b5p	102
	4b5p	106
	4b6p	113

Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces	Minimum GIA (m <sup>2</sup> )			Built-in storage (m <sup>2</sup> )
		1 storey dwellings	2 storey dwellings	3 storey dwellings	
1b	1p	39 (37)*			1.0
	2p	50	58		1.5
2b	3p	61	70		2.0
	4p	70	79		
3b	4p	74	84	90	2.5
	5p	86	93	99	
	6p	95	102	108	
4b	5p	90	97	103	3.0
	6p	99	106	112	
	7p	108	115	121	
	8p	117	124	130	
5b	6p	103	110	116	3.5
	7p	112	119	125	
	8p	121	128	134	
6b	7p	116	123	129	4.0

**Notes to Table 3 3**

- \* Where a studio one person dwelling has a shower room instead of a bathroom, the floor area may be reduced from 39m<sup>2</sup> to 37m<sup>2</sup>, as shown bracketed.
- The Gross Internal Area of a dwelling is defined as the total floor space measured between the internal faces of perimeter walls<sup>1</sup> that enclose a dwelling. This includes partitions, structural elements, cupboards, ducts, flights of stairs and voids above stairs. GIA should be measured and denoted in square metres (m<sup>2</sup>).
- The nationally described space standard sets a minimum ceiling height of 2.3 meters for at least 75% of the gross internal area of the dwelling. To address the unique heat island effect of London and the distinct density and flatted nature of most of its

<sup>8</sup> new dwellings in this context includes new build, conversions and change of use

**residential development, a minimum ceiling height of 2.5m for at least 75% of the gross internal area is strongly encouraged so that new housing is of adequate quality, especially in terms of light, ventilation and sense of space.**

3.37 Other aspects of housing design are also important to improving the attractiveness of new homes as well as being central to the Mayor's wider objectives to improve the quality of Londoners' environment. To address these he has produced guidance on the implementation of Policy 3.5 for all housing tenures in his Housing SPG, drawing on his design guide for affordable housing<sup>9</sup>.

3.38 At the neighbourhood level this SPG addresses the relationship between strategic density Policy (3.4) and different local approaches to its implementation; the spaces between and around buildings; urban layout; enclosure; ensuring homes are laid out to form a coherent pattern of streets and blocks; public, communal and private open spaces; and the ways these relate to each other and neighbourhoods as a whole. It will respond to the needs of an ageing population by **including the principles for inclusive design and those to develop and extend Lifetime Neighbourhoods set out in Policies 7.1 and 7.2.** ~~extending the inclusive design principles of Lifetime Homes to the neighbourhood level (see Policy 7.1).~~

3.39 For individual dwellings the SPG covers issues such as 'arrival' – including the importance of creating active frontages, accommodating footpaths and entrances and shared circulation spaces; size and layout including room space standards as well as the dwelling space standards set out in Table 3.3; the home as a 'place of retreat' (especially important in higher density development); meeting the challenges of a changing climate by ensuring

homes are suitable for warmer summers and wetter winters, and mitigating the extent of future change; and ensuring easy adaptation to meet the changing and diverse needs of occupiers over their lifetimes. ~~It also sets out the London approach to implementation of the Code for Sustainable Homes in the context of broader London Plan policies on sustainable design and construction.~~ The importance of an effective design process to make sure that the quality of schemes is not compromised as the development proceeds will also be highlighted. This guidance provides a strategic, functional basis for a new vernacular in London's domestic architecture which also places greater weight on complementing and enhancing local context and character.

---

<sup>9</sup> Mayor of London. London Housing Design Guide (LHDG) 2010

## HOUSING CHOICE POLICY

### POLICY 3.8 HOUSING CHOICE

#### Strategic

- A Londoners should have a genuine choice of homes that they can afford and which meet their requirements for different sizes and types of dwellings in the highest quality environments.

#### LDF preparation and planning decisions

- B To inform local application of Policy 3.3 on housing supply and taking account of housing requirements identified at regional, sub-regional and local levels, boroughs should work with the Mayor and local communities to identify the range of needs likely to arise within their areas and ensure that:
- a new developments offer a range of housing choices, in terms of the mix of housing sizes and types, taking account of the housing requirements of different groups and the changing roles of different sectors in meeting these
  - a1 the planning system provides positive and practical support to sustain the contribution of the Private Rented Sector (PRS) in addressing housing needs and increasing housing delivery.
  - b provision of affordable family housing is addressed as a strategic priority in LDF policies
  - c **all ninety percent of** new housing<sup>10</sup> **is built to 'The Lifetime Homes' standards meets Building Regulation requirement M4 (2) 'accessible and**

<sup>10</sup> Unlike the other standards in this Plan, Part M of the Building Regulations generally does not apply to dwellings resulting from a conversion or a change of use. Additional guidance on the applicable requirements of the Building Regulations (amended 2015) can be found in: Approved Document M Access to and use of buildings Volume 1: Dwellings.

#### **adaptable dwellings'**

- d ten per cent of new housing<sup>11</sup> **meets Building Regulation requirement M4 (3) 'wheelchair user dwellings', is i.e. is** designed to be wheelchair accessible, or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users
- e account is taken of the changing age structure of London's population and, in particular, the varied needs of older Londoners, including for supported and affordable provision
- f account is taken of the needs of particular communities with large families
- g other supported housing needs are identified authoritatively and co-ordinated action is taken to address them in LDF and other relevant plans and strategies
- h strategic and local requirements for student housing meeting a demonstrable need are addressed by working closely with stakeholders in higher and further education and without compromising capacity for conventional homes.
- i the accommodation requirements of gypsies and travellers (including travelling show people) are identified and addressed, with sites identified in line with national policy, in coordination with neighbouring boroughs and districts as appropriate.
- j appropriate provision is made for the accommodation of service families and custom build, having regard to local need.

- 3.48 Many already **households in London Londoners** require accessible or adapted housing in order to lead dignified and independent lives: **25,000 28,000** are attempting to move to somewhere more suitable to cope with a disability and more than **240,000 267,000** need a

<sup>11</sup> **ibid**



home adaption<sup>12</sup>. More Londoners are living longer and more older people are choosing to remain in their own homes rather than go into residential institutions. To address these and future needs, all 90 per cent of London's future housing new build housing<sup>13</sup> should be built to 'The Lifetime Homes' standards Building Regulation requirement 'M4 (2): Accessible and adaptable dwellings'<sup>14</sup> and the remaining 10 per cent of new build housing<sup>15</sup> should be designed to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for wheelchair users built to Building Regulation requirement 'M4 (3): Wheelchair user dwellings'<sup>16</sup>. LDF policy departures from these requirements must be justified by authoritative evidence from local needs assessments.

**3.48A As set out in Approved Document M of the Building Regulations- Volume 1: Dwellings, to comply with requirement M4 (2), step free access must be provided. Generally this will require a lift where a dwelling is accessed above or below the entry entrance storey. The application of requirement M4 (2) has particular implications for blocks of four storeys or less, where historically the**

**London Plan has not required lifts. Boroughs should seek to ensure that units dwellings accessed above or below the entry entrance storey in buildings of four storeys or less have step-free access. However, for these types of buildings this requirement may be subject to development-specific viability assessments and consideration should be given to the implication of ongoing maintenance costs on the affordability of service charges for residents. Where such assessments demonstrate that the inclusion of a lift would make the scheme unviable or mean that service charges are not affordable for intended residents, the units above or below the ground floor that cannot provide step free access would only need to satisfy the requirements of M4(1) of the Building Regulations. All other standards should be applied as set out in this Plan. Further guidance will be is provided in the revised 2015 Draft Interim Housing SPG.**

3.49 Boroughs should undertake assessments of the short and longer term supported housing needs of vulnerable and disadvantaged groups, taking account of the wide range of requirements which will arise as London's population ages, the importance of continuity of care, and access to family and friendship networks as well as statutory responsibilities for care.

**3.49A The requirement for 'wheelchair user dwellings' applies to all tenures. However pPart M4 (3) of the Building Regulations regarding 'wheelchair user dwellings' distinguishes between 'wheelchair accessible' (a home readily useable by a wheelchair user at the point of completion) and 'wheelchair adaptable' (a home that can be easily adapted to meet the**

<sup>12</sup> GLA. Analysis of English Housing Survey 2008/09–2011/12

<sup>13</sup> Unlike the other standards in this Plan, Part M of the Building Regulations generally does not apply to dwellings resulting from a conversion or a change of use

<sup>14</sup> Lifetime Homes. [www.lifetimehomes.org.uk](http://www.lifetimehomes.org.uk) Requirement M4 (2) Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010. HM Government 2015.

<sup>15</sup> Unlike the other standards in this Plan, Part M of the Building Regulations generally does not apply to dwellings resulting from a conversion or a change of use

<sup>16</sup> Habinteg Housing Association. Wheelchair Housing Design Guide. Habinteg, 2006 Requirement M4 (3) of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010. HM Government 2015.

**needs of a household including wheelchair users). The Planning Practice Guidance<sup>17</sup> states that Local Plan policies for wheelchair accessible homes should only be applied to those dwellings where the local authority is responsible for allocating or nominating a person to live in that dwelling. Boroughs should therefore specifically assess the level of need for wheelchair accessible dwellings and identify this in their LDF policies.**

ageing population, including through the principles for inclusive design and those to develop and extend Lifetime Neighbourhoods set out in Policies 7.1 and 7.2.

3.50 The Mayor has identified the growing and changing requirements for housing older people in London as one of the most important emerging planning issues for London. It is anticipated that between 2011 and 2036 'over 65s' could increase by 64% and 'over 90s' could grow in number by 89,000.

3.50A Most older Londoners are likely to prefer to remain in their own homes, and some will require support to enable them to do so. It is important that new development expands this choice for existing and future generations of older Londoners. Policy 3.5 on housing quality and its associated housing standards<sup>18</sup> will play a key role in extending choice by **ensuring 90 percent of new dwellings are 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'** ~~carrying forward Lifetime Homes standards for all dwellings~~ and ensuring that 10% are wheelchair **user dwellings accessible**<sup>19</sup>. More generally, London's changing urban environment must respond positively to the needs of an

---

<sup>17</sup> **The Planning Practice Guidance (Housing-Optional Technical Standards) Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 56-009-20150327 DCLG Revision date: 27 03 2015**

<sup>18</sup> Mayor of London. Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance. GLA, 2012

<sup>19</sup> ~~Mayor of London. Wheelchair Accessible Housing Best Practice Guidance. GLA, 2007-Requirement M4 (3) of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010. HM Government 2015~~

## SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION POLICY

- 5.26 The Government has implemented the Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) as a national standard for the sustainable design and construction of new homes. The Mayor's approach is compatible with this, and it is expected that new development in London will seek to achieve the highest code levels possible (in particular for energy, see Policy 5.2, and water, see Policy 5.15). The London Housing Strategy<sup>20</sup> outlines the minimum CSH levels required to comply with Government requirements for publicly funded housing developments, and sets out the requirement to meet code level 4 from 2011. It is also expected that the Government will publish a Code for Sustainable Buildings as a national standard for non-domestic buildings with which the Mayor will also seek to be consistent.
- 5.27 In support of the London Housing Strategy the Mayor has produced a *Housing Design Guide*<sup>21</sup> (see Chapter 3), which provides further guidance to support the move towards CSH levels and also on the standards outlined in the Mayor's **Housing s**Supplementary **p**Planning **g**Guidance.

---

<sup>20</sup> Mayor of London. The London Housing Strategy. GLA 2010

<sup>21</sup> Mayor of London. London Housing Design Guide. (LHDG). LDA, 2010.

## WATER USE AND SUPPLIES POLICY

### POLICY 5.15 WATER USE AND SUPPLIES

#### Strategic

- A The Mayor will work in partnership with appropriate agencies within London and adjoining regional and local planning authorities to protect and conserve water supplies and resources in order to secure London's needs in a sustainable manner by:
- a minimising use of mains water
  - b reaching cost-effective minimum leakage levels
  - c in conjunction with demand side measures, promoting the provision of additional sustainable water resources in a timely and efficient manner, reducing the water supply deficit and achieving security of supply in London
  - d minimising the amount of energy consumed in water supply
  - e promoting the use of rainwater harvesting and using dual potable and grey water recycling systems, where they are energy and cost-effective
  - f maintaining and upgrading water supply infrastructure
  - g ensuring the water supplied will not give rise to likely significant adverse effects to the environment particularly designated sites of European importance for nature conservation.

#### Planning decisions

- B Development should minimise the use of mains water by:
- a incorporating water saving measures and equipment
  - b designing residential development so that mains water consumption would meet a target of 105 litres or less per

head per day<sup>22</sup>

- C New development for sustainable water supply infrastructure, which has been selected within water companies' Water Resource Management Plans, will be supported

- 5.60 Water supplies are essential to any sustainable city and to the health and welfare of its people. London's consumption of water already outstrips available supplies in dry years and ensuing a sustainable and secure water supply has to be an urgent priority. Some steps have already been taken. Investment in recent years to reduce leakage from Victorian mains supply pipes has had an effect (although Thames Water still has a significantly higher leakage rate than the rest of the country). An additional source of supply, the desalination plant at Beckton, has been operational since 2010. These two measures have eased the pressure on water resources in London.
- 5.61 But the fundamental problem remains. To remain sustainable, London needs to reduce the level of water consumption per person. Currently the average Londoner consumes 164 litres/day (l/d)<sup>23</sup>, around 20 l/d above the national average. Projections for population growth in London and in the wider south-east will mean that over the period of this Plan, new strategic water resources will be required. The need for this is exacerbated by the climate change predictions of more sporadic and intense rainfall and a higher likelihood of droughts as well as the need to protect the water environment implementing the Thames River Basin Management Plan requirements. Thames Water, which

<sup>22</sup> Excluding an allowance of 5 litres or less per head per day for external water consumption.

<sup>23</sup> Environment Agency. State of the Environment Report, February 2013

provides over three-quarters of Londoners with water, projects a significant (around 6 % by 2020) capacity deficit. To ensure London's future water security, the prudent use of water will be essential: all new development will need to be water efficient ~~and~~. **Residential development should be designed so that mains water consumption would meet a target of 105 litres or less per head per day, excluding an allowance of 5 litres or less per head per day for external water use. This reflects the 'optional requirement' set out in Part G of the Building Regulations<sup>24</sup>. As all water companies that serve London are located in areas classified as seriously water stressed<sup>25</sup>, the 'optional requirement' should be applied across London. A fittings-based approach should be used to determine the water consumption of a development<sup>26</sup>. This approach is transparent and compatible with developers' procurement and the emerging Water Label, which Government and the water companies serving London are supporting.**

efficiency measures in existing buildings provides scope for considerable water savings (see Policy 5.4). A rolling programme for the replacement of London's water mains will reduce wastage and London's water companies will have to invest in sustainable sources of water. Cooperation will be needed across boundaries to identify and address potential capacity shortfalls of the wider network serving their area. Further detail relating to London's water and wastewater infrastructure is contained in the Mayor's Water Strategy. ~~The Mayor will examine the effectiveness of~~ has considered the Code for Sustainable Homes 'water calculator' approach to water use standards compared to a 'fittings-based' approach and prefers the 'fittings-based approach' such as that suggested by the Association of Environmentally Conscious Builders.

**5.61A e**Existing homes and workplaces will have to become more water efficient, particularly through metering and water efficiency retrofits. Retrofitting water

---

<sup>24</sup> Requirement G2 of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010. HM Government 2015.

<sup>25</sup> Serious water stress is defined as where current or future household demand for water is – or is likely to be – a high proportion of the effective rainfall to meet that demand. – Environment Agency, Water stressed areas – final classification, July 2013.

<sup>26</sup> Table 2.2 of Part G of the Building Regulations provides maximum consumption values for water fittings. If these consumption values are exceeded and where waste disposal units, water softeners or water re-use are specified in the application, the Water Efficiency Calculator must be completed.

## LIFETIME NEIGHBOURHOODS POLICY

- 7.5 Against the background of a rising number of both younger and older Londoners over the Plan period, increasing the opportunities everyone has to access and participate in their communities will help all Londoners to enjoy and feel secure in their neighbourhoods.<sup>27</sup> ~~This can be achieved by extending the inclusive design principles embedded in The Lifetime Homes standards (see Policy 3.8) to the neighbourhood level.~~ Ensuring that families with small children, older people and disabled people can **easily** move around, ~~enjoy and feel secure in their neighbourhoods,~~ enables everyone to participate in, and contribute to, the life of the community. Lifetime neighbourhoods,<sup>28</sup> where access to public transport, basic amenities, local shops, cultural facilities, places to meet and relax, and green and open spaces are within easy reach of homes, and where facilities such as public toilets and seating are consciously planned into proposals at the outset, help to build cohesive, successful and sustainable communities, and achieve social sustainability<sup>29</sup>.

---

<sup>27</sup> Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE), *Inclusion by Design Equality, Diversity and the Built Environment*, November 2008

<sup>28</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), *Lifetime Homes Lifetime Neighbourhoods: A National Strategy for Housing in an Ageing Society*, February 2008

<sup>29</sup> DCLG NPPF 2012, para 7 op cit.

## GLOSSARY DEFINITIONS

*The draft Housing Standards Minor Alterations to London Plan ANNEX SIX GLOSSARY comprise:*

- a new 'Allowable Solutions' entry
- deletion of the 'Lifetime homes' and 'Wheelchair accessible housing' entries
- new 'Wheelchair accessible' and 'Wheelchair adaptable' entries

### **Allowable Solutions**

**Allowable Solutions are part of the Government's strategy for the delivery of zero carbon homes from 2016. Through the mechanism of Allowable Solutions, carbon emissions which cannot be cost-effectively reduced on-site can, once a minimum on-site carbon performance standard has been reached, be tackled through off-site measures.**

### **Lifetime Homes**

Ordinary homes designed to provide accessible and convenient homes for a large segment of the population from families with young children to frail older people and those with temporary or permanent physical or sensory impairments. Lifetime Homes have 16 design features that ensure that the home will be

flexible enough to meet the existing and changing needs of most households, and can be easily adapted to meet the needs of future occupants. The 16 criteria are set out and explained in [www.lifetimehomes.org.uk](http://www.lifetimehomes.org.uk) and are included in the health and wellbeing category of the Code for Sustainable Homes. They have been built upon and extended in the British Standards Institution Draft for Development (DD-266:2007) 'Design of accessible housing—Lifetime Homes—Code of practice'.

### **Wheelchair accessible housing**

This refers to homes built to meet the standards set out in the second edition of the Wheelchair Housing Design Guide by Stephen Thorpe, Habinteg Housing Association 2006.

### **Wheelchair accessible**

This refers to homes built to Building Regulation Requirement M4 (3) (2) (b): Wheelchair user dwellings, where the dwelling is constructed to meet the needs of occupants who use wheelchairs.

### **Wheelchair adaptable**

This refers to homes built to Building Regulation Requirement M4 (3) (2) (a): Wheelchair user dwellings, where the dwelling is constructed to allow simple adaptation to the dwelling to meet the needs of occupants who use wheelchairs.

This page is intentionally left blank



# HOUSING STANDARDS

## MINOR ALTERATIONS TO THE LONDON PLAN THE SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR LONDON CONSOLIDATED WITH ALTERATIONS SINCE 2011

### INTEND TO PUBLISH

[clean version]

DECEMBER 2015

MAYOR OF LONDON

## COPYRIGHT

### Greater London Authority

Published by  
Greater London Authority  
City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
More London  
London SE1 2AA  
[www.london.gov.uk](http://www.london.gov.uk)  
enquiries 020 7983 4100  
minicom 020 7983 4458

Copies of this report are available from  
[www.london.gov.uk](http://www.london.gov.uk)

# HOUSING STANDARDS

## MINOR ALTERATIONS TO THE LONDON PLAN THE SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR LONDON CONSOLIDATED WITH ALTERATIONS SINCE 2011

### INTEND TO PUBLISH

This 'clean' version of the draft Minor Alterations published in May 2015 incorporates the August 2015 suggested changes, the September and October 2015 further suggested changes and the EiP Inspector's recommendations December 2015 – and shows all alterations and changes 'worked through'.

**DECEMBER 2015**

# HOUSING QUALITY AND DESIGN POLICY

## POLICY 3.5 QUALITY AND DESIGN OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS

### Strategic

- A Housing developments should be of the highest quality internally, externally and in relation to their context and to the wider environment, taking account of strategic policies in this Plan to protect and enhance London's residential environment and attractiveness as a place to live. Boroughs may in their LDFs introduce a presumption against development on back gardens or other private residential gardens where this can be locally justified.

### Planning decisions and LDF preparation

- B The design of all new housing developments should enhance the quality of local places, taking into account physical context; local character; density; tenure and land use mix; and relationships with, and provision of, public, communal and open spaces, taking particular account of the needs of children, disabled and older people.
- C LDFs should incorporate requirements for accessibility and adaptability<sup>1</sup>, minimum space standards<sup>2</sup> including those set out in Table 3.3, and water efficiency.<sup>3</sup> The Mayor will, and boroughs should, seek to ensure that new development reflects these standards. The design of all new dwellings should also take account of factors relating to 'arrival' at the building and the 'home as a place of retreat'. New homes should have adequately sized rooms and convenient and

efficient room layouts which are functional and fit for purpose, meet the changing needs of Londoners over their lifetimes, address climate change adaptation and mitigation and social inclusion objectives and should be conceived and developed through an effective design process<sup>4</sup>.

- D Development proposals which compromise the delivery of elements of this policy may be permitted if they are demonstrably of exemplary design and contribute to achievement of other objectives of this Plan.
- E The Mayor will provide guidance on implementation of this policy that is relevant to all tenures.

3.32 Securing new housing of the highest quality and protecting and enhancing residential neighbourhoods are key Mayoral priorities. The number of new homes needed to 2036 will create new challenges for private developers and affordable homes providers, but also brings unique opportunities for new housing which will be remembered as attractive, spacious, safe and green and which help to shape sustainable neighbourhoods with distinct and positive identities.

3.32A Since 2011 the London Plan has provided the basis for a range of housing standards that address the housing needs of Londoners and these are brought together in the Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). The options and process recently provided by Government aim to improve the quality of housing nationally<sup>5</sup> and provide an opportunity to reinforce the status of the standards already in place

<sup>1</sup> Requirements M4 (2) and M4 (3) of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010. HM Government 2015.

<sup>2</sup> Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard. DCLG 2015

<sup>3</sup> London Plan Policy 5.15

<sup>4</sup> Mayor of London, Interim Draft Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance 2015

<sup>5</sup> New national technical standards, Eric Pickles written statement to Parliament 25 March 2015: "Steps the government is taking to streamline the planning system, protect the environment, support economic growth and assist locally-led decision-making."

for London. They have been consolidated and tested to ensure that they are sound in terms of need and viability.

- 3.33 New housing development should address the wider concerns of this Plan to protect and enhance the environment of London as a whole. New development, including that on garden land and that associated with basement extensions, should avoid having an adverse impact on sites of European importance for nature conservation either directly or indirectly, including through increased recreation pressure on these sites. New development should also take account of the Plan's more general design principles (policies 7.2 to 7.12) and those on neighbourhoods (Policy 7.1), housing choice (Policy 3.8), sustainable design and construction (Policy 5.3), as well as those on climate change (Chapter 5), play provision (Policy 3.6), biodiversity (Policy 7.19), and flood risk (Policy 5.12).
- 3.35 The quality of individual homes and their neighbourhoods is the product of detailed and local design requirements but the implementation of these across London has led to too many housing schemes in London being of variable quality. The cumulative effect of poor quality homes, and the citywide benefits improved standards bring, means this is a strategic issue and properly a concern of the London Plan. Addressing these issues is an important element of achieving the Mayor's vision and detailed objectives for London and its neighbourhoods set out in Chapter One.
- 3.36 The Mayor regards the relative size of all new homes in London to be a key element of this strategic issue and therefore has adopted the Nationally Described Space Standard<sup>6</sup>. Table 3.3 sets out minimum space standards for dwellings of different

sizes. This is based on the minimum gross internal floor area (GIA) required for new homes relative to the number of occupants and taking into account commonly required furniture and the spaces needed for different activities and moving around. This means developers should state the number of bedspaces/occupiers a home is designed to accommodate rather than, say, simply the number of bedrooms. These are minimum standards which developers are encouraged to exceed. When designing homes with more than eight persons/bedspaces, developers should allow approximately 10 sq m per extra bedspace/person. Single person dwellings of less than 37 square metres may be permitted if the development proposal is demonstrated to be of exemplary design and contributes to achievement of other objectives and policies of this Plan.

---

<sup>6</sup> Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard. DCLG 2015

**Table 3.3 Minimum space standards for new dwellings<sup>7</sup>**

Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces	Minimum GIA (m <sup>2</sup> )			Built-in storage (m <sup>2</sup> )
		1 storey dwellings	2 storey dwellings	3 storey dwellings	
<b>1b</b>	1p	39 (37)*			1.0
	2p	50	58		1.5
<b>2b</b>	3p	61	70		2.0
	4p	70	79		
<b>3b</b>	4p	74	84	90	2.5
	5p	86	93	99	
	6p	95	102	108	
<b>4b</b>	5p	90	97	103	3.0
	6p	99	106	112	
	7p	108	115	121	
	8p	117	124	130	
<b>5b</b>	6p	103	110	116	3.5
	7p	112	119	125	
	8p	121	128	134	
<b>6b</b>	7p	116	123	129	4.0

Notes to Table 3 3

- \* Where a one person dwelling has a shower room instead of a bathroom, the floor area may be reduced from 39m<sup>2</sup> to 37m<sup>2</sup>, as shown bracketed.
- The Gross Internal Area of a dwelling is defined as the total floor space measured between the internal faces of perimeter walls<sup>1</sup> that enclose a dwelling. This includes partitions, structural elements, cupboards, ducts, flights of stairs and voids above stairs. GIA should be measured and denoted in square metres (m<sup>2</sup>).
- The nationally described space standard sets a minimum ceiling height of 2.3 meters for at least 75% of the gross internal area of the dwelling. To address the unique heat island effect of London and the distinct density and flatted nature of most of its residential development, a minimum ceiling height of 2.5m for at least 75% of the gross internal area is strongly encouraged so that new housing is of adequate quality, especially in terms of light, ventilation and sense of space.

<sup>7</sup> new dwellings in this context includes new build, conversions and change of use

3.37 Other aspects of housing design are also important to improving the attractiveness of new homes as well as being central to the Mayor's wider objectives to improve the quality of Londoners' environment. To address these he has produced guidance on the implementation of Policy 3.5 for all housing tenures in his Housing SPG, drawing on his design guide for affordable housing<sup>8</sup>.

3.38 At the neighbourhood level this SPG addresses the relationship between strategic density Policy (3.4) and different local approaches to its implementation; the spaces between and around buildings; urban layout; enclosure; ensuring homes are laid out to form a coherent pattern of streets and blocks; public, communal and private open spaces; and the ways these relate to each other and neighbourhoods as a whole. It will respond to the needs of an ageing population by including the principles for inclusive design and those to develop and extend Lifetime Neighbourhoods set out in Policies 7.1 and 7.2.

3.39 For individual dwellings the SPG covers issues such as 'arrival' – including the importance of creating active frontages, accommodating footpaths and entrances and shared circulation spaces; size and layout including room space standards as well as the dwelling space standards set out in Table 3.3; the home as a 'place of retreat' (especially important in higher density development); meeting the challenges of a changing climate by ensuring homes are suitable for warmer summers and wetter winters, and mitigating the extent of future change; and ensuring easy adaptation to meet the changing and diverse needs of occupiers over their lifetimes. The importance of an effective design process to make sure

that the quality of schemes is not compromised as the development proceeds will also be highlighted. This guidance provides a strategic, functional basis for a new vernacular in London's domestic architecture which also places greater weight on complementing and enhancing local context and character.

---

<sup>8</sup> Mayor of London. London Housing Design Guide (LHDG) 2010

## HOUSING CHOICE POLICY

### POLICY 3.8 HOUSING CHOICE

#### Strategic

- A Londoners should have a genuine choice of homes that they can afford and which meet their requirements for different sizes and types of dwellings in the highest quality environments.

#### LDF preparation and planning decisions

- B To inform local application of Policy 3.3 on housing supply and taking account of housing requirements identified at regional, sub-regional and local levels, boroughs should work with the Mayor and local communities to identify the range of needs likely to arise within their areas and ensure that:
- a new developments offer a range of housing choices, in terms of the mix of housing sizes and types, taking account of the housing requirements of different groups and the changing roles of different sectors in meeting these
  - a1 the planning system provides positive and practical support to sustain the contribution of the Private Rented Sector (PRS) in addressing housing needs and increasing housing delivery.
  - b provision of affordable family housing is addressed as a strategic priority in LDF policies
  - c ninety percent of new housing<sup>9</sup> meets Building Regulation requirement M4 (2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'

<sup>9</sup> Unlike the other standards in this Plan, Part M of the Building Regulations generally does not apply to dwellings resulting from a conversion or a change of use. Additional guidance on the applicable requirements of the Building Regulations (amended 2015) can be found in: Approved Document M Access to and use of buildings Volume 1: Dwellings.

- d ten per cent of new housing<sup>10</sup> meets Building Regulation requirement M4 (3) 'wheelchair user dwellings', i.e. is designed to be wheelchair accessible, or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users
- e account is taken of the changing age structure of London's population and, in particular, the varied needs of older Londoners, including for supported and affordable provision
- f account is taken of the needs of particular communities with large families
- g other supported housing needs are identified authoritatively and co-ordinated action is taken to address them in LDF and other relevant plans and strategies
- h strategic and local requirements for student housing meeting a demonstrable need are addressed by working closely with stakeholders in higher and further education and without compromising capacity for conventional homes.
- i the accommodation requirements of gypsies and travellers (including travelling show people) are identified and addressed, with sites identified in line with national policy, in coordination with neighbouring boroughs and districts as appropriate.
- j appropriate provision is made for the accommodation of service families and custom build, having regard to local need.

- 3.48 Many already households in London require accessible or adapted housing in order to lead dignified and independent lives: 28,000 are attempting to move to somewhere more suitable to cope with a disability and more than 267,000 need a home adaption<sup>11</sup>. More Londoners are

<sup>10</sup> *ibid*

<sup>11</sup> GLA. Analysis of English Housing Survey 2008/09–2011/12



living longer and more older people are choosing to remain in their own homes rather than go into residential institutions. To address these and future needs, 90 per cent of London's new build housing<sup>12</sup> should be built to Building Regulation requirement 'M4 (2): Accessible and adaptable dwellings'<sup>13</sup> and the remaining 10 per cent of new build housing<sup>14</sup> should be built to Building Regulation requirement 'M4 (3): Wheelchair user dwellings'<sup>15</sup>. LDF policy departures from these requirements must be justified by authoritative evidence from local needs assessments.

- 3.48A As set out in Approved Document M of the Building Regulations - Volume 1: Dwellings, to comply with requirement M4 (2), step free access must be provided. Generally this will require a lift where a dwelling is accessed above or below the entrance storey. The application of requirement M4 (2) has particular implications for blocks of four storeys or less, where historically the London Plan has not required lifts. Boroughs should seek to ensure that dwellings accessed above or below the entrance storey in buildings of four storeys or less have step-free access. However, for these types of buildings this requirement may be subject to development-specific viability assessments and consideration should be given to the implication of ongoing maintenance costs on the affordability of service charges for residents. Where such

assessments demonstrate that the inclusion of a lift would make the scheme unviable or mean that service charges are not affordable for intended residents, the units above or below the ground floor that cannot provide step free access would only need to satisfy the requirements of M4(1) of the Building Regulations. All other standards should be applied as set out in this Plan. Further guidance is provided in the Draft Interim Housing SPG.

- 3.49 Boroughs should undertake assessments of the short and longer term supported housing needs of vulnerable and disadvantaged groups, taking account of the wide range of requirements which will arise as London's population ages, the importance of continuity of care, and access to family and friendship networks as well as statutory responsibilities for care.
- 3.49A The requirement for 'wheelchair user dwellings' applies to all tenures. However part M4 (3) of the Building Regulations regarding 'wheelchair user dwellings' distinguishes between 'wheelchair accessible' (a home readily useable by a wheelchair user at the point of completion) and 'wheelchair adaptable' (a home that can be easily adapted to meet the needs of a household including wheelchair users). The Planning Practice Guidance<sup>16</sup> states that Local Plan policies for wheelchair accessible homes should only be applied to those dwellings where the local authority is responsible for allocating or nominating a person to live in that dwelling. Boroughs should therefore specifically assess the level of need for wheelchair accessible dwellings and identify this in their LDF policies.

---

<sup>12</sup> Unlike the other standards in this Plan, Part M of the Building Regulations generally does not apply to dwellings resulting from a conversion or a change of use

<sup>13</sup> Requirement M4 (2) Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010. HM Government 2015.

<sup>14</sup> Unlike the other standards in this Plan, Part M of the Building Regulations generally does not apply to dwellings resulting from a conversion or a change of use

<sup>15</sup> Requirement M4 (3) of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010. HM Government 2015.

---

<sup>16</sup> The Planning Practice Guidance (Housing- Optional Technical Standards) Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 56-009-20150327 DCLG Revision date: 27 03 2015

- 3.50 The Mayor has identified the growing and changing requirements for housing older people in London as one of the most important emerging planning issues for London. It is anticipated that between 2011 and 2036 'over 65s' could increase by 64% and 'over 90s' could grow in number by 89,000.
- 3.50A Most older Londoners are likely to prefer to remain in their own homes, and some will require support to enable them to do so. It is important that new development expands this choice for existing and future generations of older Londoners. Policy 3.5 on housing quality and its associated housing standards<sup>17</sup> will play a key role in extending choice by ensuring 90 percent of new dwellings are 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' and ensuring that 10% are wheelchair user dwellings<sup>18</sup>. More generally, London's changing urban environment must respond positively to the needs of an ageing population, including through the principles for inclusive design and those to develop and extend Lifetime Neighbourhoods set out in Policies 7.1 and 7.2.

---

<sup>17</sup> Mayor of London. Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance. GLA, 2012

<sup>18</sup> Requirement M4 (3) of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010. HM Government 2015

## SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION POLICY

- 5.27 In support of the London Housing Strategy the Mayor has produced a *Housing Design Guide*<sup>19</sup> (see Chapter 3), which provides further guidance on the standards outlined in the Mayor's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance.

---

<sup>19</sup> Mayor of London. London Housing Design Guide. (LHDG). LDA, 2010.

# WATER USE AND SUPPLIES POLICY

## POLICY 5.15 WATER USE AND SUPPLIES

### Strategic

- A The Mayor will work in partnership with appropriate agencies within London and adjoining regional and local planning authorities to protect and conserve water supplies and resources in order to secure London's needs in a sustainable manner by:
- a minimising use of mains water
  - b reaching cost-effective minimum leakage levels
  - c in conjunction with demand side measures, promoting the provision of additional sustainable water resources in a timely and efficient manner, reducing the water supply deficit and achieving security of supply in London
  - d minimising the amount of energy consumed in water supply
  - e promoting the use of rainwater harvesting and using dual potable and grey water recycling systems, where they are energy and cost-effective
  - f maintaining and upgrading water supply infrastructure
  - g ensuring the water supplied will not give rise to likely significant adverse effects to the environment particularly designated sites of European importance for nature conservation.

### Planning decisions

- B Development should minimise the use of mains water by:
- a incorporating water saving measures and equipment
  - b designing residential development so that mains water consumption would meet a target of 105 litres or less per head per day<sup>20</sup>

- C New development for sustainable water supply infrastructure, which has been selected within water companies' Water Resource Management Plans, will be supported

- 5.60 Water supplies are essential to any sustainable city and to the health and welfare of its people. London's consumption of water already outstrips available supplies in dry years and ensuing a sustainable and secure water supply has to be an urgent priority. Some steps have already been taken. Investment in recent years to reduce leakage from Victorian mains supply pipes has had an effect (although Thames Water still has a significantly higher leakage rate than the rest of the country). An additional source of supply, the desalination plant at Beckton, has been operational since 2010. These two measures have eased the pressure on water resources in London.
- 5.61 But the fundamental problem remains. To remain sustainable, London needs to reduce the level of water consumption per person. Currently the average Londoner consumes 164 litres/day (l/d)<sup>21</sup>, around 20 l/d above the national average. Projections for population growth in London and in the wider south-east will mean that over the period of this Plan, new strategic water resources will be required. The need for this is exacerbated by the climate change predictions of more sporadic and intense rainfall and a higher likelihood of droughts as well as the need to protect the water environment implementing the Thames River Basin Management Plan requirements. Thames Water, which provides over three-quarters of Londoners with water, projects a

<sup>20</sup> Excluding an allowance of 5 litres or less per head per day for external water consumption.

<sup>21</sup> Environment Agency. State of the Environment Report, February 2013

significant (around 6 % by 2020) capacity deficit. To ensure London's future water security, the prudent use of water will be essential: all new development will need to be water efficient. Residential development should be designed so that mains water consumption would meet a target of 105 litres or less per head per day, excluding an allowance of 5 litres or less per head per day for external water use. This reflects the 'optional requirement' set out in Part G of the Building Regulations<sup>22</sup>. As all water companies that serve London are located in areas classified as seriously water stressed<sup>23</sup>, the 'optional requirement' should be applied across London. A fittings-based approach should be used to determine the water consumption of a development<sup>24</sup>. This approach is transparent and compatible with developers' procurement and the emerging Water Label, which Government and the water companies serving London are supporting.

boundaries to identify and address potential capacity shortfalls of the wider network serving their area. Further detail relating to London's water and wastewater infrastructure is contained in the Mayor's Water Strategy.

- 5.61A Existing homes and workplaces will have to become more water efficient, particularly through metering and water efficiency retrofits. Retrofitting water efficiency measures in existing buildings provides scope for considerable water savings (see Policy 5.4). A rolling programme for the replacement of London's water mains will reduce wastage and London's water companies will have to invest in sustainable sources of water. Cooperation will be needed across

---

<sup>22</sup> Requirement G2 of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010. HM Government 2015.

<sup>23</sup> Serious water stress is defined as where current or future household demand for water is – or is likely to be – a high proportion of the effective rainfall to meet that demand. – Environment Agency, Water stressed areas – final classification, July 2013.

<sup>24</sup> Table 2.2 of Part G of the Building Regulations provides maximum consumption values for water fittings. If these consumption values are exceeded and where waste disposal units, water softeners or water re-use are specified in the application, the Water Efficiency Calculator must be completed.

# LIFETIME NEIGHBOURHOODS POLICY

- 7.5 Against the background of a rising number of both younger and older Londoners over the Plan period, increasing the opportunities everyone has to access and participate in their communities will help all Londoners to enjoy and feel secure in their neighbourhoods.<sup>25</sup> Ensuring that families with small children, older people and disabled people can easily move around, enables everyone to participate in, and contribute to, the life of the community. Lifetime neighbourhoods,<sup>26</sup> where access to public transport, basic amenities, local shops, cultural facilities, places to meet and relax, and green and open spaces are within easy reach of homes, and where facilities such as public toilets and seating are consciously planned into proposals at the outset, help to build cohesive, successful and sustainable communities, and achieve social sustainability<sup>27</sup>.

---

<sup>25</sup> Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE), *Inclusion by Design Equality, Diversity and the Built Environment*, November 2008

<sup>26</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), *Lifetime Homes Lifetime Neighbourhoods: A National Strategy for Housing in an Ageing Society*, February 2008

<sup>27</sup> DCLG NPPF 2012, para 7 op cit.

## GLOSSARY DEFINITIONS

*The draft Housing Standards Minor Alterations to London Plan ANNEX SIX GLOSSARY comprise:*

- a new 'Allowable Solutions' entry
- deletion of the 'Lifetime homes' and 'Wheelchair accessible housing' entries
- new 'Wheelchair accessible' and 'Wheelchair adaptable' entries

### **Allowable Solutions**

Allowable Solutions are part of the Government's strategy for the delivery of zero carbon homes from 2016. Through the mechanism of Allowable Solutions, carbon

emissions which cannot be cost-effectively reduced on-site can, once a minimum on-site carbon performance standard has been reached, be tackled through off-site measures.

### **Wheelchair accessible**

This refers to homes built to Building Regulation Requirement M4 (3) (2) (b): Wheelchair user dwellings, where the dwelling is constructed to meet the needs of occupants who use wheelchairs.

### **Wheelchair adaptable**

This refers to homes built to Building Regulation Requirement M4 (3) (2) (a): Wheelchair user dwellings, where the dwelling is constructed to allow simple adaptation to the dwelling to meet the needs of occupants who use wheelchairs.

This page is intentionally left blank



# **PARKING STANDARDS**

## **MINOR ALTERATIONS TO THE LONDON PLAN THE SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR LONDON CONSOLIDATED WITH ALTERATIONS SINCE 2011**

### **INTEND TO PUBLISH**

[showing alterations and suggested/further suggested changes]

**DECEMBER 2015**

**MAYOR OF LONDON**

# COPYRIGHT

## Greater London Authority

Published by  
Greater London Authority  
City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
More London  
London SE1 2AA  
[www.london.gov.uk](http://www.london.gov.uk)  
enquiries 020 7983 4100  
minicom 020 7983 4458

Copies of this report are available from  
[www.london.gov.uk](http://www.london.gov.uk)

# PARKING STANDARDS

## MINOR ALTERATIONS TO THE LONDON PLAN THE SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR LONDON CONSOLIDATED WITH ALTERATIONS SINCE 2011

### INTEND TO PUBLISH

This version shows the original consultation draft Minor Alterations published in May 2015 together with the August 2015 suggested changes, the October 2015 further suggested change and the EiP Inspector's recommendation December 2015.

The sources of the alterations are as follows:

- **MINOR ALTERATIONS TO THE LONDON PLAN CONSULTATION DRAFT 11 May 2015**  
<http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/MALP%20PARKING%20STANDARDS%20-%20CONSULTATION%20DRAFT%20May%202015web.pdf>  
new or altered text is shown in **red bold**  
deleted text is shown in ~~red strikethrough~~
- **SUGGESTED CHANGES 21 August 2015**  
<http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/MALP%20PARKING%20STANDARDS%20-%20CONSULTATION%20DRAFT%20May%202015web.pdf>  
new or altered text is shown in **green bold**  
deleted text is shown in ~~green strikethrough~~
- **FURTHER SUGGESTED CHANGE 28 October 2015**  
[http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/MASC07\\_MALP\\_Parking\\_standards\\_%20further\\_suggested\\_change\\_PFS1.pdf](http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/MASC07_MALP_Parking_standards_%20further_suggested_change_PFS1.pdf)  
new or altered text is shown in **blue bold**  
changes listed by the MALP EiP Inspector in his recommendations are shown in **blue with yellow highlight**

DECEMBER 2015

## PARKING POLICY

### POLICY 6.13 PARKING

#### Strategic

- A The Mayor wishes to see an appropriate balance being struck between promoting new development and preventing excessive car parking provision that can undermine cycling, walking and public transport use.
- B The Mayor supports Park and Ride schemes in outer London where it can be demonstrated they will lead to overall reductions in congestion, journey times and vehicle kilometres.

#### Planning decisions

- C The maximum standards set out in Table 6.2 in the Parking Addendum to this chapter should be the basis for considering planning applications (also see Policy 2.8), **informed by policy and guidance below on their application for housing in parts of Outer London with low public transport accessibility (generally PTALs 0-1)**.
- D In addition, developments **in all parts of London** must:
  - a ensure that 1 in 5 spaces (both active and passive) provide an electrical charging point to encourage the uptake of electric vehicles
  - b provide parking for disabled people in line with Table 6.2
  - c meet the minimum cycle parking standards set out in Table 6.3
  - d provide for the needs of businesses for delivery and servicing.

#### LDF preparation

- E
  - a the maximum standards set out in Table 6.2 in the Parking Addendum

should be used to set standards in DPDs

- b in locations with high public transport accessibility, car-free developments should be promoted (while still providing for disabled people)
- c in town centres where there are identified issues of vitality and viability, the need to regenerate such centres may require a more flexible approach to the provision of public car parking to serve the town centre as a whole
- d outer London boroughs wishing to promote a more generous standard for office developments would need to take into account in a DPD
  - a regeneration need
  - no significant adverse impact on congestion or air quality
  - a lack (now and in future) of public transport
  - a lack of existing on or off street parking
  - a commitment to provide space for electric and car club vehicles, bicycles and parking for disabled people above the minimum thresholds
  - a requirement, via Travel Plans, to reduce provision over time.
- e **outer London boroughs should promote demonstrate that they have actively considered more generous standards for housing development in areas with low public transport accessibility (generally PTALs 0 -1) and take into account current and projected pressures for on-street parking and their bearing on all road users, as well as the criteria set out in NPPF (Para 39).**

6.42 Parking policy, whether in terms of levels

of provision or regulation of on- or off-street parking, can have significant effects in influencing transport choices and addressing congestion. It can also affect patterns of development and play an important part in the economic success and liveability of places, particularly town centres (see Policy 2.8 for further detail on the outer London economy). The Mayor considers it is right to set car parking standards in the Plan given his direct operational responsibility for elements of London's road network, and the strategic planning importance of ensuring London's scarce resources of space are used efficiently. Boroughs wishing to develop their own standards should take the standards in this Plan as their policy context. But he also recognises that London is a diverse city that requires a flexible approach to identifying appropriate levels of car parking provision across boundaries. This means ensuring a level of accessibility by private car consistent with the overall balance of the transport system at the local level; for further advice refer to the Housing SPG. In line with the Duty to Cooperate boroughs adjoining other regions must also liaise with the relevant authorities to ensure a consistent approach to the level of parking provision. Transport assessments and travel plans for major developments should give details of proposed measures to improve non-car based access, reduce parking and mitigate adverse transport impacts. They will be a key factor in helping boroughs assess development proposals and resultant levels of car parking.

**6.42i In developing their residential parking standards in the context of London Plan policy, outer London boroughs should take account of residents' dependency on the car in areas with low public transport accessibility (generally PTALs 0-1).**

**Where appropriate in these locations Boroughs should consider revised standards (which could include minima) and permitting higher levels of provision there than is indicated in Table 6.2, particularly to avoid generating unacceptable pressure for on-street parking. This may be especially important in 'suburban' areas and for areas with family housing.**

**6.42j In outer London a more flexible approach for applications may also be acceptable in some limited parts of areas within PTAL 2, in locations where the orientation or levels of public transport mean that a development is particularly dependent on car travel. In doing so, authorities should take account of the criteria set out in paragraph 39 of the NPPF. Further advice is provided in the draft Housing SPG and forthcoming TfL guidance on parking design.**

**6.42k In deciding whether or not more generous standards are to be applied, account should be taken of the extent to which public transport might be provided in the future. Consideration should also be given to the implications for air quality and the impact of on-street parking measures such as CPZs which may also help reduce the potential for overspill parking and congestion, and improve safety and amenity.**

6.43 Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTALs) are used by TfL to produce a consistent London wide public transport access mapping facility to help boroughs with locational planning and assessment of appropriate parking provision by measuring broad public transport accessibility levels. There is evidence that car use reduces as access to public

transport (as measured by PTALs) increases. Given the need to avoid over-provision, car parking should reduce as public transport accessibility increases. TfL may refine how PTALs operate but would consult on any proposed changes to the methodology. At a neighbourhood level TfL would also recommend making use of the ATOS (access to opportunities and services) tool in order to better understand what services are accessible in a local catchment area, by both walking and cycling.

6.44 This policy recognises that developments should always include parking provision for disabled people. Despite improvements to public transport, some disabled people require the use of private cars. Suitably designed and located designated car parking and drop-off points are therefore required. Boroughs should take into account local issues and estimates of local demand in setting appropriate standards and should develop monitoring and enforcement strategies to prevent misuse of spaces. Applicants for planning permission should use their transport assessments and access statements to demonstrate how the needs of disabled people have been addressed<sup>1</sup>.

6.45 The Outer London Commission<sup>2</sup> has found that developers view the lack of on-site car parking for offices in outer London, when compared to the more generous standards outside of London, as a disincentive to develop offices in London. The Mayor supports further office development in outer London, but would not want to see unacceptable levels of congestion and pollution – which could also be a disincentive to investment there.

Policy 6.13 enables flexibility in setting office parking standards; if outer London boroughs wish to adopt a more generous standard this should be done via a DPD to allow TfL and the GLA to assess the impact of such a change on the wider transport network (see Policy 6.3) and on air quality. Likewise, the policy takes a similar approach to outer London town centres, providing local authorities with the opportunity to implement a more flexible approach to town centre parking where there is a demonstrable need. Guidance on implementing parking policy for offices and town centres is set out in the Town Centres SPG, including the importance of improving the quality of provision. This also addresses the need for sensitively designed town centre parking management strategies which contribute to the Mayor's broader objectives for town centres and outer London. The Mayor continues to encourage a restraint based approach to parking across all land uses in Inner London and other locations which benefit from good access to public transport.

6.46 The Mayor, through TfL, and working with the London boroughs, car club operators, and other stakeholders, will support expansion of car clubs and encourage their use of ultra low carbon vehicles. More than 2,200 car club vehicles are used by 120,000 people in London, with vehicles including plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles. Each car club vehicle typically results in eight privately owned vehicles being sold, and members reducing their annual car mileage by more than 25 per cent.

6.47 Park and Ride schemes can help boost the attractiveness of outer London centres and as such are supported. They must be carefully sited to ensure they lead to overall reductions in congestion and do not worsen air quality. Further advice on Park and Ride is set out in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Mayor of London. *Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment Supplementary Planning Guidance*. GLA, April 2004.

<sup>2</sup> Outer London Commission.  
<http://www.london.gov.uk/olc>

Land for Transport SPG.

the calculation of total parking supply.

- 6.48 Operational parking for maintenance, servicing and deliveries is required to enable a development to function. Some operational parking is likely to be required on site and should be included in

# RESIDENTIAL CAR PARKING STANDARDS

**Table 6.2 Car parking standards**

<i>Parking for residential development</i>						
	<b>PTAL 0 to 1</b>		<b>PTAL 2 to 4</b>		<b>PTAL 5 to 6</b>	
<b>Suburban</b>	<b>150–200 hr/ha</b>	<b>Parking provision</b>	<b>150–250 hr/ha</b>	<b>Parking provision</b>	<b>200–350 hr/ha</b>	<b>Parking provision</b>
3.8–4.6 hr/unit	35–55 u/ha	Up to 2 spaces per unit	35–65 u/ha	Up to 1.5 spaces per unit	45–90 u/ha	Up to one space per unit
3.1–3.7 hr/unit	40–65 u/ha		40–80 u/ha		55–115 u/ha	
2.7–3.0 hr/unit	50–75 u/ha		50–95 u/ha		70–130 u/ha	
<b>Urban</b>	<b>150–250 hr/ha</b>		<b>200–450 hr/ha</b>		<b>200–700 hr/ha</b>	
3.8–4.6 hr/unit	35–65 u/ha	Up to 1.5 spaces per unit	45–120 u/ha	Up to 1.5 spaces per unit	45–185 u/ha	Up to one space per unit
3.1–3.7 hr/unit	40–80 u/ha		55–145 u/ha		55–225 u/ha	
2.7–3.0 hr/unit	50–95 u/ha		70–170 u/ha		70–260 u/ha	
<b>Central</b>	<b>150–300 hr/ha</b>		<b>300–650 hr/ha</b>		<b>650–1100 hr/ha</b>	
3.8–4.6 hr/unit	35–80 u/ha	Up to 1.5 spaces per unit	65–170 u/ha	Up to one space per unit	140–290 u/ha	Up to one space per unit
3.1–3.7 hr/unit	40–100 u/ha		80–210 u/ha		175–355 u/ha	
2.7–3.0 hr/unit	50–110 u/hr		100–240 u/ha		215–405 u/ha	

  

<b>Maximum residential parking standards</b>			
<b>number of beds</b>	<b>4 or more</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1–2</b>
parking spaces	up to 2 per unit	up to 1.5 per unit	less than 1 per unit

Notes:

All developments in areas of good public transport accessibility (**in all parts of London**) should aim for significantly less than 1 space per unit

Adequate parking spaces for disabled people must be provided preferably on-site<sup>3</sup>

20 per cent of all spaces must be for electric vehicles with an additional 20 per cent passive provision for electric vehicles in the future.

**In outer London areas with low PTAL (generally PTALs 0-1), boroughs should consider higher levels of provision, especially to address ‘overspill’ parking pressures.**

<sup>3</sup> Mayor of London. Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance. GLA, 2012. Mayor of London. Accessible London. Supplementary Planning Guidance. GLA, 2014.



## GLOSSARY DEFINITIONS

*The draft Parking Standards Minor Alterations to London Plan ANNEX SIX GLOSSARY comprise:*

- *amendment to the 'PTAL' entry*
- *nb: unaltered text is included for context*

### **Public transport accessibility levels (PTALS)**

are **a detailed and accurate** ~~detailed and accurate~~ measure of the accessibility of an **area point** to the public transport network, taking into account walk access time and service availability. PTALs reflect:

- walking time from **the area** ~~the point~~ of interest to the public transport access points;
- the reliability of the service modes available;
- the number of services available within the catchment; and
- the level of service at the public transport access points - i.e. average waiting time.

PTALs do not consider:

- the speed or utility of accessible services;
- crowding, including the ability to board services; or,
- ease of interchange.

This page is intentionally left blank

# **PARKING STANDARDS**

**MINOR ALTERATIONS TO THE LONDON PLAN**  
**THE SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR LONDON**  
**CONSOLIDATED WITH ALTERATIONS SINCE 2011**

**INTEND TO PUBLISH**

[clean version]

**DECEMBER 2015**

**MAYOR OF LONDON**

# **COPYRIGHT**

## **Greater London Authority**

Published by  
Greater London Authority  
City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
More London  
London SE1 2AA  
[www.london.gov.uk](http://www.london.gov.uk)  
enquiries 020 7983 4100  
minicom 020 7983 4458

Copies of this report are available from  
[www.london.gov.uk](http://www.london.gov.uk)

# PARKING STANDARDS

## MINOR ALTERATIONS TO THE LONDON PLAN THE SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR LONDON CONSOLIDATED WITH ALTERATIONS SINCE 2011

### DUMMY INTEND TO PUBLISH

This 'clean' version of the draft Minor Alterations published in May 2015 incorporates the August 2015 suggested changes, the October 2015 further suggested change and the EiP Inspector's recommendation December 2015 – and shows all alterations and changes 'worked through'.

DECEMBER 2015

## PARKING POLICY

### POLICY 6.13 PARKING

#### Strategic

A The Mayor wishes to see an appropriate balance being struck between promoting new development and preventing excessive car parking provision that can undermine cycling, walking and public transport use.

B The Mayor supports Park and Ride schemes in outer London where it can be demonstrated they will lead to overall reductions in congestion, journey times and vehicle kilometres.

#### Planning decisions

C The maximum standards set out in Table 6.2 in the Parking Addendum to this chapter should be the basis for considering planning applications (also see Policy 2.8), informed by policy and guidance below on their application for housing in parts of Outer London with low public transport accessibility (generally PTALs 0-1).

D In addition, developments in all parts of London must:

- a ensure that 1 in 5 spaces (both active and passive) provide an electrical charging point to encourage the uptake of electric vehicles
- b provide parking for disabled people in line with Table 6.2
- c meet the minimum cycle parking standards set out in Table 6.3
- d provide for the needs of businesses for delivery and servicing.

#### LDF preparation

E a the maximum standards set out in Table 6.2 in the Parking Addendum should be used to set standards in DPDs

- b in locations with high public transport accessibility, car-free developments should be promoted (while still providing for disabled people)
- c in town centres where there are identified issues of vitality and viability, the need to regenerate such centres may require a more flexible approach to the provision of public car parking to serve the town centre as a whole
- d outer London boroughs wishing to promote a more generous standard for office developments would need to take into account in a DPD
  - a regeneration need
  - no significant adverse impact on congestion or air quality
  - a lack (now and in future) of public transport
  - a lack of existing on or off street parking
  - a commitment to provide space for electric and car club vehicles, bicycles and parking for disabled people above the minimum thresholds
  - a requirement, via Travel Plans, to reduce provision over time.
- e outer London boroughs should demonstrate that they have actively considered more generous standards for housing development in areas with low public transport accessibility (generally PTALs 0 -1) and take into account current and projected pressures for on-street parking and their bearing on all road users, as well as the criteria set out in NPPF (Para 39).

6.42 Parking policy, whether in terms of levels of provision or regulation of on- or off-street parking, can have significant effects in influencing transport choices and addressing congestion. It can also affect patterns of development and play

an important part in the economic success and liveability of places, particularly town centres (see Policy 2.8 for further detail on the outer London economy). The Mayor considers it is right to set car parking standards in the Plan given his direct operational responsibility for elements of London's road network, and the strategic planning importance of ensuring London's scarce resources of space are used efficiently. Boroughs wishing to develop their own standards should take the standards in this Plan as their policy context. But he also recognises that London is a diverse city that requires a flexible approach to identifying appropriate levels of car parking provision across boundaries. This means ensuring a level of accessibility by private car consistent with the overall balance of the transport system at the local level; for further advice refer to the Housing SPG. In line with the Duty to Cooperate boroughs adjoining other regions must also liaise with the relevant authorities to ensure a consistent approach to the level of parking provision. Transport assessments and travel plans for major developments should give details of proposed measures to improve non-car based access, reduce parking and mitigate adverse transport impacts. They will be a key factor in helping boroughs assess development proposals and resultant levels of car parking.

- 6.42i In developing their residential parking standards in the context of London Plan policy, outer London boroughs should take account of residents' dependency on the car in areas with low public transport accessibility (generally PTALs 0-1). Where appropriate in these locations Boroughs should consider revised standards (which could include minima) and permitting higher levels of provision there than is indicated in Table 6.2, particularly to avoid generating unacceptable pressure

for on-street parking. This may be especially important in 'suburban' areas and for areas with family housing.

- 6.42j In outer London a more flexible approach for applications may also be acceptable in some limited parts of areas within PTAL 2, in locations where the orientation or levels of public transport mean that a development is particularly dependent on car travel. In doing so, authorities should take account of the criteria set out in paragraph 39 of the NPPF. Further advice is provided in the draft Housing SPG and forthcoming TfL guidance on parking design.
- 6.42k In deciding whether or not more generous standards are to be applied, account should be taken of the extent to which public transport might be provided in the future. Consideration should also be given to the implications for air quality and the impact of on-street parking measures such as CPZs which may also help reduce the potential for overspill parking and congestion, and improve safety and amenity.
- 6.43 Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTALs) are used by TfL to produce a consistent London wide public transport access mapping facility to help boroughs with locational planning and assessment of appropriate parking provision by measuring broad public transport accessibility levels. There is evidence that car use reduces as access to public transport (as measured by PTALs) increases. Given the need to avoid over-provision, car parking should reduce as public transport accessibility increases. TfL may refine how PTALs operate but would consult on any proposed changes to the methodology. At a neighbourhood level TfL would also recommend making use of the ATOS (access to opportunities and services) tool in order to better understand what services are accessible in

a local catchment area, by both walking and cycling.

6.44 This policy recognises that developments should always include parking provision for disabled people. Despite improvements to public transport, some disabled people require the use of private cars. Suitably designed and located designated car parking and drop-off points are therefore required. Boroughs should take into account local issues and estimates of local demand in setting appropriate standards and should develop monitoring and enforcement strategies to prevent misuse of spaces. Applicants for planning permission should use their transport assessments and access statements to demonstrate how the needs of disabled people have been addressed<sup>1</sup>.

6.45 The Outer London Commission<sup>2</sup> has found that developers view the lack of on-site car parking for offices in outer London, when compared to the more generous standards outside of London, as a disincentive to develop offices in London. The Mayor supports further office development in outer London, but would not want to see unacceptable levels of congestion and pollution – which could also be a disincentive to investment there. Policy 6.13 enables flexibility in setting office parking standards; if outer London boroughs wish to adopt a more generous standard this should be done via a DPD to allow TfL and the GLA to assess the impact of such a change on the wider transport network (see Policy 6.3) and on air quality. Likewise, the policy takes a similar approach to outer London town centres, providing local authorities with the opportunity to implement a more

flexible approach to town centre parking where there is a demonstrable need. Guidance on implementing parking policy for offices and town centres is set out in the Town Centres SPG, including the importance of improving the quality of provision. This also addresses the need for sensitively designed town centre parking management strategies which contribute to the Mayor's broader objectives for town centres and outer London. The Mayor continues to encourage a restraint based approach to parking across all land uses in Inner London and other locations which benefit from good access to public transport.

6.46 The Mayor, through TfL, and working with the London boroughs, car club operators, and other stakeholders, will support expansion of car clubs and encourage their use of ultra low carbon vehicles. More than 2,200 car club vehicles are used by 120,000 people in London, with vehicles including plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles. Each car club vehicle typically results in eight privately owned vehicles being sold, and members reducing their annual car mileage by more than 25 per cent.

6.47 Park and Ride schemes can help boost the attractiveness of outer London centres and as such are supported. They must be carefully sited to ensure they lead to overall reductions in congestion and do not worsen air quality. Further advice on Park and Ride is set out in the Land for Transport SPG.

6.48 Operational parking for maintenance, servicing and deliveries is required to enable a development to function. Some operational parking is likely to be required on site and should be included in the calculation of total parking supply.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mayor of London. *Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment Supplementary Planning Guidance*. GLA, April 2004.

<sup>2</sup> Outer London Commission.  
<http://www.london.gov.uk/olc>



# RESIDENTIAL CAR PARKING STANDARDS

**Table 6.2 Car parking standards**

<i>Parking for residential development</i>						
	<b>PTAL 0 to 1</b>		<b>PTAL 2 to 4</b>		<b>PTAL 5 to 6</b>	
<b>Suburban</b>	<b>150–200 hr/ha</b>	<b>Parking provision</b>	<b>150–250 hr/ha</b>	<b>Parking provision</b>	<b>200–350 hr/ha</b>	<b>Parking provision</b>
3.8–4.6 hr/unit	35–55 u/ha	Up to 2 spaces per unit	35–65 u/ha	Up to 1.5 spaces per unit	45–90 u/ha	Up to one space per unit
3.1–3.7 hr/unit	40–65 u/ha		40–80 u/ha		55–115 u/ha	
2.7–3.0 hr/unit	50–75 u/ha		50–95 u/ha		70–130 u/ha	
<b>Urban</b>	<b>150–250 hr/ha</b>		<b>200–450 hr/ha</b>		<b>200–700 hr/ha</b>	
3.8–4.6 hr/unit	35–65 u/ha	Up to 1.5 spaces per unit	45–120 u/ha	Up to 1.5 spaces per unit	45–185 u/ha	Up to one space per unit
3.1–3.7 hr/unit	40–80 u/ha		55–145 u/ha		55–225 u/ha	
2.7–3.0 hr/unit	50–95 u/ha		70–170 u/ha		70–260 u/ha	
<b>Central</b>	<b>150–300 hr/ha</b>		<b>300–650 hr/ha</b>		<b>650–1100 hr/ha</b>	
3.8–4.6 hr/unit	35–80 u/ha	Up to 1.5 spaces per unit	65–170 u/ha	Up to one space per unit	140–290 u/ha	Up to one space per unit
3.1–3.7 hr/unit	40–100 u/ha		80–210 u/ha		175–355 u/ha	
2.7–3.0 hr/unit	50–110 u/hr		100–240 u/ha		215–405 u/ha	

<b>Maximum residential parking standards</b>			
<b>number of beds</b>	<b>4 or more</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1–2</b>
parking spaces	up to 2 per unit	up to 1.5 per unit	less than 1 per unit

Notes:

All developments in areas of good public transport accessibility (in all parts of London) should aim for significantly less than 1 space per unit

Adequate parking spaces for disabled people must be provided preferably on-site<sup>3</sup>

20 per cent of all spaces must be for electric vehicles with an additional 20 per cent passive provision for electric vehicles in the future.

In outer London areas with low PTAL (generally PTALs 0–1), boroughs should consider higher levels of provision, especially to address ‘overspill’ parking pressures.

<sup>3</sup> Mayor of London. Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance. GLA, 2012. Mayor of London. Accessible London. Supplementary Planning Guidance. GLA, 2014.

## GLOSSARY DEFINITIONS

*The draft Parking Standards Minor Alterations to London Plan ANNEX SIX GLOSSARY comprise:*

- *amendment to the 'PTAL' entry*
- *nb: unaltered text is included for context*

### **Public transport accessibility levels (PTALS)**

are a detailed and accurate measure of the accessibility of an area to the public transport network, taking into account walk access time and service availability. PTALs reflect:

- walking time from the area of interest to the public transport access points;
- the reliability of the service modes available;
- the number of services available within the catchment; and
- the level of service at the public transport access points - i.e. average waiting time.

PTALs do not consider:

- the speed or utility of accessible services;
- crowding, including the ability to board services; or,
- ease of interchange.