

Report to the Assembly on the Mayor's Final Draft Consolidated Budget for 2013 – 2014

Report to: London Assembly

Date: 25 February 2013

Report of: Conservative Group

Proposed by: Gareth Bacon

Seconded by: Andrew Boff

PART A: INTRODUCTION & COMMENTARY¹

Boris Johnson's re-election shows again that the electorate have put their faith in a Mayor who knows how to steer London through tough times. Londoners chose a Mayor committed to reducing the burden on the taxpayer and creating a more efficient GLA Group, focussed on the vast investment required to keep London moving and remain globally competitive. This Budget is testament to that vision.

The Mayor was elected on a manifesto commitment to reduce the precept by 10% over four years and GLA Conservatives welcome the 1.2% reduction in the precept for this year. This represents a 20% real terms cut since the Mayor was first elected in 2008. Not only was the Mayor able to continue to deliver for Londoners whilst keeping the precept frozen, but last year and now this year, he will continue to deliver for London whilst cutting the precept.

This Budget sees some difficult decisions being made, especially on the police and fire budgets. The tough but necessary steps being taken at a national level to repair our damaged economy have fed through to the GLA Group, where we must operate with fewer resources than we have previously been used to. Under the last government public spending grew faster than our ability to pay for it. The deficit meant huge amounts of money were borrowed. The Government is now committed to cutting the deficit and bringing public spending under control. Clearly that means difficult and unpopular decisions.

The Mayor's first priority remains to keep Londoners safe and GLA Conservatives are confident that the police and the fire service can continue to do this under the proposed reforms to their operations and estates.

¹ This report is made up of two Parts, A and B. The text in Part A does not form part of the formal budget amendments, which are set out in Part B.

Whilst we fully support this Budget and the proposed precept cut, there are areas where we feel that more progress can be made. Our amendment takes account of this.

In our Draft Consolidated Budget amendment, we proposed reinstating the £300,000 savings target from the Assembly's budget – mooted in the Mayor's consultation budget but since removed – and using this money to make a real difference to some of the most disadvantaged Londoners through a City Hall programme to help homeless veterans. Since raising this important topic with the Mayor, action is to be taken within City Hall to investigate the scale of this problem, as we proposed. As a result, we have removed this section of our amendment, although we still believe greater efficiencies can be found within the Assembly.

Our amendment therefore focuses solely on making better use of taxpayers' money at TfL. Staff nominee travel cards for TfL employees represent a cost of at least £35.8 million. We do not believe that in the current economic climate TfL should be using taxpayers' money to fund the travel for people who do not even work at TfL and we are therefore proposing the removal of this over generous perk. We consider it reasonable to budget for only half the value of the nominee passes as not all the current pass holders will pay for travel instead of receiving it for free, and this will represent an increased income from fares of £17.8 million. This money should be used to fund a greater reduction in council tax than that proposed by the Mayor. By reducing the MPS's contribution to the TfL's Safer Transport Command TfL can use the additional fares income to cover this cost, with the saving from the MPS being passed on to a reduction of £17.8 million from MOPAC's council tax requirement.

Our amendment reduces the Band D precept amount by 3.5%, to £296.07. This is the first time since 2006 that the precept has come below £300, making good progress towards the Mayor's 10% reduction over this term.

Core GLA – Mayor

	Mayor's Draft	Conservative Proposal
Changes in the Mayor's council tax requirement	£m	£m
2012-13 council tax requirement	120.5	120.5
Changes due to:		
Inflation	0.0	0.0
Savings	-2.4	-2.4
Efficiencies	-4.7	-4.7
New initiatives and service improvements	0.7	0.7
Change in use of reserves	-19.6	-19.6
Change in government grants	2.3	2.3
Other changes	-1.8	-1.8
2013-14 council tax requirement	95.0	95.0

Boris Johnson's first term involved huge investment in London's infrastructure, made possible by the pursuit of efficiency across the GLA Group and ambitious savings programmes. The Government clearly trusts this administration's efficient running of the GLA Group, with further devolution having recently created further responsibilities. A major area in which greater power has been devolved to London is housing, with the GLA inheriting housing assets and existing programmes from the HCA. As a result, this administration is now taking the necessary steps to combat London's housing crisis. Alan Benson, GLA Head of Housing, recently confirmed that the rate of affordable housing completions in London is higher than at any point since the early 1990s.²

The GLA is investing £16.8 million over the next two years with the aim of ending rough sleeping in London. However, as indicated above, one area that we feel has not received enough attention is with homeless veterans. Despite differences of opinion on the scale of the problem of homeless veterans on our streets, that fact that there are *any* war veterans sleeping rough in London is an injustice. Furthermore, both the Mayor of London and the Assembly are signatories of the Armed Forces Community Covenant. The purpose of this covenant is to "encourage support for the Armed Forces Community working and residing in London". For the Assembly, "the Community Covenant presents an opportunity to bring their knowledge, experience and expertise to bear on the provision of help and advice to members of the Armed Forces Community." Helping prevent homelessness amongst veterans is therefore important in honouring the Covenant.

Our Draft Consolidated Budget amendment proposed using an additional £300,000 saving from the Assembly to fund work within the Housing Directorate to help prevent homelessness among veterans in London. We proposed adding this money to the range of GLA homelessness projects, but ring-fencing it to deal specifically with the problem of homeless veterans. Following this proposal, work is underway within the GLA, with funding allocated, to investigate the problem. Therefore we are no longer proposing any amendment to the Mayor's section of the Budget.

² London Assembly Housing and Regeneration Committee, 23rd Jan 2013.

Core GLA – Assembly

	Mayor's Draft	Conservative Proposal
Changes in the Assembly's council tax requirement	2013-14 £m	£m
2012-13 council tax requirement	2.6	2.6
Changes due to:		
Inflation	0.0	0.0
Savings	0.0	0.0
Efficiencies	-0.3	-0.3
Changes in government grants	0.3	0.3
2013-14 council tax requirement	2.6	2.6

Our amendment now proposes no change to the Assembly's budget.

Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime

	Mayor's Draft	Conservative Proposal
Changes in the MOPAC's council tax requirement	2013-14 £m	£m
2012-13 council tax requirement	695.0	695.0
Changes due to:		
Inflation	14.9	14.9
Savings and net change in existing services	-181.8	-181.8
Efficiencies	-137.9	-137.9
New Initiatives	4.6	4.6
Change in Government grants	126.7	126.7
Change in Reserves	50.3	50.3
Other adjustments	-14.7	-14.7
Reduction in MPS's contribution to the costs of transport policing	0.0	-17.8
2013-14 council tax requirement	557.1	539.3

There is no denying that MOPAC faces a challenging year, financially. However, the Mayor's draft Police and Crime Plan presents a clear route towards cutting crime and improving public confidence in the police with a smaller budget.

The estates strategy is an important part of this reform. Yet the proposed changes are not just budget related: they are the right steps to take. Yes, London is a different beast to other cities, but half the police forces in England and Wales do not even have one 24hr station. Between 2007 and 2011, London saw a 54% increase in internet reporting of crime and a significant drop

in front counter reporting too. On average front counters receive five crime reports a day. The 10 quietest front counters deal with, on average, fewer than five crime reports a week.

Analysis published this month by Reform confirms these figures. It found that, “even the busiest police stations experience relatively low levels of public use.” They argued that, “there seems to be no relationship between a greater number of police stations and lower levels of crime or public satisfaction”, concluding that, “interactions between the police and the public may be increasingly taking place within neighbourhoods and through new forms of communication, rather than in police buildings.”³

These reforms are not just about efficient use of resources, but also about protecting victims of crime. Professor Marian Fitzgerald recently criticised police stations as “very unpleasant” and unsuitable places for vulnerable victims to report crime, arguing that more victim focussed and discreet locations are preferable.⁴

The opposition groups both criticise the Mayor for fetishizing police numbers and working hard to keep them high; whilst also criticizing him when numbers fall. But police numbers will grow in London whilst in other forces across the country numbers are falling. The Mayor proved his commitment to policing in London during his first term and this Budget proves that he will continue to do so in his second.

Our amendment includes a transfer of £17.8 million from TfL to MOPAC, through a reduction in the MPS’s contribution to the costs of transport policing. This additional money will be used to fund a precept cut on MOPAC’s Budget, to be passed on to all Londoners.

³ Reform, Reform Analysis: Police station visits. Available at: http://www.reform.co.uk/content/17345/research/criminal_justice/reform_analysis_police_station_visits_

⁴ London Assembly Police and Crime Committee, 14th January 2013.

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority

	Mayor's Draft	Conservative proposal
Changes in the LFEPA's council tax requirement	£m	£m
2012-13 council tax requirement	120.7	120.7
Changes due to:		
Inflation	7.2	7.2
Savings	-5.9	-5.9
Efficiencies	-8.0	-8.0
New initiatives and service improvements	0.0	0.0
Change in use of reserves	30.0	30.0
Net Change in Government grants	-13.0	-13.0
Other adjustments	3.1	3.1
Savings to be identified	-5.7	-5.7
2013-14 council tax requirement	128.4	128.4

The draft London Safety Plan 5 covers the next three years of the fire brigades operations with the smaller budget that the fire service now has. 12 of London's fire stations will have to close, 18 pumping appliances will go and a reduction in the establishment of around 500 jobs. Yet the attendance time standards will remain protected: reaching an emergency call with the first pump in six minutes or under and the second in eight or under. These are the quickest target times in the country by some way. In some parts of Greater Manchester, for example, the target attendance times are 12 or 17 minutes.

Under the plan, central London will see a small increase in attendance times, but these will still remain the fastest, beating the target comfortably. Outer London will see its attendance times improve and a number of boroughs which currently fall outside the target time will come inside the six and eight minute times.

These plans have been drawn up by the most experienced firefighter in London and we fully support Ron Dobson and his team. The same cannot be said about the opposition's plans. They attempted to amend the draft plan with just four bullet points:

- Removal of references to closures or reductions be removed from the plan
- Re-write the Commissioner's professional introduction by a committee of politicians
- Hold a two hour consultation meeting in every London borough [despite the amendment removing references to closures]
- Keep open those stations earmarked for closure to and follow through with the plans for four stations to receive an additional fire engine, even though their changes meant that they wouldn't be available from the stations set to close.

The proposals made the Commissioner's plan incoherent and undeliverable. Instead of saving £45 million over two years the plan would have increased expenditure by £8 million. The Mayor is right to be using his powers to push through these plans. LFEPA members have a responsibility to deliver a balanced budget. Those opposing these plans without a credible alternative are failing in this duty.

Transport for London

	Mayor's draft	Conservative proposals
Changes in the TfL's council tax requirement	£m	£m
2012-13 council tax requirement	6	6
Changes due to:		
Inflation	59	59
Savings and Efficiencies	-134	-134
Fares, charges and other income changes	-174	-174
Additional income from removal of TfL employee nominee travel cards	0	-17.8
Reduction in MPS's contribution to the costs of transport policing	0	+17.8
New initiatives and service improvements (capital investment and net operational increases/decreases)	350	350
Change in use of general reserves	0	0
Changes in Government revenue grants	124	124
Other adjustments	-225	-225
2013-14 council tax requirement	6	6

Investment in our transport infrastructure is fundamental both to London's future and to the Mayor's central focus of this second term: jobs and growth. London is growing and so is demand on the transport system. TfL's Budget must therefore keep up (unlike the demand on the police front counters, for example, which has steadily fallen). This budget will enable TfL to keep up, whilst also putting records amounts of money into cycling. In the last year we have seen a plethora of successes:

- the completion of Overground's orbital route
- upgrades progressing well on the Northern and District Lines
- confirmation of funding for the Northern Line extension
- trouble-free Olympic travel
- continued expansion of the cycle hire scheme

The rise in fares that we all felt in January may be hard to swallow, but it is essential for delivering this investment; investment that should have been carried out years ago, but was ignored by Boris's predecessor. Ken and his supporters complain about the RPI+2% fare increase, but what they do not bother to mention is that in the 3 years after the 2004 election the former Mayor raised fares by RPI+10% each year. Between 2005 and 2007 the Oyster fare increased by 42%.

Using the so-called surplus to cut fares was never an option and did not stand up to scrutiny. Even if the surplus existed, this money is needed to pay for investment. Those calling for a reduction in fares must identify what projects they would want to see cut as a result and what investment should be put on hold. If, for example, fares were only to rise by 1%, not 2% above inflation, this represents £34 million each year in lost revenue, in perpetuity and therefore lost

capital investment. If this policy were pursued for 10 years, the compounding effect would lead to well over £1bn is foregone investment.

However, as we have previously noted, this budget involves tough decisions. Yet TfL appear to have got off comparatively lightly, in the face of the reductions to the police and fire budgets. GLA Conservatives are therefore proposing the removal of the over-generous perk that all TfL employees are entitled to: a free travel card for a chosen nominee.

Every TfL employee is entitled to a free travel card for a nominated other. The nominee need not be a spouse, but must simply live at the same address as the employee. It could be a housemate, child or lodger. We do not believe that in the current economic climate TfL should be using taxpayers' money to fund the travel for people who do not even work at TfL. We know that there is cross-party support for this measure, yet still no action has been taken.

Despite TfL's insistence that the free passes do not cost them anything – arguing that “the cost of providing free travel to nominees of TfL staff is nil, as the amount of travel is insufficient to require additional services to be operated to cope with it” – GLA Conservatives do not accept this to be the case. We believe that the lost income represents a significant cost to the organisation because these individuals would likely be paying for their travel if they did not receive the perk. This should stop, with the saving passed on to the taxpayer. Our calculation of the additional income that TfL would receive should these passes be removed is as follows:

- As of 13 November 2012, there were 21,788 nominee passes in use.⁵ (This has risen from 15,897 over the course of a year.⁶)
- Using the London Living Wage reports lowest estimate of weekly cost of travel (£31.57⁷) and multiplying these 21,788 free passes by 52 weeks would equate the passes a value of £35.8 million.
- We consider it reasonable to budget for only half the value of the nominee passes as not all the current pass holders will pay for travel instead. Half this budgeted value would be £17.8 million.

We propose that this money be used to fund a reduction in council tax. By reducing the MPS's contribution to the TfL's Safer Transport Command by £17.8 million, (for which they currently contribute £21.7m), TfL can use the additional fares income to cover this cost, with the saving from the MPS being passed on to a reduction of £17.8 million in MOPAC's council tax requirement.

⁵ <http://mqt.london.gov.uk/mqt/public/question.do?id=43631>

⁶ <http://mqt.london.gov.uk/mqt/public/question.do?id=38404>

⁷ LLW uses the weekly equivalent cost of a monthly Zone 1-3 Oyster Travel Card (£136.80 from Jan 2013) which is £31.57. Figures available at: <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/tickets/14416.aspx>

London Legacy Development Corporation

	Mayor's draft	Conservative proposals
Changes in the LLDC's council tax requirement	£m	£m
2012-13 council tax requirement	0.0	
Changes due to:		
Inflation	0.1	0.1
Savings	-2.2	-2.2
Efficiencies	-1.5	-1.5
New initiatives and service improvements	21.6	21.6
Change in use of reserves	-4.3	-4.3
Increase in Government grants via GLA	-15.0	-15.0
Other adjustments	1.3	1.3
2013-14 net expenditure	0.0	0.0

There is no doubt that the Olympics were a huge, huge success. However, from the GLA's perspective, the real work has only just started. Now that the LLDC is part of the GLA Group, the Mayor has a real opportunity to shape the development of this new piece of city.

London was the first host city to set up a legacy body in advance of the Games themselves and the benefits are clear, with legacy uses secure for the majority of venues. As a group, we have been critical of a number of the decisions made for the future of the Olympic Park and this year we will continue to scrutinise plans for the future of the Olympic Stadium and new housing across the site. In particular we will continue to push for good quality, low rise family homes; the homes in which Londoners want to live.

Summary of proposals – Budget Requirements

Component Council tax requirement	Base 2012-13	Mayor's proposals 2013-14	GLA Conservatives proposals 2013-14
GLA	£123.1m	£97.6m	97.6m
MOPAC	£695.0m	£557.1m	539.3m
LFEPAC	£120.7m	£128.4m	128.4m
TfL	£6.0m	£6.0m	6.0m
LLDC	£0.0m	£0.0m	0.0m
Consolidated council tax requirement	£935.1m	£778.7m	760.9m
Precept increase (Band D)	-	-£3.72	-£10.65
Total Band D precept	£306.72	£303.00	£296.07

PART B: Proposal to approve, with amendments, the Final Draft Consolidated Budget for the 2013-14 financial year for the Greater London Authority and the Functional Bodies.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

FORMAL BUDGET AMENDMENT

1. The Mayor's final draft consolidated budget (together with the component budgets comprised within it) for 2013-14 be amended by the sum(s) shown in column number 3 of the table for each constituent body, as set out and in accordance with the attached Schedule.

(These sums are the calculations under sections 85(4) to (8) of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 (as amended) ('The GLA Act') which give rise to each of the amounts mentioned in recommendations 2 and 3 below.)

2. The calculations referred to in recommendation 1 above, give rise to a component council tax requirement for 2013-14 for each constituent body as follows:

<i>Constituent body</i>	<i>Component council tax requirement</i>
Greater London Authority: Mayor of London	£84,624,956
Greater London Authority: London Assembly	£2,600,000
Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime	£ 539,324,972
London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority	£128,372,269
Transport for London	£6,000,000
London Legacy Development Corporation	£ NIL

3. The component council tax requirements shown in recommendation 2 above, give rise to a consolidated council tax requirement for the Authority for 2013-14 (shown at Line 73 in the attached Schedule) of **£760,922,197**

BUDGET RELATED MOTIONS

4. [WHERE APPLICABLE, INSERT ANY OTHER BUDGET RELATED MOTIONS REQUIRED]

NOTES:

- a. A two thirds majority of votes cast by those Assembly Members present and voting is required to approve any amendment to recommendations (1) to (3) above concerning the Final Draft Consolidated Budget; abstentions are not counted.
- b. To approve the Final Draft Consolidated Budget, without amendment, only a simple majority of votes cast is required. Again, abstentions are not counted.
- c. The income estimates calculated under section 85 5(a) of the GLA Act is presented in four parts within the statutory calculations:
 - Income not in respect of government grant, council tax precept or retained business rates. This includes fare revenues, congestion charging, the Crossrail business rate supplement and all other income not received from central government, council tax precept or retained business rates. This also includes for the GLA (Mayor) the GLA's share of the aggregate forecast net collection fund surplus at 31 March 2013 reported by the 33 London billing authorities (line 6 for the Mayor, line 18 for the Assembly, line 30 for MOPAC, line 42 for LFEPA , line 54 for TfL, and line 66 for the LLDC);
 - Income in respect of specific and special government grants. This includes those grants which are not regarded as general grants. This includes the GLA Transport grant for TfL and specific grants for the GLA, LFEPA and MOPAC (line 7 for the Mayor, line 19 for the Assembly, line 31 for MOPAC, line 43 for LFEPA , line 55 for TfL, and line 67 for the LLDC);
 - Income in respect of general government grants. From 2013-14 this comprises Revenue Support Grant and for MOPAC only core Home Office police and principal police formula grant (line 8 for the Mayor, line 20 for the Assembly, line 32 for MOPAC, line 44 for LFEPA, line 56 for TfL, and line 68 for the LLDC); and
 - Income in respect of retained business rates (line 9 for the Mayor, line 21 for the Assembly, line 33 for MOPAC, line 45 for LFEPA, line 57 for TfL, and line 69 for the LLDC).

SCHEDULE

Part 1: Greater London Authority: Mayor of London (“Mayor”) final draft component budget

NOTE: Amendments to the final draft component council tax will take effect as follows. Where a figure is shown in column 3, the figure in column 2 is amended to the figure in column 3. If no figure is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 shall be taken to apply un-amended. If “nil” or “£0” is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 is amended to nil.

1	2	3	4
Line	Mayor’s Proposal	Budget amendment	Description
(1)	£739,339,888	£	estimated expenditure of the Mayor for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
(2)	£5,000,000	£	estimated allowance for contingencies for the Mayor under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
(3)	£24,201,883	£	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the Mayor under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
(4)	£0	£	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the Mayor under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
(5)	£768,541,771	£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for the Mayor (lines (1) + (2) + (3) + (4) above)
(6)	-£505,863,522	-£	estimate of the Mayor’s income not in respect of Government grant, retained business rates or council tax precept calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act including the GLA share of the collection fund surplus for the 33 London council tax billing authorities
(7)	-£16,560,769	-£	estimate of the Mayor’s special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(8)	-£35,847,823	-£	estimate of the Mayor’s income in respect of general government grants (revenue support grant) calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(9)	-£29,837,076	-£	estimate of the Mayor’s income in respect of retained business rates calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(10)	-£95,807,625	-£	estimate of Mayor’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (1) and (2) above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
(11)	-£683,916,815	-£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for the Mayor (lines (6) + (7) + (8) + (9) + (10) above)
(12)	£84,624,956	£	the component council tax requirement for the Mayor (being the amount by which the aggregate at (5) above exceeds the aggregate at (11) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

The final draft component council tax requirement for the Mayor for 2013-14 is £84,624,956

Part 2: Greater London Authority: London Assembly (“Assembly”) final draft component budget

NOTE: Amendments to the final draft component council tax will take effect as follows. Where a figure is shown in column 3, the figure in column 2 is amended to the figure in column 3. If no figure is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 shall be taken to apply un-amended. If “nil” or “£0” is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 is amended to nil.

1	2	3	4
Line	Mayor’s proposal	Budget amendment	Description
(13)	£7,607,000	£	estimated expenditure of the Assembly for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
(14)	0	£	estimated allowance for contingencies for the Assembly under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
(15)	0	£	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the Assembly under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
(16)	0	£	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the Assembly under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
(17)	£7,607,000	£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for the Assembly (lines (13) + (14) + (15) + (16) above)
(18)	-£175,313	-£	estimate of the Assembly’s income not in respect of Government grant, retained business rates or council tax precept calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(19)	£0	-£	estimate of the Assembly’s special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(20)	-£2,786,405	-£	estimate of the Assembly’s income in respect of general government grants (revenue support grant) calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(21)	-£2,045,282	-£	estimate of the Assembly’s income in respect of retained business rates calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(22)	£0	-£	estimate of Assembly’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (13) and (14) above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
(23)	-£5,007,000	-£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for the Assembly (lines (18) + (19) + (20) + (21) + (22) above)
(24)	£2,600,000	£	the component council tax requirement for the Assembly (being the amount by which the aggregate at (17) above exceeds the aggregate at (23) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

The final draft component council tax requirement for the Assembly for 2013-14 is: £2,600,000

Part 3: Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime ("MOPAC") final draft component budget

NOTE: Amendments to the final draft component council tax will take effect as follows. Where a figure is shown in column 3, the figure in column 2 is amended to the figure in column 3. If no figure is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 shall be taken to apply un-amended. If "nil" or "£0" is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 is amended to nil.

1	2	3	4
Line	Mayor's proposal	Budget amendment	Description
(25)	£3,269,909,331	£3,252,109,331	estimated expenditure of the MOPAC calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
(26)	£0	£	estimated allowance for contingencies for the MOPAC under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
(27)	£27,300,000	£	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the MOPAC under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
(28)	£0	£	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the MOPAC under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
(29)	£3,297,209,331	£3,279,409,331	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for the MOPAC (lines (25) + (26) + (27) + (28) above)
(30)	-£297,100,000	-£	estimate of the MOPAC's income not in respect of Government grant, retained business rates or council tax precept calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(31)	-£473,789,795	-£	estimate of the MOPAC's special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(32)	-£1,969,194,564	-£	estimate of the MOPAC's income in respect of general government grants (revenue support grant, core Home Office police grant and principal police formula grant) calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(33)	£0	-£	estimate of the MOPAC's income in respect of retained business rates calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(34)	£0	-£	estimate of MOPAC's reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (25) and (26) above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
(35)	-£2,740,084,359	-£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for the MOPAC (lines (30) + (31) + (32) + (33) + (34) above)
(36)	£557,124,972	£539,324,972	the component council tax requirement for MOPAC (being the amount by which the aggregate at (29) above exceeds the aggregate at (35) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

The final draft component council tax requirement for the MOPAC for 2013-14 is:£539,324,972

Part 4: London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (“LFEPA”) final draft component budget

NOTE: Amendments to the final draft component council tax will take effect as follows. Where a figure is shown in column 3, the figure in column 2 is amended to the figure in column 3. If no figure is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 shall be taken to apply un-amended. If “nil” or “£0” is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 is amended to nil.

1	2	3	4
	Mayor’s Proposal	Budget amendment	Description
(37)	£445,071,409	£	estimated expenditure of LFEPA for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
(38)	£0	£	estimated allowance for contingencies for LFEPA under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
(39)	£0	£	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of LFEPA under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
(40)	£0	£	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of LFEPA under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
(41)	£445,071,409	£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for LFEPA (lines (37) + (38) + (39) + (40) above)
(42)	-£30,100,000	-£	estimate of LFEPA’s income not in respect of Government grant, retained business rates or council tax precept calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(43)	-£10,900,000	-£	estimate of LFEPA’s special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(44)	-£163,549,533	-£	estimate of LFEPA’s income in respect of general government grants (revenue support grant) calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(45)	-£108,849,608	-£	estimate of LFEPA’s income in respect of retained business rates calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(46)	-£3,300,000	-£	estimate of LFEPA’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (37) and (38) above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
(47)	-£316,699,140	-£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for LFEPA (lines (42) + (43) + (44) + (45) + (46) above)
(48)	£128,372,269	£	the component council tax requirement for LFEPA (being the amount by which the aggregate at (41) above exceeds the aggregate at (47) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

The final draft component council tax requirement for LFEPA for 2013-14 is: £ 128,372,269

Part 5: Transport for London (“TfL”) final draft component budget

NOTE: Amendments to the final draft component council tax will take effect as follows. Where a figure is shown in column 3, the figure in column 2 is amended to the figure in column 3. If no figure is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 shall be taken to apply un-amended. If “nil” or “£0” is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 is amended to nil.

1	2	3	4
Line	Mayor’s proposal	Budget amendment	Description
(49)	£6,731,775,000	£	estimated expenditure of TfL for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
(50)		£0 £	estimated allowance for contingencies for TfL under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
(51)		£0 £	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of TfL under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
(52)		£0 £	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of TfL under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
(53)	£6,731,775,000	£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for the TfL (lines (49) + (50) + (51) + (52) above)
(54)	-£4,773,000,000	-£	estimate of TfL’s income not in respect of Government grant, retained business rates or council tax precept calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(55)	-£1,150,000,000	-£	estimate of TfL’s special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(56)		£0 -£	estimate of TfL’s income in respect of general government grants (revenue support grant) calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(57)	-£802,775,000	-£	estimate of TfL’s income in respect of retained business rates calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(58)		£0 -£	estimate of TfL’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (49) and (50) above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
(59)	-£6,725,775,000	-£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for TfL (lines (54) + (55) + (56) + (57) + (58) above)
(60)	£6,000,000	£	the component council tax requirement for TfL (being the amount by which the aggregate at (53) above exceeds the aggregate at (59) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

The final draft component council tax requirement for TfL for 2013-14 is: £6,000,000

Part 6: London Legacy Development Corporation (“LLDC”) draft component budget

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component council tax will take effect as follows. Where a figure is shown in column 3, the figure in column 2 is amended to the figure in column 3. If no figure is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 shall be taken to apply un-amended. If “nil” or “£0” is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 is amended to nil.

1	2	3	4
Line	Mayor’s proposal	Budget amendment	Description
(61)	£44,200,000	£	estimated expenditure of LLDC for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
(62)		£0 £	estimated allowance for contingencies for LLDC under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
(63)		£0 £	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of LLDC under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
(64)		£0 £	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of LLDC under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
(65)	£44,200,000	£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for LLDC (lines (61) + (62) + (63) + (64) above)
(66)	-£38,700,000	-£	estimate of LLDC’s income not in respect of Government grant, retained business rates or council tax precept calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(67)		£0 -£	estimate of LLDC’s special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(68)		£0 -£	estimate of LLDC’s income in respect of general government grants (revenue support grant) calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(69)		£0 -£	estimate of LLDC’s income in respect of retained business rates calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(70)	-£5,500,000	-£	estimate of LLDC’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (61) and (62) above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
(71)	-£44,200,000	-£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for LLDC (lines (66) + (67) + (68) + (69) + (70) above)
(72)		£0 £	the component council tax requirement for LLDC (being the amount by which the aggregate at (65) above exceeds the aggregate at (71) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

The final draft component council tax requirement for LLDC for 2013-14 is: £ 0

Part 6: The Greater London Authority ("GLA") final draft consolidated council tax requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the final draft consolidated council tax requirement will take effect as follows. Where a figure is shown in column 3, the figure in column 2 is amended to the figure in column 3. If no figure is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 shall be taken to apply un-amended. If "nil" or "£0" is shown in column 3, then the figure in column 2 is amended to nil.

1	2	3	4
Line	Mayor's proposal	Budget amendment	Description
(73)	£778,722,197	£760,922,197	the GLA's consolidated council tax requirement (the sum of the amounts in lines (12) + (24) + (36) + (48) +(60) +(72) calculated in accordance with section 85(8) of the GLA Act

The final draft consolidated council tax requirement for 2013-14 is: £ 760,922,197