

# Report to the Assembly on the Mayor's Draft Consolidated Budget for 2016 – 2017

**Report to:** London Assembly

**Date:** 27 January 2016

**Report of:** Liberal Democrat Group

**Proposed by:** Stephen Knight AM

**Seconded by:** Caroline Pidgeon AM

## PART A: INTRODUCTION & COMMENTARY<sup>1</sup>

It's estimated that London's population has grown more in the past decade than at any point in the city's 2,000 year history – reaching a new peak of 8.6 million residents in January last year.

It hasn't stopped there either: London's population is now forecast to reach nearly 10 million by 2030 – a rate of growth equivalent to six new residents every hour, two buses full of people every day or a tube train full of people every week.

With a growing population, there is a growing need to invest in London's infrastructure, not just in our public transport network but across London's homes, schools, hospitals and utilities.

Our Liberal Democrat budget amendment seeks to meet this challenge head-on by **freezing the Greater London Authority's share of council tax** and using the proceeds to fund a package of bold and ambitious measures to tackle the most pressing issues facing our city, ensuring that London remains one of the most successful big cities in the world.

### Providing affordable homes for Londoners

The shortage of affordable housing in London remains the gravest crisis facing our city, with over 500,000 people currently languishing on housing waiting lists. For decades London has failed to build enough new homes, driving up rents and putting property prices well beyond the reach of most ordinary Londoners. Rising property prices are bad for London's economy too, since businesses increasingly struggle to find workers who can afford to live in the city. This must change if London is to retain its competitive edge on the international stage.

While the current Mayor continues to stand idly by, looking forward to the day when government may grant City Hall control over Stamp Duty receipts to fund additional affordable housing initiatives, this Liberal Democrat budget amendment shows how the GLA could itself fund a large scale home-building initiative by borrowing against its existing revenue budget - stimulating demand across the whole economy at the same time as addressing the shortage of affordable homes and guarding against the risk of a housing bubble.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

In future years we propose that the extra resources needed to fund our housing investment programme could be found by freezing the GLA's share of council tax at its current level, converting the full £20-a-year Olympic precept into a new 'housing precept', and utilising unallocated revenue funding currently held within the GLA's reserves.

The Mayor has already proposed a reduction in the Band D precept in 2016/17 of £19, of which £12 will arise from a reduction in the GLA's contribution to the cost of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. The remaining element (£8) of the 'Olympic precept' is due to become obsolete in 2017/18 when London's commitment to contribute £625 million to the public sector funding package for the Games will have been achieved.

Though the need to finance London's 2012 Games may have passed, the social and economic imperative to address the current shortage of affordable homes in London remains and, we believe, more than justifies freezing the GLA's share of council tax at its current level – in effect creating a new 'housing precept'.

A sustained freeze over the next two years, combined with £11.5 million of unallocated revenue funding currently available to the next Mayor, would release an additional £86.4 million per annum from 2017/18 onwards – providing the long-term revenue stream needed to finance a large-scale, £2 billion programme of home building.

At the same time we would create a new London housing and property company, wholly owned by the GLA, to kick-start this programme, giving London Government the means, once again, to directly commission, construct and manage London's affordable homes.

It's vital this once in a generation chance to solve London's housing crisis and secure the future of our city is not squandered by a Mayor set to leave City Hall within a few months and arguably more concerned with his future career prospects than providing the critical infrastructure London requires.

It is clear though that future growth must be more sustainable, not just financially but environmentally too.

## **Improving air quality**

It remains a scandal that around 10,000 Londoners die prematurely every year due to the poor quality of our city's air. Worse still, there is growing evidence to suggest that the problem hits the poorest and most vulnerable hardest, with children and the elderly among those most affected.

While the current Mayor seems content to wait until 2020 before taking any action, we believe measures are needed urgently to improve air quality across the city and so avoid the prospect of substantial fines being passed down to the GLA under the terms of the Localism Act (2011). Our budget therefore introduces a modest charge (£2.50 per day) on all diesel vehicles entering central London, enabling Transport for London (TfL) to influence purchasing and driving behaviour far sooner than currently planned while delivering a measurable benefit to the health and quality of life of Londoners.

We would use the additional revenue generated through this scheme to fund additional participation in the *Cleaner Air for Schools* programme – giving every child in London the chance to learn about the simple steps they can take to reduce their exposure to air pollution – as well as establishing a programme to retrofit all primary school buildings sited in pollution hotspots with air filtration systems.

## **Improving energy efficiency**

London still has some of the most energy inefficient buildings in Europe, with around one in four homes still below the official 'Decent Homes' standard. With 80 per cent of these buildings still expected to be standing in 2050, there is huge potential to retrofit the capital's homes, reducing carbon emissions and cutting energy bills for millions of Londoners in the process.

Renewable and decentralised energy also offer cheaper, more efficient, low carbon sources of energy. Yet here again London falls well behind the rest of UK, not to mention its international competitors. Given the huge potential for improvement, as well as the potential to unlock significant savings, the case for investing in improving the energy efficiency of London's homes is compelling.

Our budget therefore includes a plan to identify all those properties which could benefit from having more substantial energy-saving measures fitted (such as loft and wall insulation) at the same time as expanding the Decentralised Energy Project Delivery Unit, giving it the resources and funding it deserves.

## **Supporting green technology**

When first announcing his plan for an Ultra Low Emission Zone in central London, the Mayor was clear that his intention was "to restrict central London [from 2020 onwards] only to those vehicles that have zero or near-zero tailpipe emissions" Since then, the Mayor has dropped this commitment, putting the health of Londoners at risk and placing London years behind the best practice of other major cities.

By contrast, we continue to support the Mayor's original aim and believe a stronger emissions requirement would produce greater emission savings and health benefits. We recognise, however, that the current limited availability of zero emission taxis, and the rapid charging infrastructure required to operate them effectively, creates a particular problem for London's 25,000 taxi drivers whose livelihoods depend on the availability of suitable vehicles. Our budget therefore allows for TfL to procure a fleet of zero-emission capable taxis and lease them directly to taxi drivers, in much the same way as it has already done with the new Routemaster buses and London's bus operating companies.

Such a scheme would enable London's taxi fleet to be replaced far more rapidly than by expecting drivers to buy vehicles individually and would give certainty to manufacturers as well as raising the profile of new cleaner technologies - positioning London firmly as a leader in the 'low emission' field.

## **Tackling road congestion**

As our city continues to grow, so the pressures and demands facing its road network continue to increase. Although the number of vehicles entering central London has fallen in recent years, congestion has increased, due in large part to the reallocation of roadspace to support walking, cycling and other improvements to our streets. A recent study published by the GLA found that "London is fast approaching the limits of what can be achieved via reallocation alone", adding that "if reallocation continues without mitigation, congestion [will] increase significantly further."

To help meet this challenge we would introduce a new Workplace Parking Levy (WPL) in central London and Canary Wharf in addition to a smarter form of congestion charging designed to reflect demand more accurately. We would use the additional revenue generated through both of these schemes to support a step change in the proportion of journeys being made by sustainable modes – such as walking and cycling – as well as funding a package of targeted fares reductions to support those using our public transport network.

## **Reforming TfL's fares and ticketing structure**

This budget proposal also responds to the urgent need to reform the fares and ticketing structure currently used on our transport system. Across London and the South East there are over two million part-time workers, the highest number on record. It's time these part-time workers enjoyed the same discounts offered by monthly and annual travelcards. Our budget therefore includes a suite of targeted fare reductions – including early bird fares, a one hour bus ticket and flexible ticketing – to reflect changing patterns of employment, putting fairness at the heart of our fares and ticketing structure.

## **Restoring Neighbourhood Policing and tackling knife crime**

As the remit of neighbourhood policing teams has broadened to include investigative work and other tasks, so the number of dedicated safer neighbourhood officers has been reduced – resulting in a less visible street presence, lower levels of community engagement and a reduction in the amount of crime prevention work undertaken. This gradual erosion of neighbourhood policing must stop if the Metropolitan Police is to remain responsive to the concerns of our local communities. Our budget seeks to restore this crucial link by funding an additional, dedicated PCSO for every ward in London and reinstating dedicated ward Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs).

At the same time we would provide funding for two dedicated youth workers in every Accident & Emergency (A&E) Department across London to address the worrying rise in the number of young people presenting with knife related injuries, offering help and support to young people who are trapped in a cycle of violence.

## **Improving Apprenticeships**

Youth unemployment across London remains stubbornly high, with around one in ten 16 to 24-year-olds not in education, employment or training. Put simply, too many young Londoners are not being given the help they need to get on in life, leaving them trapped in cycles of unemployment or low pay.

Apprenticeships provide real, measurable benefits for employers while also ensuring that individuals who need help to access employment are provided with the necessary skills to build a meaningful future career. Yet the Mayor's failure to meet his apprenticeships target has left many young people in lingering patterns of unemployment.

By contrast, our budget proposal would see City Hall acting as a citywide broker between employers and apprenticeship candidates – matching individual skills and interests with employer requirements and streamlining the process for small and medium-sized enterprises. In addition our new GLA-owned housing and property company would offer thousands of young Londoners the chance to gain a nationally recognised qualification.

## **Addressing the high cost of childcare in London**

Our budget amendment also seeks to address the high cost of childcare in London – which continues to be a major barrier to maternal employment – by providing interest-free loans for GLA staff while at the same time establishing a Children's Fund for London, ensuring that those on low and middle incomes have access to high quality, affordable childcare across the capital.

## **Living Wage and other priorities**

Lastly our budget offers solutions to some of London's other pressing challenges: providing a larger, dedicated team to promote the London Living Wage; expanding the GLA's domestic homes retrofit programme; linking every secondary school with a local credit union; speeding up work to improve cycle safety; developing plans for a new pedestrian and cycle river crossing and rolling out a programme of selective licensing across London to tackle rogue landlords in the private rented sector.

## Greater London Authority (GLA): Mayor of London

Increased expenditure	Additional cost 2016/17	Explanatory notes	
<p><b>‘Homes for London’ Fund</b></p> <p>We would create a new £2 billion housing investment fund to deliver 50,000 new low-rent homes across London over the next four years – a scale of public homebuilding not seen since the days of the London County Council and the Greater London Council.</p> <p>The shortage of affordable housing remains the gravest crisis facing our city and the biggest potential threat to London’s economy. With rents soaring and house prices now well beyond the reach of most ordinary Londoners, our city desperately needs a major new programme of housing investment if we are to meet the challenge of accommodating a growing population and retaining our city’s competitive edge on the international stage.</p> <p>To fund this proposal we would freeze the GLA’s share of council tax at its current level, converting the existing £20-a-year contribution Londoners make towards the cost of hosting the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games into a new housing fund.</p>	2016/17  £51.153m	2017/18  £86.355m	Note 1
<p><b>GLA Homes Ltd</b></p> <p>We would create a new London housing and property company, wholly owned by the GLA, to kick-start our programme of affordable homebuilding, giving London Government the means, once again, to directly commission, construct and manage London’s affordable homes.</p> <p>The company would also act as a public sector vehicle to assemble surplus public sector land and match it with private sector and institutional investment.</p> <p>With all public profits being reinvested into new affordable housing schemes, this initiative would also have the potential to deliver 100,000 new jobs across the capital over the next four years.</p>	£0.250m		Note 2
<p><b>Homebuilding and Construction Academy</b></p> <p>To support the delivery of affordable homes on the scale envisaged through our new housing programme, we would establish a new Homebuilding and Construction Academy, providing training in the key skills required to build the homes and infrastructure London so desperately needs.</p> <p>From bricklaying and plumbing, to crane driving and surveying, this new state-of-the-art facility would address the current shortage of construction skills across the capital, offering every student the chance to gain a nationally recognised qualification while at the same time widening the skills base across the construction sector.</p>	£0.150m		Note 3

<p><b>A ‘one-stop-shop’ for apprentices in London</b>  City Hall is well placed to act as a citywide broker between employers and apprenticeship candidates – matching individual skills and interests with employer requirements across the capital. This scheme would also ensure that training and development for apprentices continues beyond the lifespan of their initial placement.</p> <p>As part of wider devolution efforts for the capital, skills and FE funding should also be devolved to ensure it works for London’s different sectors, streamlining the process for small and medium-sized enterprises in particular.</p>	£0.100m	Note 4
<p><b>Tackling Rogue Landlords</b>  We would roll out ‘selective licensing’ across Greater London, ensuring every borough uses the full range of enforcement powers at its disposal to tackle the problem of rogue landlords.</p> <p>The last two decades have seen huge growth in the number of Londoners living in the private rented sector, with one in four now renting privately. Yet standards of property maintenance remain highly variable, with many tenants having to suffer poor or unsafe living conditions at the mercy of rogue landlords.</p> <p>Selective licensing offers a powerful tool for local authorities to control the behaviour of private landlords while also improving management practices across the sector, making renting a more viable option in the longer term too.</p>	£0.426m	Note 5
<p><b>Supporting energy efficiency and decentralised energy</b>  We would expand the Mayor’s domestic homes retrofit programme to focus on fitting more substantial measures to London’s harder-to-fit homes (such as loft and wall insulation). At the same time we would expand the Decentralised Energy Project Delivery Unit, giving it the resources and funding it deserves.</p> <p>With nearly 80 per cent of carbon emissions coming from London’s buildings, and over three million homes in London alone, there is huge potential to retrofit the capital’s homes, reducing carbon emissions and cutting energy bills for millions of Londoners.</p>	£1.000 m	Note 6
<p><b>£5 for each secondary school starter’s own credit union account</b>  We would open a credit union savings account with an opening balance of £5 for every secondary school starter in London.</p> <p>Each secondary school in London would be linked with its local credit union, giving pupils the chance to learn about saving and budgeting while also promoting awareness of credit unions as a destination for ethical savings and affordable loans.</p>	£0.441m	Note 7
<p><b>Re-establish the London Debt Strategy Group</b>  We would re-establish the London Debt Strategy Group to undertake critical research into debt levels and related problems across the capital.</p> <p>The Group would act as a city-wide discussion forum and coordinator for all debt advice providers, charities and stakeholders, publishing an annual report on debt levels and a strategy to alleviate the problem.</p>	£0.100m	

<p><b>A larger, dedicated team to promote the London Living Wage</b></p> <p>While the UK government is set to introduce a higher minimum wage of £7.20 an hour for workers aged 25 and over from April this year – known as the ‘National Living Wage’ – this still fails to reflect the higher living costs Londoners experience, especially for housing and childcare.</p> <p>If the London Living Wage (LLW) campaign is to win wider support from larger employers – which have potential to extend the LLW to the greatest number of employees – the GLA must do more to support the work of the Living Wage Foundation with a larger, dedicated team at City Hall focused on outlining the clear benefits for employers in increasing productivity and reducing staff turnover, while making a real difference to the quality of life for employees.</p>	£0.100m	Note 8
<p><b>Childcare loan scheme for GLA employees</b></p> <p>We would establish an interest-free childcare loan scheme for all GLA staff, enabling parents to spread the costs of childcare over a longer period of time.</p> <p>The GLA already offers its staff an interest-free loan to cover the cost of buying an annual travel card, paying rent deposits or gym membership. It’s time this benefit was extended to cover the upfront costs of childcare too – which too often prove prohibitively expensive for parents wishing to return to the workplace.</p> <p>Alongside this we would initiate a review into employment practices across the GLA group to ensure it is a model of best practice when it comes to being a family friendly employer, using the Mayor’s links with London businesses to encourage them to take similar steps.</p>	£0.200m	Note 9
<p><b>A permanent home for the ‘blue light’ collection</b></p> <p>We believe the rich history of our emergency services deserves a permanent home in central London.</p> <p>The need to move the existing Crime Museum ahead of the closure of New Scotland Yard, as well as the Museum of London’s recent decision to relocate from Barbican to West Smithfield by 2021, provides the ideal opportunity to investigate the feasibility of bringing together the historic collections of the Metropolitan Police Service, London Fire Brigade and London Ambulance Service for the first time as part of a ‘Blue Light’ collection.</p> <p>The success of the recent ‘Crime Museum Uncovered’ exhibition – through which never-before-seen objects from the MPS’s historic collections went on public display at the Museum of London – demonstrates the huge public interest in these items as well as the potential to generate significant sums of additional income through opening up these collections to the wider public.</p>	£0.100m	Note 10
<p><b>Hotel Room Occupancy Levy</b></p> <p>We would introduce a modest £2-a-night levy on stays at three-to-five star hotels in the capital, with all proceeds used to support a Children’s Fund to help with childcare costs across the capital, creating a lasting legacy for the city.</p> <p>Several major cities have adopted similar schemes, including New York, Paris, Berlin, Rome, Venice and Florence. It’s time London followed suit, harnessing its status as one of the world’s most visited destinations to solve the most pressing issues facing our city, starting by providing parents with a guarantee of wraparound childcare.</p>	£0.100m	Note 11

Early estimates suggest this scheme could generate over £50 million per annum if adopted across London's three-to-five star hotels – providing an unprecedented level of investment to support the provision of childcare outside of normal school hours, such as breakfast clubs or after school, and training for childminders.		
<b>Total additional expenditure</b>	<b>£54.120m</b>	

<b>Savings</b>	<b>Identified Savings 2016/17</b>	Explanatory notes
Reduce expenditure on Consultancy by 20%	£ 2.287m	Note 12
Reduce expenditure on Advertising and PR by 20%	£ 0.093m	Note 13
Reduce expenditure on Marketing by 20%	£ 0.298m	Note 14
Reduce expenditure on Agency Staff by 20%	£ 0.124m	Note 15
<b>Reduce expenditure on Mayoral 'World Tours'</b> We believe there is an opportunity to reduce the number and cost of prime ministerial-style foreign trips currently undertaken by the Mayor.  Where overseas visits are required – for example to maximise London's economic competitiveness or to support overseas trade – we would expect the Mayor's official promotional agency, London & Partners – which continues to receive the majority of its funding from the GLA – to cover the cost of these visits.	£ 0.165m	Note 16
<b>Total savings</b>	<b>£ 2.967m</b>	

## Greater London Authority (GLA): London Assembly

We are not proposing any change to the London Assembly's budget this year. We believe it is vital that the Assembly has sufficient resources to be able to hold the Mayor of London to account, particularly as the Mayor continues to exercise significant new powers around policing, housing, regeneration and education, with prospect of more control over the city's fire and emergency planning functions too. We note however that the Assembly has identified further savings and efficiencies of £0.1m in 2016/17 in addition to those achieved in 2015/16 (£0.1m) and 2014/15 (£0.3m).

At a total annual cost to each Band D council taxpayer of just 95 pence, we believe the London Assembly continues to provide value for money by holding the Mayor to account and investigating issues of importance to Londoners.



Note 1	<p>'Additional Expenditure' figures represent the finance costs of prudential borrowing for capital investment and would be subject to the successful renegotiation of the GLA's long-term borrowing limits with central government in addition to requiring the GLA's debt schedule to be adjusted to reflect a 50-year period of payback. It assumes a capital finance-expenditure ratio of 1:25, based on the current interest rate for long-term borrowing.</p> <p>The figure for 2016/17 includes additional income that would arise from the reversal of the Mayor's planned reductions to both the non-Olympic and Olympic precept (directing the maximum amount possible (£51.153m) to non-police services without breaching the council tax referendum thresholds set for 2016/17). The sum for 2017/18 assumes that council tax at Band D in the 32 boroughs would remain at its 2015/16 level (£295) and has been adjusted to reflect an expected 1 per cent rise in the taxbase (generating £52.669m in total). It also includes the usage of the balance of the 'Olympic precept' (i.e. the remaining £8 element) worth £22.185m in 2016/17; and £11.5 million of unallocated revenue funding held within the Resources Directorate, as shown in the Part 2, Section 2 of the Mayor's Draft Consolidated Budget for 2016/17.</p> <p>There is sufficient funding within the Mayor's <a href="#">existing housing programmes</a> to deliver 4,500 homes per annum at 'capped' affordable rents, typically set at around 50 per cent of the market rent. The additional funding set out above would enable a further 18,000 homes with rents set at council rates to be delivered in London per annum, at an average grant of £62,500 per unit. Any additional funding requirements to support this programme would come from other sources including the in-kind use of surplus GLA-owned land.</p>
Note 2	This sum would pay for initial set-up costs, financial modelling, independent legal advice and support.
Note 3	This would cover the cost of commissioning an independent feasibility report.
Note 4	Figure covers estimated staffing and initial set-up costs.
Note 5	This expenditure will provide match-funding for boroughs interested in establishing a selective licensing scheme and is intended to cover the costs of consultation. It is envisaged that once licensing schemes are established they will become self-financing, with registration fees covering the cost of additional enforcement activity.
Note 6	This would cover the cost of creating an additional four posts at Grades 5- 9 (including on-costs) within the Decentralised Energy Project Delivery Unit as well as increasing the number of assessments undertaken through the Mayor's existing domestic homes retrofit programme, RE:NEW.
Note 7	Based on projections submitted by London local authorities to the <a href="#">Department for Education</a> , 88,200 pupils are forecast enter London secondary schools at Year 7 in the 2016/17 academic year.
Note 8	This would cover the cost of creating an additional two posts (including on-costs) at Grades 5 – 9.
Note 9	It is envisaged that an interest-free loan up to £1500 would be offered to staff to cover the upfront costs of childcare, paid back via salary deductions over the following 11 months. This would be subject to the GLA's Expenses and Benefits Framework being reviewed and updated in accordance with the GLA Financial Regulations.
Note 10	<p>Figure represents funding towards the cost of a feasibility study into incorporating the 'Blue light' historical collections within a new, purpose built, Museum of London at Smithfield Market. See MOPAC decision '2015 120' and the Mayor's <a href="#">press release</a> of 09 October 2015 ['Mayor announces plans for permanent Policing Museum in London'] for more details relating to the planed relocation of the Metropolitan Police Crime Museum.</p> <p>For more information on the Museum of London's plan to move from its Barbican home to West Smithfield see the Museums Association <a href="#">press release</a> of 06 January 2015 ['Museum of London confirms move to Smithfield Market'].</p> <p>A <a href="#">feasibility study</a> commissioned by the Mayor in late 2009 concluded that "if no action is taken to address collections care, management facilities and capacity, it can be safely assumed that within ten years the [blue light] collections will have suffered great losses."</p>
Note 11	Represents funding towards a feasibility study into a voluntary Hotel Room Occupancy Levy. Estimates for the amount that could be raised annually are based on the latest available count of 3-5-star hotels in London (AM:PM Hotel Database) and assume a standard occupancy rate of 83 per cent.
Notes 12 - 15	Figures based on GLA spending in the year-to-date [i.e. periods 1-8 in 2015/16; and 8-12 in 2014/15]. See data from expenditure over £250 lists. <a href="http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/gla/budget-expenditure-charges/expenditure">http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/gla/budget-expenditure-charges/expenditure</a>
Note 16	London & Partners is set to receive a core grant of £10.9m from the GLA in 2016/17

## Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC)

Increased expenditure	Additional Cost 2016/17	Explanatory note
<p><b>Strengthening dedicated Safer Neighbourhood Teams</b> Recent changes to the structure of neighbourhood policing have left wards with only one dedicated PC and one dedicated PCSO – resulting in a less visible street presence and lower levels of community engagement.</p> <p>Our budget would reverse this change, putting dedicated officers and PCSOs back into the trusted structure of Safer Neighbourhood Teams, funding an additional dedicated PCSO for every ward in London.</p>	£9.638m	Note 1
<p><b>Two Youth Workers in every Accident &amp; Emergency Department</b> We would provide funding for two dedicated youth workers in every Accident &amp; Emergency (A&amp;E) Department across London.</p> <p>A&amp;E Departments offer the chance to pick up and refer young people who turn up with knife related injuries at a critical moment in their lives. These youth workers would also share anonymised data on knife and gang assaults with the police and other agencies to help inform joint plans for support and enforcement.</p>	£2.900m	Note 2
<p><b>Increasing Portable Archway Metal Detectors</b> Portable Archway Metal Detectors (AMDs) have proved extremely useful in detecting and deterring knife crime across the capital, yet there are currently only 71 AMDs deployed across London's 32 boroughs. We would increase this number to ensure 5 AMDs are available to each borough commander.</p>	£0.312m	Note 3
<p><b>Hand-held metal detectors/improving Stop &amp; Search</b> Hand-held metal detectors have become a vital tool in helping the police to detect hidden weapons, drugs and needles without resorting to the intrusiveness of a full search, thereby improving the stop and search.</p> <p>Currently the MPS has just 326 hand-held metal detectors available across the force, with only 1 per cent of officers having access to this resource at any one time. We would increase the number of detectors to over 3,000 – giving 10 per cent of officers access to this vital tool.</p>	£0.157m	Note 4
<p><b>340 Extra Safer Schools Officers</b> Police officers working in schools provide a valuable service by focusing on early intervention and crime prevention – creating a safer environment for everyone to learn in. We would more than double the number of police officers working in schools to ensure the good work done to build trust and mutual respect between young people and the police is continued.</p>	£5.470m	Note 5
<p><b>Additional Resourcing for Child Abuse Investigation Teams (CAIT)</b> The Metropolitan Police unit responsible for investigating allegations of rape and sexual assault against children has been stretched in recent years by a significant increase in the number of reported incidents.</p>	£1.920m	Note 6

While the Met has sought to increase the number of officers within its child abuse command in response to this increase, it has struggled to keep pace with demand. Our budget proposal therefore provides funding for an additional 32 officers – the equivalent of one additional full-time officer per borough – to help investigate these serious offences.		
<b>Total additional expenditure</b>	<b>£20.397m</b>	

<b>Savings</b>	<b>Identified Savings 2016/17</b>	
<b>Cars and Drivers for Senior Officers</b> We would remove chauffeurs and limousines for NPCC officers except where required for security reasons.	<b>£1.058m</b>	Note 7
<b>Taxi and Private Hire Vehicles</b> We would stop the use of taxis and private hire vehicles except where required for security reasons.	<b>£0.092m</b>	Note 8
<b>Flights – First Class and Business</b> We would reduce expenditure on flights by 25%.	<b>£0.264m</b>	Note 9
<b>Consultants</b> We would reduce expenditure on consultants by 10%.	<b>£4.310m</b>	Note 10
<b>Temporary Agency Workers</b> We would reduce expenditure on temporary staff by 10%.	<b>£4.23m</b>	Note 11
<b>Non-Executive Advisers</b> We would delete all paid Non-Executive Adviser posts. London has a wealth of specialist stakeholders in the commercial and charity sectors with whom the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime could engage at no extra cost.	<b>£0.079m</b>	Note 12
<b>Property Services</b> We would create a new shared services agreement with Transport for London, giving MOPAC and the MPS access to the expertise of TfL's Property and Commercial Development Team, maximising the use of this talent for the benefit of the whole GLA group.	<b>£0.250m</b>	Note 13
<b>NPCC Accommodation</b> We would rent out the 8 central London flats which MOPAC currently holds for NPCC officers. This would generate an additional income stream.	<b>£0.260m</b>	Note 14
<b>Overtime</b> We would reduce expenditure on overtime for police officers by 10%.	<b>£8.584m</b>	Note 15
<b>Advertising</b> We would cut the cost of in-house press and public relations by 10%.	<b>£0.257m</b>	Note 16
<b>Total savings</b>	<b>£19.384m</b>	

Note 1	Our budget assumes an additional 640 PCSOs would be required at an approximate cost of £36,200 per PCSO including on-costs. This represents a full year cost of £23.168m. However recruitment would need to take place first, thus we would phase the introduction of these officers over the course of the year, with the aim of having an additional 640 PCSOs in place by 31 March 2017. Additionally we would dedicate a further PC to each SNT from within the existing pool of neighbourhood officers, at no extra cost.
Note 2	The cost of placing a youth worker in A&Es is based on the scheme currently overseen by 'Oasis Youth', a charity which has one full-time youth worker in place at St Thomas' A&E at a cost of £50,040 per annum.
Note 3	There are 71 portable Archway Metal Detectors (AMDs) distributed across the boroughs and certain specialist units in the MPS. On average there are 2 AMDs issued to each borough. The majority of these arches were purchased back in 2008/9, and the cost of one of these units today would be £3,500 (MQ <a href="#">2015/3621</a> )
Note 4	The MPS currently has 326 hand held scanners at a cost of approximately £55 per unit. In each of the last three financial years 7 scanners have been purchased, the 2015/16 forecast is to purchase a further 7 scanners. (MQ <a href="#">2015/4238</a> )
Note 5	At the last count there were 219 Safer Schools Officers working in 559 Safer Schools Partnerships, comprising secondary schools, Pupil Referral Units and 6th Form Colleges (MQ <a href="#">2013/4398</a> ). Our budget assumes an additional 340 officers would be recruited over the year (at a cost of £53,000 per officer, including on-costs). This amounts to a full year cost of £18.020m. However recruitment would need to take place first, thus we would phase the introduction of these officers over the course of the year, with the aim of having an additional 640 PCSOs in place by 31 March 2017.
Note 6	This assumes an average cost of £53,000 per officer. A contingency of £0.224m has been provided to allow for overstaffing during periods of high demand. For further information regarding the Met's role in safeguarding children, see the <a href="#">report</a> published by the London Assembly's Police and Crime Committee in July 2014 entitled 'Keeping London's children safe'.
Note 7	Indicative figure based on the forecast spend on drivers for senior officers in 2015/16 (including the maintenance, fuel and insurance cost for cars) of £1,058,469 (Source: MQs <a href="#">2015/3600</a> , <a href="#">2015/3362</a> and <a href="#">2015/3599</a> ).
Note 8	Indicative figure based on a forecast spend on Taxis and Private Hire vehicles of £91,931 in 2014/15 (MQ <a href="#">2014/4167</a> ).
Note 9	Last year the MPS spent £1.005m on first class and business flights (MQ <a href="#">2015/3367</a> ).
Note 10	In 2014/15 MOPAC/MPS spent £43.1m on external consultants. (MQ <a href="#">2015/3609</a> ).
Note 11	In 2014/15 MOPAC/MPS spent £42.3m on agency staff. (MQ <a href="#">2015/3610</a> ).
Note 12	For the period October 2012 (when they were appointed) to August 2013, a total of £79,000 was paid to MOPAC's non-executive advisers: Faith Boardman (Advisor for Change): £26,500; Jeremy Mayhew Advisor for Procurement: £25,562; Jonathan Glanz (Advisor for Property): £27,000. Steve O'Connell (Advisor for Neighbourhoods) chose not to receive remuneration for his post.
Note 13	This figure assumes additional rental income of £0.250m from joint working with TfL.
Note 14	MOPAC has eight residential properties for the use of NPCC officers (MQ <a href="#">2015/3611</a> ). Our budget proposal assumes that each property would achieve the median monthly rent for a two bedroom property in the City of Westminster: £2708 over 12 months.
Note 15	The 2016/17 budget for overtime is £85,835,000. See MOPAC budget submission to the Mayor.
Note 16	Forecast spend for 2016/17 is £2.81m (MQ <a href="#">2015/3371</a> ).

## London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA)

We note the Mayor's intention to maintain LFEPA's funding at its 2014/15 level for the next three years, but remain concerned by the Mayor's direction instructing the authority to examine the option of decommissioning 13 fire appliances to help find £6.4 million of savings.

While we await the results of the consultation on the two options LFEPA has identified for finding the necessary savings, we believe strongly that the alternate crewing option, put forward by the LFEPA Resources Committee, represents the safest course of action. It not only enables a greater number of appliances to remain available to respond to incidents but has also been shown to have the least impact on first response times. By contrast, cutting appliances would risk public safety and leave firefighters poorly equipped to do their jobs.

We believe that any significant operational changes, were they to be approved by the new Mayor, would be best introduced as part of a comprehensive package following the outcome of the full LSP 6 review due to take effect in the year 2017/18. Therefore, any operational changes for 2016/17 should be kept to a minimum.

## Transport for London (TfL)

Additional Income	2016/17	Explanatory notes
<p><b>Ultra Low Emission Zone – Diesel Levy</b></p> <p>We would introduce a modest levy (£2.50 per day) on diesel vehicles entering central London from late 2016 – cleaning London’s dirty air and protecting the health of all those who live, work and visit our city. Current Congestion Charge exemptions (for emergency service vehicles, Blue Badge holders and licensed taxis) would continue to apply.</p> <p>Diesel remains a major source of London’s pollutant emissions, with diesel vehicles producing up to 20 times as much harmful particulate matter (PM10) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) as their petrol equivalents. While the Mayor seems content to wait until 2020 before taking action, we believe measures are needed urgently if London is to achieve compliance with health-based, legal limits and avoid the prospect of substantial fines being passed down to the GLA under the terms of the Localism Act (2011). Our modest charge would enable TfL to influence purchasing and driving behaviour far sooner than currently planned, without having an undue economic impact.</p>	£26.810m	Note 1
<p><b>Workplace Parking Levy in central London and Canary Wharf</b></p> <p>We would introduce a Workplace Parking Levy (WPL) in central London and Canary Wharf to help tackle congestion, using the proceeds to support a step change in the proportion of journeys being made by sustainable modes.</p> <p>Under this proposal all employers (excluding schools and hospitals) that provide more than one workplace parking space within the Congestion Charging Zone or in Canary Wharf would be required to pay an annual charge of £3,000 per space, equivalent to £12 per working day – a level that enables larger employers who wish to continue providing workplace parking spaces for employees to do so whilst encouraging others to promote alternative modes of transport such as walking and cycling.</p>	£16.648m	Note 2
<p><b>Smart Congestion Charging</b></p> <p>Whilst the Congestion Charge has been successful in reducing the number of motorised vehicles entering central London during charging hours, the increasing competition for limited road space has caused congestion to increase again over the last three years. As the population of London continues to grow, TfL must look at other ways of reducing congestion and keeping traffic moving on the Capital’s roads.</p> <p>We would increase the base level of the congestion charge from £11.50 to £14. At the same time, drawing on the experience of other cities such as Stockholm and Singapore, we would introduce a system of smart congestion charging – charging users an additional £6 to enter central London at peak times when its roads are most congested – to reflect demand more fairly while maintaining a functioning road network for essential journeys. Like Singapore we would keep the definition of ‘peak time’ under review to reflect actual road use.</p> <p>At the same time we would invest the additional revenue raised through this measure in our targeted fares package listed below, increasing the proportion of journeys being made by public transport and sustainable modes.</p>	£107.818m	Note 3
<b>Total income</b>	<b>£151.276m</b>	

Note 1	<p>Due to the limited availability of zero emission vehicles and the rapid charging infrastructure required to operate them effectively, it is proposed that both licensed taxis and TfL buses would be exempt from this charge. 'Additional Income' figure therefore represents the estimated net revenue of the scheme based on the number of 'chargeable' diesel vehicles entering the central London congestion charging zone during an average 24hr period (See the latest available CCZ data from TfL and fleet composition projections published by DfT).</p> <p>A 15 per cent reduction in 'chargeable' traffic has been forecast due to behaviour change, while initial set-up costs (including consultation and marketing) and annual operating costs have been estimated at £15m and £6m respectively.</p> <p>It is also anticipated that a 12-week consultation period would be required followed by a further three months to establish the scheme, therefore revenue has only be projected for 6 months in 2016/17.</p>
Note 2	<p>This assumes there are currently 17,400 Private Non-Residential (PNR) employee car parking spaces in central London and 3,500 in Canary Wharf, of which 17,765 would continue to be used (excluding those used by disabled Blue Badge Holders) and therefore required to pay a Workplace Parking Levy.</p> <p>Initial set-up costs; and annual operating costs (including enforcement and administration) have been estimated at £5m each. It is also anticipated that a 12-week consultation period would be required followed by a further three months to establish the scheme, therefore revenue has only be projected for 6 months in 2016/17.</p> <p>For more information on the number of car parking spaces available across London, see the latest update to the London Parking Supply Study prepared by MVA Ltd for Transport for London (July, 2005). For more details on the number of employee and public car parking spaces across the Canary Wharf estate see the following link:  <a href="http://canarywharf.com/getting-here/road/">http://canarywharf.com/getting-here/road/</a></p>
Note 3	<p>TfL figures show that on an average weekday 137,250 vehicles enter the Congestion Charge zone, of which 54,220 enter during the peak times between 07:00-09:30 and 16:00-18:00.</p> <p>We would increase the congestion charge from its current base of £11.50 by £14 for those entering the zone during the off peak period (09:30-16:00) and £20 during the peak period. This would yield an estimated additional £107.9m, factoring behaviour change and the need for a 12-week consultation period.</p>

<b>Increased expenditure</b>	<b>Additional cost 2016/17</b>	<i>Explanatory notes</i>
<p><b>Half price travel before 7.30am</b></p> <p>We would offer a discount to Londoners travelling before 7.30am on all Tube, DLR and TfL Overground services. By rewarding these passengers with an off-peak rate we would reduce the cost of travel for thousands of hard-working Londoners – such as cleaners and shift workers – easing peak congestion in the process.</p>	£7.500m	Note 4
<p><b>One Hour Bus Ticket</b></p> <p>Liberal Democrats have long called for the introduction of a ‘One Hour’ bus ticket – allowing passengers to change from bus to bus without having to pay an additional fare. Other European cities have recognised the benefits of time-limited bus tickets and passengers on the Tube have long been able to change trains without being charged again – it’s time this benefit was enjoyed by bus passengers too.</p>	£7.500m	Note 5
<p><b>Flexible Travelcards</b></p> <p>We would instruct TfL to develop a new flexible travelcard system allowing passengers to buy a set number of days’ travel each month and receive the same discount as a monthly travelcard.</p> <p>We would also conduct a review of TfL’s zoning policy for all stations across its Tube network, addressing anomalies that have arisen over time such as those at Kingston, Surbiton, Bermondsey and Kennington stations.</p>	£5.000m	Note 6
<p><b>‘Oysterising’ the Cable Car</b></p> <p>The “Emirates Air Line” cable car remains an expensive project carrying a dwindling number of passengers, with TfL now openly more focussed on attracting tourists than regular users. If the scheme is genuinely to improve connections across the river, more must be done to open up the scheme to regular transport users. Liberal Democrats would integrate the cable car into the wider transport network by allowing travelcard holders to use the service at no extra cost.</p>	£3.000m	Note 7
<p><b>Rolling out and extending Mini-Holland projects in the Boroughs</b></p> <p>London’s cycling revolution still fails to reach the edges of the city, and while the successful ‘Mini-Holland’ bids are welcome, the remaining boroughs have proposals that should be pursued too. We would provide extra funding to outer London boroughs to enable all the Mini-Holland projects to proceed as soon as possible.</p>	£7.000m	Note 8
<p><b>Expansion of Cycle Hire Scheme to Bermondsey &amp; Rotherhithe</b></p> <p>Bermondsey and Rotherhithe remain two of the only areas in central London not to benefit from having Cycle Hire facilities; expansion of the scheme here is long overdue.</p>	£ 6.000m	Note 9

<p><b>Planning and Development Costs for Brunel Bridge</b>  We would provide further funding to enable TfL to bring forward a detailed plan for a new pedestrian/cycle 'Brunel Bridge' running between Rotherhithe and Canary Wharf.</p> <p>Capacity constraints on the DLR and Jubilee Line, combined with a proposed extension of the Cycle Hire scheme, mean a pedestrian and cycle link in this location would meet several needs.</p>	£5.000m	
<p><b>Bakerloo Line Extension</b>  We would speed up plans to extend the Bakerloo line, with the aim of completing a southern extension by the mid-2020s.</p> <p>With 96 per cent of those so far consulted supporting the principle of an extension, and the potential to unlock significant numbers of new homes and employment opportunities, the time is right to kick start this scheme.</p> <p>We would increase the resources available to TfL to carry out the extensive planning, design and public consultation work necessary in order to prepare a detailed submission to the Secretary of State for permission to build and operate this Bakerloo Line extension.</p>	£10.000m	Note 10
<p><b>Restoring and expanding Traffic-Free Days</b>  We would launch a New York-style 'Summer Streets' programme, beginning by closing Oxford Street to traffic on certain weekends during June, July and August.</p> <p>The Mayor himself has endorsed plans for new traffic-free days, announcing during a recent visit to Indonesia that he would "certainly be asking Transport for London to dust down [their] old ideas and have a look [at car-free Sundays]". This proposal makes good that commitment, allowing London's streets to become a focal point for entertainment, exhibitions and other public events for 12 weeks during the Summer.</p>	£5.500m	Note 11
<p><b>Pedestrianising Oxford Street</b>  We would fund a feasibility study into the options for pedestrianising Oxford Street, including a review of all central London bus routes.</p> <p>Oxford Street has seen a structural decline over the last 10 years, facing high levels of congestion, competition from out-of-town shopping centres and the rise of on-line shopping. Opening up the street to pedestrians would not only offer the chance to improve the look and feel of the street – increasing its attraction as a visitor destination and supporting the local economy – but also allow shoppers to enjoy an area free of traffic hazards and pollution.</p>	£5.500m	
<p><b>Supporting Sutton's Tram extension</b>  We would provide the additional staffing resources needed to push forward plans to extend the tramlink into Sutton town centre.</p> <p>The proposed tramlink extension would bring major economic and social benefits to south London, creating thousands of long-term jobs, improving access to our commercial districts and providing much needed extra transport capacity. It's time the Mayor said 'yes' to extending the tramlink into Sutton.</p>	£5.500m	



<p><b>Zero Emission Bus Fund</b>  We would establish a Zero Emission Bus Fund with the aim of electrifying all London's single-decker buses by 2020.</p> <p>Air pollution from London's bus fleet causes huge health problems, and makes London a dirty, noisy city. However recent advances in battery technology along with the Government's focus on low carbon vehicles have made zero (tailpipe) emission single-deck buses a viable transport option.</p> <p>While the Mayor plans to turn all single-deck buses in central London zero emission by September 2020, we would go further and faster, with a plan to switch every single-deck bus across London to run on electric power from 2020 onwards. Additional benefits include reduced CO<sub>2</sub>, healthier air, and huge savings on fuel and running costs too – helping to make public transport more affordable for all.</p>	£67.500m	Note 12
<p><b>Zero Emission Taxis</b>  The development of new zero-emission capable taxis is welcome news, but given the current barriers to widespread adoption, we believe the time has come for TfL to intervene in this market by procuring a fleet of zero emission capable taxis directly and leasing them to taxi drivers, in much the same way as it has already done with the new Routemaster buses. At the same time TfL should install the rapid charging infrastructure required for these taxis to operate effectively.</p> <p>Such a scheme would enable London's taxi fleet to be replaced far more rapidly than by expecting drivers to buy vehicles individually and would give certainty to the market as well as raising the profile of new cleaner technologies.</p>	£67.500m	Note 13
<p><b>Enforcement and Compliance for Taxis and Private Hire Services</b>  We would more than double the number of dedicated Taxi and Private Hire Compliance Officers to reach 165 by 2017.</p> <p>As the taxi and private hire industry continues to grow, TfL must do more to meet the challenges this brings, strengthening enforcement and clamping down on touting, ensuring the licensed and law-abiding taxi and private hire trades can continue to operate effectively and deliver a high quality service to customers.</p> <p>In addition we would ensure that all Underground stations located on the 24-hour Tube network have a taxi rank in place by the launch of the programme.</p>	£6.201m	Note 14
<p><b>Cleaner Air for Schools Programme</b>  The current breaching of air quality limits has serious public health implications, with recent research estimating that poor air quality in London contributes to around 10,000 premature deaths each year.</p> <p>Children are particularly sensitive to the health impacts of poor air quality. We would fund additional participation in the Cleaner Air for Schools programme – giving every child the chance to learn about the simple steps that they can take to reduce their exposure to harmful air pollution. A programme of capital grants to retrofit London's primary schools with air filtration systems would also be established, concentrating initially on those schools sited in pollution hotspots.</p>	£5.000m	
<p><b>Total additional expenditure</b></p>	£213.701m	

<b>Savings</b>	<b>Identified Savings 2016/17</b>	<i>Explanatory notes</i>
<p><b>Withdraw public funding for the Garden Bridge</b>  We would withdraw TfL's funding for the Garden Bridge – bringing the project in line with the Mayor's original aim of being entirely privately funded.</p> <p>With Transport for London facing a period of austerity – having recently had its government grant funding cut by £240 million – and the Garden Bridge Trust having already proved capable of raising funds from the private sector (with £85m pledged to date), we believe the Mayor of London should look to invest this funding instead in transport projects of greater benefit to Londoners where there is a genuine need for capital investment.</p>	£30.000m	Note 15
<p><b>Removing TfL Staff Nominee free travel</b>  TfL employees would retain the right to free travel themselves, but their right to nominate another person of their choice for free travel would be withdrawn. We would phase the withdrawal of the nominees' cards as they come up for renewal.</p>	£10.000m	Note 16
<p><b>Scrapping east London river crossings for motor vehicles</b>  We would scrap plans to build new river crossings for lorries and cars to the east.</p> <p>While improving cross-river connectivity in east London will be vital to the future success and prosperity of the capital, the current proposals are too centred around motorists and completely overlook the need for significant improvements in our public transport network.</p> <p>Increasing road capacity simply attracts more traffic and pollution rather than reducing congestion. As car ownership in London continues to decline, it's time TfL looked instead at delivering other more sustainable river crossings, such as building a new pedestrian and cycle bridge between Rotherhithe and Canary Wharf, extending the Overground to the rapidly growing area of Barking Riverside and integrating the Cable Car fully into London's public transport network.</p>	£12.300m	Note 17
<p><b>Reducing spend on marketing of the Cable Car</b>  With the Cable Car properly integrated into London's transport network, TfL would be able to reduce its spend on marketing and advertising the 'Emirate Air Line' as a tourist attraction.</p>	£0.125m	Note 18
<p><b>Reduce expenditure on consultants</b>  We would cut spending on consultants and plough this money back into improving services for passengers.</p>	£5.000m	Note 19
<p><b>Reduce expenditure on press and advertising</b>  In tough financial times TfL's spending on press and advertising must be reduced. This will enable more money to be spent on the things that matter most to Londoners, namely getting from A to B cheaply and efficiently.</p>	£5.000m	Note 20
<b>Total savings</b>	<b>£62.425m</b>	

Note 4	TfL estimates that reducing all PAYG fares on its rail services by 50 per cent for journeys starting before 7.30am on weekdays would reduce fares income by up to £30m per year. We would introduce this next January, therefore the sum reflects costs for a quarter of the year.
Note 5	TfL estimates the net effect of introducing a free transfer for all PAYG bus journeys made within an hour of boarding, after adjusting for additional travel, would reduce fares revenue by around £30m per annum. We would introduce this measure next January, therefore the sum reflects costs for a quarter of the year.
Note 6	This would cover the cost of a feasibility study looking at bringing daily caps into line with the cost of monthly travelcards and a London-wide review of existing station zones.
Note 7	Figure based on current ridership figures and assumed loss of fares income arising from opening up the scheme to travelcard holders. N.B. Emirates Air Line Cable Car already accepts Oyster Pay-as-you-Go at the gate-line, so no additional capital costs would be incurred. Operating costs and staffing levels are also expected to remain unaffected. For more information on current ridership figures see the following link: <a href="https://www.tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/emirates-air-line-performance-data">https://www.tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/emirates-air-line-performance-data</a>
Note 8	This fund would contribute towards the further development and implementation of the Mini-Holland bids in Outer London that failed to receive funding from TfL in 2014: <a href="https://www.london.gov.uk/press-releases-5766">https://www.london.gov.uk/press-releases-5766</a>
Note 9	TfL Finance and Policy Committee figures show that CHEI (Cycle Hire Expansion & Intensification) had a net cost of £19.4m. We estimate an expansion into Bermondsey and Rotherhithe to be just less than a third in size of the CHEI.
Note 10	This expenditure will help to fund the technical feasibility studies and other reports necessary to support the extension of the Bakerloo Line.
Note 11	This sum covers the design, planning and marketing of traffic-free days as well as the indirect costs (including the need to issue Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) and install diversion route signage) relating to the temporary, one-day closure of red routes to traffic between 8am and 8pm.
Note 12	This assumes a £67.5m revenue contribution could be made to the capital budget for 2016/17. Based on the current price of a single-deck electric bus (£200,000) it is anticipated that this fund would enable the procurement of 675 electric buses, if used to subsidise the electric 'premium' (i.e. that paid over the cost of a conventional single-deck diesel model). There are approximately 2,700 single decker buses in the TfL fleet, of which 175 operate in central London on a daily basis.
Note 13	This assumes a £67.5m revenue contribution could be made to the capital budget for 2016/17. It is anticipated that lower running and maintenance costs will ensure there is no price premium over the current black cab, which costs around £33,000. This would enable the procurement of just over 200 0 electric taxis. However, as with the new Routemaster buses, the direct procurement of taxis would mean that millions of pounds would be saved over the working life of these vehicles. It is proposed that any savings should be put towards the development of a rapid charging network. (Of the 1,400 charge points currently in the Source London network, less than 10 per cent (129 charge points) are currently capable of providing a rapid charge).
Note 14	A report published by the Assembly's Transport Committee in December 2014 found that TfL's performance as regulator and enforcer has been woefully inadequate, with the interests of the passenger being largely ignored. While the number of dedicated Taxi and Private Hire Compliance Officers has been increased from a baseline of 41 in January 2015 to 82 in early 2016, our proposal would fund a further 83 posts at Band 2, costing at £35,000 per officer including on-costs. Primary duties would include investigating complaints received from customers, stakeholders, the trade and public as well as providing education and advice to private hire operator applicants and existing licensees in order to achieve high levels of compliance with the required standards.
Note 15	See the Mayor's answer to MQ 2015/4179 for the latest summary of TfL's public contribution towards the Garden Bridge project. See the London Assembly's <a href="#">report</a> into the viability of sponsored transport schemes for an analysis of the business case relative to other capital projects in London.
Note 16	It's estimated that if all staff nominees and bus operator nominees were charged fares, the revenue raised would be of the order of £10m per annum. (See answer to Mayor's Question <a href="#">2013/2987</a> )
Note 17	TfL has confirmed that the 2016/17 budget expenditure for Silvertown Tunnel is £10.7m; and £1.6m for crossings east of Silvertown.
Note 18	Indicative figure based on planned expenditure in 2015/16 (see MQ <a href="#">2015/2531</a> for more information)
Note 19	Figures published for the latest available financial year show TfL spent nearly £19m on consultants
Note 20	Figures for the latest available year show TfL spent over £25m on advertising, marketing and public relations.

## **London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC)**

We are not proposing any change to the LLDC budget this year.

While the LLDC continues to rely on the GLA to support its activities (and manage its risks) it will be important that the long-term transformation of the Olympic Park is not put at risk by any uncertainty over its future income stream.

We welcome the establishment of a charitable company, Foundation for FutureLondon, to help realise the potential of the Olympicopolis project and Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park, but remain concerned by the LLDC's most recent monitoring reports which find a high likelihood of delays and cost increases. However, if the wider cultural and education objectives promised through this scheme are to be achieved, then it will be necessary to find additional resources to support an ongoing employment and skills programme.

As the scope and scale of the LLDC's work continues to increase beyond that which was intended when the organisation was established, it will be important that every effort is made to spend money wisely and take decisions in an open and transparent manner. Within this context we are concerned by the LLDC's recent decision to spend taxpayers' money appealing the decision of the information commissioner which called for the full details of the agreement between the LLDC and West Ham United Football Club regarding the use of the Olympic Stadium to be disclosed. There is a strong and justified case, as well as significant public demand, for this contract to be published. We therefore urge the LLDC not to appeal the decision of the First-tier Tribunal in the event that it too calls for full disclosure.

Finally it will be important that any extra costs relating to the works being carried out on the Olympic Stadium roof do not compromise the LLDC's wider regeneration objectives, or the Mayor's original commitment, to ensure that a sufficient proportion of new homes are made available to local residents at prices they can afford, whether renting or buying.

## **Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation (OPDC)**

We are not proposing any change to the OPDC budget this year.

We remain supportive of the Mayor's objectives for Old Oak and Park Royal in seeking to secure the maximum benefits from newly planned transport infrastructure and to deliver high-quality sustainable development for the benefit of the area and communities that surround it. We also recognise the role that the OPDC will play in meeting those objectives, by streamlining the planning and development process and providing greater certainty for potential investors.

However, as with the LLDC, it will be important that the long-term transformation of the area is not put at risk by any uncertainty over its future income stream. Already the LLDC has faced significant revenue pressures in recent years as its government funding has been withdrawn, forcing it to rely on an ongoing annual subsidy from the GLA and income from venues and events within the Olympic park.

The OPDC, by comparison, has relatively limited opportunities in the short term to generate commercial returns through the development of its assets. It therefore leaves the next Mayor with less flexibility over when, and where, to promote new regeneration schemes.

**PART B: Proposal to approve, with amendments, the Draft Consolidated Budget for the 2016-17 financial year for the Greater London Authority and the Functional Bodies.**

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**FORMAL BUDGET AMENDMENT**

1. The Mayor's draft consolidated budget (together with the component budgets comprised within it) for 2016-17 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 2016-17 for each constituent body as follows:

<i><b>Constituent body</b></i>	<b>Component council tax requirement</b>
<b>Greater London Authority: Mayor of London</b>	<b>£94,335,318</b>
<b>Greater London Authority: London Assembly</b>	<b>£2,615,000</b>
<b>Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime</b>	<b>£567,507,912</b>
<b>London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority</b>	<b>£138,238,000</b>
<b>Transport for London</b>	<b>£6,000,000</b>
<b>London Legacy Development Corporation</b>	<b>£NIL</b>
<b>Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation</b>	<b>£NIL</b>

3. The component council tax requirements shown in recommendation 2 above, give rise to a consolidated council tax requirement for the Authority for 2016-17 (shown at Line 99 in the attached Schedule) of **£808,696,230**.

**BUDGET RELATED MOTIONS**

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

---

## NOTES:

### ***Assembly's powers of budget amendment***

- a. The Mayor is required to set a consolidated and component council tax requirement and it is this amount which the Assembly has the power to amend. The council tax requirement equates to the amount which will be allocated to the Mayor, the Assembly and for each functional body from the Mayor's council tax precept. These individual functional body requirements are consolidated to form the consolidated council tax requirement for the GLA Group.
- b. A simple majority of votes cast by Assembly Members is required to approve any amendment to recommendations (1) to (3) above concerning the Draft Consolidated Budget; abstentions are not counted.
- c. To approve the Draft Consolidated Budget, without amendment, only a simple majority of votes cast is required. Again, abstentions are not counted.
- d. Lines 4 (GLA Mayor), 18 (Assembly), 32 (MOPAC), 46 (LFEPA), 60 (TfL), 74 (LLDC) and 88 (OPDC) within the expenditure estimates are used to allocate any revenue account deficit being met from reserves relating to a prior financial year. Under the Mayor's proposals the GLA (Mayoral) component budget (line 4) includes the GLA's share of the aggregate current forecast net collection fund deficit at 31 March 2016 in respect of retained business rates. This is nominally allocated to the GLA in line with accounting practice as the precepting authority but in principle the deficit can be attributed to any component budget. The forecast net collection fund surplus reported by billing authorities for council tax in respect of 2015-16 is treated as an income item (see section e below).
- e. The income estimates calculated under section 85 5(a) of the GLA Act are presented in five parts within the statutory calculations:
  - Income not in respect of Government grant, retained business rates or council tax precept. This includes fare revenues; congestion charging income; the Crossrail Business rate supplement; the sums receivable in non domestic rates from London billing authorities required to meet the GLA's fixed tariff payment under rates retention; and all other income not received from central government, through the council tax precept or for *retained* business rates. (line 6 for the Mayor, line 20 for the Assembly, line 34 for MOPAC, line 48 for LFEPA , line 62 for TfL, line 76 for the LLDC and line 90 for the OPDC);
  - Income in respect of specific and special government grants. This includes those grants which are not regarded as general grants and are nominally paid for specific purposes. This includes Home Office specific grants for MOPAC including counter-terrorism funding and other grants paid for specific purposes to the GLA and the other functional bodies (line 7 for the Mayor, line 21 for the Assembly, line 35 for MOPAC, line 49 for LFEPA, line 63 for TfL, line 77 for the LLDC and line 91 for the OPDC);
  - Income in respect of general government grants. In 2016-17 this comprises Revenue Support Grant, the general element only of the GLA Transport Grant payable for the purposes of Transport for London and for - MOPAC only - core Home Office police, NICC grant, council tax legacy support and principal police formula grant (line 8 for the Mayor, line 22 for the Assembly, line 36 for MOPAC, line 50 for LFEPA, line 64 for TfL, line 78 for the LLDC and line 92 for OPDC). The Home Office policing and principal police formula grant reported within line 36 – this being the total sum excluding the £27.1 million provided via revenue support grant for prior year council tax freeze grants - can only be applied to the MOPAC component budget and the general transport grant figure on line 64 for TfL can only be applied for its purposes;

- Income in respect of retained business rates including estimated related section 31 grant income payable by the Secretary of State under the Local Government Act 2003 (line 9 for the Mayor, line 23 for the Assembly, line 37 for MOPAC, line 51 for LFEPA, line 65 for TfL, line 79 for the LLDC and line 93 for OPDC). This excludes the sum receivable in non domestic rates required to meet the fixed tariff and estimated levy on growth estimated as payable to central government which is treated as general income as above; and
  - The GLA's estimated share of any aggregate forecast net collection fund surplus at 31 March 2016 reported by the 33 London billing authorities in respect of either council tax and/or retained business rates. This is nominally allocated to the GLA in line with accounting practice but in principle the surplus can be attributed to any component budget. For the draft budget this figure reflects the GLA forecast share of the forecast net collection fund surplus for 2015-16 in respect of council tax only as the retained business rates forecast is reported on line 4 as it is forecast to be a deficit (line 10 for the Mayor, line 24 for the Assembly, line 38 for MOPAC, line 52 for LFEPA, line 66 for TfL, and line 80 for the LLDC). This figure will be updated in the final draft budget to reflect the actual forecasts supplied by billing authorities by the end of January 2016.
- f. A subtotal for income items before the use of reserves (line 11 for the Mayor, line 25 for the Assembly, line 39 for MOPAC, line 53 for LFEPA, line 67 for TfL, line 81 for the LLDC and line 95 for the OPDC) is included in the proforma and must also be amended to reflect the sum of any amendments made to the income items listed in paragraph d above.
  - g. The proposed use of reserves to meet expenditure is recorded in lines 12 (Mayor), 26 (Assembly), 40 (MOPAC), 54 (LFEPA), 68 (TfL), 82 (LLDC) and 96 (OPDC). The overall income total including the use of reserves and the sum of the income items from paragraph e is recorded in lines 13 (Mayor), 27 (Assembly), 41 (MOPAC), 55 (LFEPA), 69 (TfL), 83 (LLDC) and 97 (OPDC) – and again this must also be amended to reflect the sum of any amendments made to the income items described in paragraphs d and e above.

***Council tax base and GLA Share of Billing Authority Collection Fund Surpluses or Deficits***

- h. The council tax requirements are calculated using the 2016-17 approved council taxbases for the 33 London billing authorities uprated 1 per cent – 2,745,768.64 Band D equivalent properties for non police services and 2,739,466.65 for police services (i.e. excluding the taxbase for the City of London). The Mayor's final draft budget will incorporate the effect of the approved billing authority council taxbases and the GLA's forecast share of retained business rates income for 2016-17 alongside the forecast collection fund surpluses or deficits in respect of retained business rates and council tax for 2015-16 which are recoverable in 2016-17 through an adjustment to the instalments payable to the GLA by billing authorities.

***Compliance with Council Tax "Excessiveness Principles" Set by the Secretary of State***

- i. A Band D council tax for non police services in the City of London (the unadjusted basic amount of council tax applying in the City) which exceeds £87.84 and/ or a total council tax elsewhere (the adjusted basic amount applying in the 32 London boroughs) which exceeds £300.87 would be regarded as "excessive" under the principles announced by the Secretary of State and approved by the House of Commons. This is because a higher Band D amount in either case will result in an increase at or above the 2% threshold set by the Secretary of State, in which case the increase is regarded "excessive," thereby triggering (in either or both cases as applicable) the requirement to hold a council tax referendum of local government electors across the whole of Greater London.
- j. Assembly Groups should therefore seek advice should they wish to propose amendments which have the effect of increasing the precept compared to the figures proposed by the Mayor of £69.21 (the unadjusted amount of council tax in the City) and £276.00 (the adjusted amount in the 32 boroughs) as it is possible that the amendment could breach the excessiveness principles depending on the apportionment of any additional council tax precept income raised between police and non police services.

- k. If an amendment resulting in an “excessive” council tax is passed at the 22 February meeting at which the final draft budget is to be considered, the Assembly will also be required to approve an alternative default or ‘substitute’ budget that is compliant with the excessiveness principles and which would become the budget should any resulting referendum not be passed – in effect one consistent with an unadjusted council tax of £87.84 (in the area of the Common Council of the City of London) and/or an adjusted council tax of £300.87 (in the 32 London Boroughs) depending on which (or both) is/are “excessive”. Part 3 of the Mayor’s final draft budget provides advice to Assembly members on Council tax referendum issues.



## SCHEDULE

### Part 1: Greater London Authority: Mayor of London ("Mayor") 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
1	£619,260,000	£670,413,671	estimated expenditure of the Mayor for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
2	£2,800,000	£	estimated allowance for contingencies for the Mayor under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
3	£0	£	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the Mayor under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
4	£72,493,489	£	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the Mayor under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act reflecting the collection fund deficit for retained business rates
5	<b>£694,553,489</b>	<b>£745,707,160</b>	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	-£506,225,613	-£	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
7	-£4,600,000	-£	estimate of the Mayor's special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
8	-£9,961,097	-£	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	-£95,845,132	-£	estimate of the Mayor's income in respect of retained business rates including related section 31 grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
10	-£5,600,000	-£	estimate of the Mayor's share of any net council tax collection fund surplus for the 33 London billing authorities calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
11	<b>-£622,231,842</b>	<b>-£</b>	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5)(a) of the GLA Act (lines (6) + (7) + (8) + (9) + (10))
12	-£29,140,000	-£	estimate of Mayor's reserves to be used in meeting amounts in line 5 above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
13	<b>-£651,371,842</b>	<b>-£</b>	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for the Mayor (lines (11) + (12) above)
14	<b>£43,181,647</b>	<b>£94,335,318</b>	the component council tax requirement for the Mayor (being the amount by which the aggregate at (5) above exceeds the aggregate at (13) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

**The draft component council tax requirement for the Mayor for 2016-17 is £94,335,318**

## Part 2: Greater London Authority: London Assembly (“Assembly”) 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
15	£7,646,000	£	estimated expenditure of the Assembly for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
16	£0	£	estimated allowance for contingencies for the Assembly under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
17	£0	£	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the Assembly under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
18	£0	£	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the Assembly under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
19	<b>£7,646,000</b>	<b>£</b>	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for the Assembly (lines (15) + (16) + (17) + (18) above)
20	-£400,000	-£	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
21	£0	-£	estimate of the Assembly’s special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
22	-£2,531,000	-£	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
23	-£2,100,000	-£	estimate of the Assembly’s income in respect of retained business rates including related section 31 grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
24		-£	estimate of the Assembly’s share of any net council tax collection fund surplus for the 33 London billing authorities calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
25	<b>-£5,031,000</b>	<b>-£</b>	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5)(a) of the GLA Act (line (20) + (21) + (22) + (23) + (24))
26	£0	-£	estimate of Assembly’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines 19 above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
27	<b>-£5,031,000</b>	<b>-£</b>	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for the Assembly (lines (25) + (26) above)
28	<b>£2,615,000</b>	<b>£</b>	the component council tax requirement for the Assembly (being the amount by which the aggregate at (19) above exceeds the aggregate at (27) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

**The draft component council tax requirement for the Assembly for 2016-17 is £2,615,000**

### Part 3: Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime ("MOPAC") 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
29	£3,252,790,309	£3,254,053,912	estimated expenditure of the MOPAC calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
30	£0	£	estimated allowance for contingencies for the MOPAC under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
31	£0	£	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the MOPAC under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
32	£0	£	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the MOPAC under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
33	<b>£3,252,790,309</b>	<b>£3,254,053,912</b>	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for the MOPAC (lines (29) + (30) +(31) + (32) above)
34	-£257,660,000	-£257,910,000	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
35	-£374,636,000	-£	estimate of the MOPAC's special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
36	-£1,931,700,000	-£	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
37	£0	-£	estimate of the MOPAC's income in respect of retained business rates including related section 31 grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
38	£0	-£	estimate of MOPAC's share of any net council tax collection fund surplus for the 33 London billing authorities calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
39	<b>-£2,563,996,000</b>	<b>-£2,564,246,000</b>	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5)(a) of the GLA Act (lines (34) + (35) + (36) + (37) +(38))
40	-£122,300,000	-£	estimate of MOPAC's reserves to be used in meeting amounts in line 33 above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
41	<b>-£2,686,296,000</b>	<b>-£2,686,546,000</b>	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for the MOPAC (lines (39) + (40) above)
42	<b>£566,494,309</b>	<b>£567,507,912</b>	the component council tax requirement for MOPAC (being the amount by which the aggregate at (33) above exceeds the aggregate at (41) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

**The draft component council tax requirement for the MOPAC for 2016-17 is: £567,507,912**

#### Part 4: London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority ("LFEPA") 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
43	£425,160,000	£	estimated expenditure of LFEPA for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
44	£0	£	estimated allowance for contingencies for LFEPA under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
45	£2,800,000	£	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of LFEPA under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
46	£0	£	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of LFEPA under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
47	<b>£427,960,000</b>	<b>£</b>	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for LFEPA (lines (43) + (44) + (45) + (46) above)
48	-£32,600,000	-£	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
49	-£12,800,000	-£	estimate of LFEPA's special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
50	-£128,530,000	-£	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
51	-£115,659,936	-£	estimate of LFEPA's income in respect of retained business rates including related section 31 grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
52	£0	-£	estimate of LFEPA's share of any net council tax collection fund surplus for the 33 London billing authorities calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
53	<b>-£289,589,936</b>	<b>-£</b>	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5)(a) of the GLA Act (lines (48) + (49) + (50) + (51) + (52))
54	-£132,064	-£	estimate of LFEPA's reserves to be used in meeting amounts in line 47 above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
55	<b>-£289,722,000</b>	<b>-£</b>	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for LFEPA (lines (53) + (54) above)
56	<b>£138,238,000</b>	<b>£</b>	the component council tax requirement for LFEPA (being the amount by which the aggregate at (47) above exceeds the aggregate at (55) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

**The draft component council tax requirement for LFEPA for 2016-17 is: £138,238,000**

## Part 5: Transport for London ("TfL") 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
57	£6,964,208,000	£7,115,484,000	estimated expenditure of TfL for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
58	£0	£	estimated allowance for contingencies for TfL under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
59	£75,845,000	£	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of TfL under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
60	£0	£	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of TfL under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
61	<b>£7,040,053,000</b>	<b>£7,191,329,000</b>	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for the TfL (lines (57) + (58) + (59) + (60) above)
62	-£5,713,954,856	-£5,865,230,856	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
63	-£30,100,000	-£	estimate of TfL's special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
64	-£435,700,000	-£	estimate of TfL's income in respect of general government grants (revenue support grant and the GLA Transport General Grant) calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
65	-£854,298,144	-£	estimate of TfL's income in respect of retained business rates including related section 31 grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
66	£0	-£	estimate of TfL's share of any net council tax collection fund surplus for the 33 London billing authorities calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
67	<b>-£7,034,053,000</b>	<b>-£7,185,329,000</b>	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5)(a) of the GLA Act for TfL (lines (62) + (63) + (64) + (65) + (66) above)
68	£0	-£	estimate of TfL's reserves to be used in meeting amounts in line 61 above under s85(5) (b) of the GLA Act
69	<b>-£7,034,053,000</b>	<b>-£7,185,329,000</b>	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act (lines (67) + (68))
70	<b>£6,000,000</b>	<b>£</b>	the component council tax requirement for TfL (being the amount by which the aggregate at (61) above exceeds the aggregate at (69) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

**The draft component council tax requirement for TfL for 2016-17 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
71	£40,050,000	£	estimated expenditure of LLDC for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
72	£750,000	£	estimated allowance for contingencies for LLDC under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
73	£0	£	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of LLDC under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
74	£0	£	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of LLDC under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
75	<b>£40,800,000</b>	<b>£</b>	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for LLDC (lines (71) + (72) + (73) + (74) above)
76	-£32,900,000	-£	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
77	£0	-£	estimate of LLDC's special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
78	£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
79	£0	-£	estimate of LLDC's income in respect of retained business rates including related section 31 grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
80	£0	-£	estimate of LLDC's share of any net council tax collection fund surplus for the 33 London billing authorities calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
81	<b>-£32,900,000</b>	<b>-£</b>	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5)(a) of the GLA Act (lines (76) + (77) + (78) + (79) + (80))
82	-£7,900,000	-£	estimate of LLDC's reserves to be used in meeting amounts in line 75 above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
83	<b>-£40,800,000</b>	<b>-£</b>	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for LLDC (lines (81) + (82) above)
84	<b>£0</b>	<b>£</b>	the component council tax requirement for LLDC (being the amount by which the aggregate at (75) above exceeds the aggregate at (83) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

**The draft component council tax requirement for LLDC for 2016-17 is: £NIL**

### Part 7: Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation ("OPDC") 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
85	£5,500,000	£	estimated expenditure of OPDC for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
86	£0	£	estimated allowance for contingencies for OPDC under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
87	£0	£	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of OPDC under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
88	£0	£	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of OPDC under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
89	<b>£5,500,000</b>	<b>£</b>	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for OPDC (lines (85) + (86) + (87) + (88) above)
90	-£5,500,000	-£	estimate of OPDC'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
91	£0	-£	estimate of OPDC's special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
92	£0	-£	estimate of OPDC's income in respect of general government grants (revenue support grant) calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
93	£0	-£	estimate of OPDC's income in respect of retained business rates including related section 31 grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
94	£0	-£	estimate of OPDC's share of any net council tax collection fund surplus for the 33 London billing authorities calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
95	<b>-£5,500,000</b>	<b>-£</b>	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5)(a) of the GLA Act (lines (90) + (91) + (92) + (93) + (94))
96	-£0	-£	estimate of OPDC's reserves to be used in meeting amounts in line 89 above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
97	<b>-£5,500,000</b>	<b>-£</b>	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for OPDC (lines (95) + (96) above)
98	<b>£0</b>	<b>£</b>	the component council tax requirement for OPDC (being the amount by which the aggregate at (89) above exceeds the aggregate at (97) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

**The draft component council tax requirement for OPDC for 2016-17 is: £NIL**

## Part 8: The Greater London Authority ("GLA") draft consolidated council tax requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft consolidated 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
99	<b>£756,528,956</b>	<b>£808,696,230</b>	the GLA's consolidated council tax requirement (the sum of the amounts in lines (14) + (28) + (42) + (56) + (70) + (84) + (98) calculated in accordance with section 85(8) of the GLA Act)

**The draft consolidated council tax requirement for 2016-17 is: £808,696,230**