

Report to the Assembly on the Mayor's Draft Consolidated Budget for 2012 – 2013

Report to: London Assembly

Date: 25 January 2012

Report of: The London Assembly Labour Group

Proposed by: John Biggs

Seconded by: Valerie Shawcross

PART A: INTRODUCTION & COMMENTARY¹

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

**Labour Group Alternative
Greater London Authority Budget**

2012 – 2013

By the London Assembly Labour Group:

Jennette Arnold

John Biggs

Len Duvall

Nicky Gavron

Joanne McCartney

Murad Qureshi

Navin Shah

Valerie Shawcross

January 2012

Introduction

As in previous years we continue to support the Greater London Authority precept freeze.

This is Tory Mayor Boris Johnson's fourth budget. It is a mixture of bogus claims, overselling, temporary financial fixes and pretending that there are no cuts but merely 'efficiencies'. It is disjointed and lacks a sustainable, coherent strategy or 'direction of travel' for this great city. Currently, in his draft budget there is a massive black hole for London's policing, which will inevitably lead to a drastic cut in police numbers and other service areas immediately after the Olympics. This threat is real and will remain despite an expected last minute bail-out by the Government. Whatever happens, the police service in London will look very different in future years and how it responds to tackling crime.

Against a backdrop of public and private wage freezes, high unemployment and families struggling with rising prices and insecurity, Boris Johnson has willingly overseen the scrapping of the budgets he inherited from Labour to support jobs, skills and investment in the capital whilst calling this "good news for London"². And he continues to levy unnecessary fare increases on Londoners - a strange way of serving its residents. Even his allies in the coalition Government saw that his fare rises are excessive and have given London extra funding to reduce the increase slightly.

The Labour Group identifies four critical issues:

- While Londoners face a nightmare of unemployment and job insecurity, the Mayor and the Government have stripped from London the capacity, and lack the will, through investment in skills and economic development, to intervene to cushion the upheaval and prepare for the future.
- Londoners are being hit with above-inflation fare rises at a time when the boom has long ended and many face hardship. The Mayor had a choice of whether to put up fares or help out hard-pressed Londoners. He chose to put up fares.
- Youth violence, knife and street crime, burglary and sexual crimes are going up. These are affecting public confidence and fear of crime is rising, but under this Mayor previously hard-fought-for increases in police officers are under threat. Without further funding we will have less police officers and support staff in the coming years. The Government may choose to bail-out the Mayor's budget but, without a permanent fix, severe cuts are simply being delayed. Crime will not disappear after the closing ceremony of the Olympic Games or after an expected pre-election spending fix has gone.
- The collapse in construction of homes for rent, the fact that low-cost homes for sale are out of the reach of most Londoners and with some of the private rented sector taking advantage by levying high rents and maintaining poor quality homes all beg for leadership by the Mayor. Building homes should be one of the tools to re-invigorate London's economy. The Mayor's budget should not be silent on this but it largely is.

² Mayor's oral update to London Assembly meeting – March 23rd 2011

Overall, the Mayor lacks the serious and coherent vision and leadership for a City that needs it. His leadership is disjointed and lacks in ambition. At a time when other cities who compete with London know clearly how they want to develop to meet new challenges London is drifting.

The Mayor's Budget

Labour's four key budget areas are:

- **London's economy**
- **Fares**
- **Police**
- **Housing**

While our alternative budget focuses on four key areas, there are many others where the Mayor has failed, or acted inconsistently. A few are outlined below, before the four key areas are highlighted.

Value for money is of great importance and Labour strongly supports the need for a continuing drive for greater efficiencies, particularly as an alternative to service cuts. But we currently have a Mayor who when he can't achieve what he promises changes his priorities to fit the reality.

The main drive to efficiencies and savings across the Greater London Authority (GLA) by the Mayor was given the title of 'Shared Services', where a drive was launched for saving through collaborative procurement and sharing of support services. Unfortunately over the last couple of years little progress has been made by the Mayor or his advisor bought in especially to set and implement these savings and it is generally agreed it has been an unmitigated disaster. The Mayor's headline figure was massive efficiency savings of £440m over two years.³ Yet this current budget talks about £300m and shows a shortfall on this target of over £170m by 2013/14.

Although we are facing cuts, not everybody experiences the pain equally. One of the enduring memories of this mayoralty was that of massive pay rises, in some cases 20-50% increases, for the Mayor's closest advisers, and a fifty percent increase since 2008 in those in the GLA earning £100,000 or more. All this while others faced a pay freeze and many lost their jobs. It was only after a prolonged campaign by opposition Assembly Members and staff, ultimately even supported by Tory Assembly Members, that Boris Johnson agreed to a pay rise for the lowest paid staff at City Hall.

Surprisingly despite his views in the past this is a Mayor who talks loud and long about the importance of the environment but we have seen massive cut backs in the amount of work carried out by the GLA in this area. Targets for RE:NEW, a leading carbon

³ Nick Griffin, the Mayor's special advisor stated he expected 20% savings of a joint procurement spend across the GLA Group of £2.2bn – Budget and Performance Committee, July 13th 2010

reduction programme aimed at reducing the energy costs of hard pressed Londoners, have been reduced from 200,000 to 55,000 by March 2012, and even this has not yet been achieved.

London's Economy At a time of worsening unemployment, and catastrophic levels of youth unemployment, we need to use the Mayoralty to promote London's economy. By using City Hall funds but also by lobbying for investment in London. Under the current Mayor neither of these things has happened.

Labour supported the abolition of the London Development Agency and the transfer of its powers to the Mayor's office. It was not, however, made clear that the Mayor and Government would withdraw, rather than transfer, its funding as part of the change. Simultaneously, the Skills Funding Agency, which the previous Mayor had successfully lobbied to bring under Londoners influence was effectively 'recentralised' by Government, with the influence won for Londoners removed and its London Board (The London Skills and Employment Board) scrapped. The Mayor has been sidelined by his own Government and his silence on this issue is deafening.

In his autumn spending announcement, the Chancellor, standing alongside the Mayor, created the impression that he would support two major investments in London – Thames River Crossings in East London and the Northern Line extension to Battersea in West London. However, there was in fact no money whatsoever for either of these projects but merely a commitment to thinking about them, with no timescale and no project commencement. The Government and Mayor accepted the need for investment but did not allocate any resources to it. In the new year these 'commitments' have been restated but there is still no funding or credible timescale.

At a time when a strong vision and leadership for London's employment market, skills training, and investment in its infrastructure are needed, the resources and powers to do this have disappeared. Labour will urgently create, as a first step, a 'task force' to explore the range of initiatives and interventions, and resources needed, to help get Londoners back to work and equipped for the jobs of the future; and to make the case for vital strategic investment in London's transport and other infrastructure rather than simply posing in vacuous photo-opportunities. And we will earmark funds, in this year's budget to restart this important, but abandoned, job. This task force will work collaboratively with local Government and the business sector.

Fares It is a recurrent theme of Conservative administrations that there is a focus on Council Tax while charges elsewhere are allowed to rise. Boris Johnson's administration is no exception. At City Hall, while Council Tax has been frozen fares have risen ahead of inflation. The Mayor has settled on an RPI + 2% fares increase on transport users. So this year has seen a freeze in the precept for Council Band D tax payers worth 26p per month whilst the average fare payer has seen their fares rise by £9.30 per month.⁴

⁴ A 1% rise in Band D council tax would cost £3.10 per annum, or 26p per month. A Zone 1-4 travel card cost £160.60, an increase of £9.30 per month.

When questioned by Labour Assembly Members about his extortionate fare rise, the Mayor said that reducing fares "is not right thing for this city." And "the last thing Londoners want or deserve".⁵

Labour rejects this unnecessary fare increase and we would reverse it without jeopardising the current transport investment plans.

Later, even his friends in Government recognised quite how regressive his policy was. An additional grant over three years was found, allowing his average increase to be reduced from 7% to 5.6%. In our view it wasn't enough to support hard working families or London residents.

Police A cut in police numbers is a direct consequence of Government spending cuts, and is happening across the country. In a desperate act to preserve police numbers in London the Mayor's budget raids the reserves of the London Fire Brigade, with a £30m one year transfer of funds from fire to police. Other short-term funding measures that may help to cushion the Metropolitan Police budget pressures, include the use of Council Tax Freeze Grant, GLA Contingency funds, and a 'carry forward' of GLA Grant. However, there are many other competing demands for these funds. It's clear that if we were to take the Mayor at face value, that he would balance his budget without loss of police numbers, he must be expecting a last-minute bail-out from the Home Secretary.

At the time of writing this report, the Mayor had advised the Assembly that he would be getting extra money from the Government. However, the detail is unclear – whether it is a one year boost or longer and whether it is genuinely an increase in funding or some accounting manoeuvre designed to get past the elections. One-off payments do not solve budget problems, but only defer it for future years.

Regardless of the 'fix' the Mayor has secured there is an additional problem with London's policing strength. This is that numbers of budgeted police officers does not tell the whole story, for a number of reasons:

- Crime has begun to grow in a number of particularly sensitive areas, and will affect public confidence.
- A cut in support staff and PCSO's has meant an increasing amount of police time now spent on support activities, reducing their availability for policing.
- The numbers of officers employed has consistently undershot the Mayor's targets.
- The uniform presence on our streets will be reduced

In other words, the success of London's policing is being thrown into jeopardy.

Labour understands that when crime is rising we need uniformed officers on London's streets. We aim to bring police numbers back to their previously high levels and protect the capacity of our police service. In addition to the gross budget, we will focus on a

⁵ Mayor's Question Time, October 12th 2011

number of initiatives to tackle problems with Londoners safety, as highlighted in our amendment.

Housing During this year the Mayor will assume additional responsibilities for funding housing investment in London with the transfer to him of the powers and resources, including land, of the Homes and Communities Agency for London and a range of Government funded investment programmes.

The Mayor has set himself targets for 'affordable' homes, albeit a reduced number than in previous years, including homes for rent and for low-cost home ownership. He has repeatedly failed to meet those targets, and has shifted deadlines in order to try to evade failure. Meanwhile, his Government has slashed the affordable housing investment budget. Labour has repeatedly challenged the Mayor's failure on his targets. We have also queried his priorities, with an emphasis on 'low cost' homes for sale, and not for affordable rent. Not only are such homes, even with subsidy, out of the reach of most Londoners in housing need, but the lack of supply of affordable, good quality, rented housing is becoming ever greater.

Combining this with the Government's welfare reforms and at a time when house building has virtually stopped, a programme of building new homes is obviously one of the ways in which, together with meeting needs, London's economy can be brought back to life. This is a time when London needs a clear voice, and it needs to be a voice in support of those in need and London's economy. This is not just about standing up for the most vulnerable but about protecting the quality of life and economic future of our city.

Labour will promote these priorities and stand up for London and Londoners.

Conclusion

This Mayor's budget is based upon a lack of recognition of the critical challenges facing London. An alternative is needed that will prepare our City for the future, and its beginnings, given where we are, are set out below.

Core Greater London Authority - Mayor

Core Greater London Authority Mayor's Council tax requirement	£87,050,000
Nil change (but see below)	
Additional spending on London's priorities and needs	
Economy/Joblessness Task Force (notional figure)	£1,000,000
Create a Targeted Employment fund	£4,000,000
Earmark funds for continuing/new post-LDA activities (including skills, small business support, new employment opportunities)	£10,000,000
Extend funding for environmental initiatives (including former LDA funded areas now ending)	£4,000,000
Extend the Re:New initiative, providing for a further 25,000 homes	£3,000,000
Instigate a Boiler Scrappage Scheme	£3,000,000
Olympic Legacy Employment initiatives	£2,000,000
Funded by:	
Use of Revenues in 2012-13	
Apply part of 2012-13 Council Tax Freeze Grant (transferred from reserves)	£25,300,000
Efficiencies and Savings	
Reduce net contingency element of budget by	£788,800
Achieve unmet Budget savings in Core GLA Budget	£831,000
Reverse Salary increases of Mayoral Advisers	£ 80,200

The 'Core GLA' historically has consisted of the corporate and administrative machinery helping the Mayor together with a number of small functions, such as the management of events and some grants programmes and policy initiatives, that do not belong in the larger Functional Bodies, for Police, Fire, Transport and Regeneration.

Following recent legislative changes, in 2012/13 this will fundamentally change, with far greater resource and delivery functions contained within City Hall. These are for policing, where the Metropolitan Police Authority has been abolished, to be replaced by the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPC); for regeneration, where the London Development Agency will be abolished, to be replaced by regeneration powers within the Mayor's office; and for 'homes and communities' where the London Homes and Communities Agency, and its resources, are to transfer into City Hall. Finally, a Mayoral Development Corporation, the OPLC, will be created to carry forward the regeneration of the Olympic Park after the Games, and will be a functional body accountable to the Mayor's Office. Although legally a separate functional body it looks as if it will be a tightly controlled agency, not least so that City Hall can control its assets.

We generally support these changes but the change in scale of operations at City Hall will require a review of its accountabilities, checks and balances. The historic functions of City Hall will remain but will be a small part of its overall budget.

We do however take issue on a number of priorities, and failures, of the Mayor's Office:

- The failure of the Mayor's Office to achieve savings targets set by the Mayor. Of the £2.9million of savings required at City Hall, £0.8million, or over 25%, were achieved by sleight of hand, by scrapping proposed capital spending. This is not a recurrent item and is therefore not a true budget saving. It shows a flabbiness and unwillingness to act on the part of the Mayor's Office itself. We would require a real saving in this budget.
- The fact that the same Mayor's Office who failed to meet cuts targets awarded pay increases above inflation to a number of the Mayor's political advisers shows a misplaced set of priorities. We will reverse these increases.
- The move of environmental priorities away from Carbon Reduction towards mitigation measures, together with the slashing of budgets in this area.
- The fact that the shared services agenda, for achieving savings of £450million across the GLA, and by doing this avoiding front line service cuts, has been a disastrous failure, achieving only a tiny proportion of the target.
- The failure to secure resources for the former LDA responsibilities now held within City Hall.
- The MOPC is now an office reporting to the Mayor. As a part of the reforms leading to the creation of the MOPC, it was asserted that the new arrangements would achieve a saving. This has not happened. Again, this indicates a failure to achieve a saving in the Mayor's office when expecting them elsewhere. We would require a saving in this budget.

A number of these key areas are highlighted below:

Former London Development Agency (LDA) The failure to secure resources is a major failure by the Mayor's Office. In our alternative budget we will provide resources from a proportion of the Council Tax Freeze Grant, the Contingency Fund and the brought forward sum of £41 million grant provided by Government. We would earmark the majority of this funding for a range of initiatives to fund skills, training and

regeneration projects designed to address London's jobs and employment crisis, and particularly the need to provide opportunities for the young and long-term unemployed. We will also fund a 'task force' whose job would be to consider the range of initiatives needed to both address London's economic, training and skills needs and to assemble a 'Case for London' aimed at influencing other agencies and Government to meet our needs. The failure of the Mayor to recognise or to begin to react to this crisis is a scandal.

Housing The Mayor's proposed budget raises questions about the deliverability of the Mayor's current housing and regeneration policies. The budget gives no outline of an investment strategy, no information on how investment will deliver the policy goals established in the Housing Strategy and no spring board for increasing supply in 2012/13 and beyond.

The budget highlights the impact of the Government's 60% cut to the national affordable housing budget. In London this means that funding will fall from the high of £1.5bn in 2009/10 to the low of £323.2m in 2014/15, with £468.6m for 2012/13.

The budget also appears to show the Mayor again pushing back the deadline for achieving his 50,000 affordable homes – originally promised by April 2011 (out of the 2008/11 investment round) then moved to April 2012 and now to "the end of 2012". The Mayor must clarify when this target will be met.

Although the Mayor has said a great deal about building on public land in the future, the budget is silent on GLA family land – how much will be sold, bought, developed and how much capital will be generated or spent. Despite the Mayor's promises, completions on GLA family land have dropped by 60% under his administration – this budget gives no indication that this will change.

Similarly, no information is provided on the Targeted Funding Stream outlined in the consultation London Plan Implementation Plan that will drive investment in empty homes. The homelessness budget in 2012/13 will remain at the same level as last year, £8.5m, and will remain at this level until 2014/15. This is against the background of accelerated homelessness due to national welfare and housing reforms. Finally, the lack of commitment to funding traveller pitches until 2014/15 suggests a Mayor attempting to kick the issue into the long grass.

Environment The Mayor has cut resources and emphasis from environmental programmes. We highlight two areas – home insulation and air quality – where action is needed.

The Mayor's Home Energy Efficiency Programme otherwise known as RE:NEW to retrofit Londoner's homes to make them warmer, has seen a 75% cut from a 200,000 target to 55,000 and has failed to meet even this reduced amount. Nonetheless, it is a worthwhile programme particularly in light of rising energy prices, and particularly their impact on Londoners on low or fixed incomes. Effectively delivered it would mean more

Londoners spending less to keep warm. At a time when we already have a quarter of London households in fuel poverty, this is crucial. It's delivery is also labour intensive and would generate jobs at a time when much of the construction industry could do with the work to see them through these recessionary times.

Regarding air quality, at the beginning of the present Mayoral term, it was established that some 4,300 Londoners prematurely die from poor air quality annually. London has consistently been in breach of EU standards for air quality, designed to protect the lives of Londoners. The Low Emission Zone (LEZ), which we support and which, after repeated delay, the Mayor is now implementing, was established on the basis that we had 1,000 premature deaths annually, so we clearly have to do a lot more than just the LEZ. A number of initiatives can be taken to deal with the scale of the problem including improving the emissions of buses, taxis and private hire vehicles, soft landscaping of Red Routes, schemes to encourage the replacement of offending vehicles and public information to inform Londoners when we have poor air quality and education to encourage environmentally better behaviour. Much of this is included below in our transport amendment.

There are other Environment programmes which have fallen off the Mayor's "bandwagon", including those funded and led through the LDA. With its demise and the move away from revenue support to asset transfer by Government, we would aim to keep a number of these. We will examine resources and prioritise a range of environmental programmes including, for example, some of the following: RE:CONNECT, RE:LEAF, the all London Green Grid, the Low Carbon Capital programme and Green Enterprise Districts. Many of these projects not only promote a sustainable environment but help to promote future economic areas of growth in London's economy.

Core Greater London Authority – Assembly

Core Greater London Authority – Assembly	£2,600,000
No change	

The Assembly Budget is a small but important self-contained part of the Core GLA budgets. It faces several years of continuing savings and has, unlike the Mayor’s budget at City Hall, complied with the savings requirements set for it. We propose no changes to it. However, we do wish to signal a key issue that we believe needs to be addressed during the coming year, and which is described below.

During this calendar year, the closure of the LDA, and the transfer of its powers to City Hall, will conclude. Additionally, the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) ceased to exist in January 2012, with its duties and powers substantially transferred to the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPC). And the London powers, duties, budgets and assets of the Homes and Communities Agency will similarly transfer to City Hall, probably before the budget year commences. Collectively these represent a massive increase in the resources, and a considerable increase in the powers, of the Mayor’s Office from the 2012/13 budget onwards. Alongside the increased direct powers is an increased need for powers of transparency and accountability. While it has no immediate direct impact on the overall resources of the GLA, in our view the Assembly needs to consider during this year whether its powers and resources, to scrutinise and hold to account the Mayor’s exercise of his powers, are adequate. We are already adding a resource to enable scrutiny of the MOPC. A similar case can be made for the need to hold accountable the Mayor’s powers over housing and regeneration. We do not believe that the budget lines need to be amended at this stage but are signalling that a further and thorough discussion is needed to identify how the accountability of the Mayor can be improved in this changing landscape.

Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (formerly the MPA)

Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime	£711,394,960
Initiatives in support of Londoners	
Reorganisation of officers through the redeployment of specialist teams will enable additional officers to Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNT) in target wards with higher crime	Cost neutral
Save planned cuts to 150 SNT Sergeants, which would have been deployed elsewhere	Cost neutral
Dedicated burglary hot-spot police teams in the 10 boroughs with highest burglary rates	£1,080,000
Additional 32 Safer School Team PCSOs	£1,152,000
Action on gangs and youth knife crime to support partnership and CONNECT	£4,000,000
Additional resources for vehicles and kit to support increased road safety, such as Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR).	£400,000
TOTAL INITIATIVES	£6,632,000.00
Note: If we recovered from Government the cost of policing the Diamond Jubilee we could pay for an additional 286 officers.	£14,900,000
Efficiencies and savings	
Cut the Directorate of Public Affairs budget by 25%	£1,725,000
Reduced overtime budget	£1,807,000
Savings on unnecessary 1 st and business class air travel, senior officer cars and hotel use.	£300,000
Estates budgets:	£2,500,000
Cut energy use in police buildings	£300,000
TOTAL SAVINGS	£6,632,000.00

Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime

Government front loaded cuts to policing budgets of over 20% over the next 4 years coupled with the Mayor's lack of foresight in these matters has created extreme difficulties for London's policing. Police numbers are falling and crime rates which had fallen steadily over the last decade have now, in many cases, flat-lined and in some categories have increased over the past year, with residential burglary up 9%, personal robbery up 13%, knife crime up 14% and rape up 10%.

Police officer numbers have fallen⁶, down from a high of 33,260. The Mayor has again raided London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) reserves as a temporary fix to the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) budget, but, prior to the bail-out which we understand, is coming from the Home Office (the scope of which we do not yet understand, the MPS business plan clearly spells out that police officers would need to reduce to 30,064 in 2014/15 to meet budget gaps. We are also seeing drastic cuts to local authorities and other partner organisations that pay for additional officers, which the Mayor has admitted will see these posts decline. In order to try and balance the budgets, there have been severe cuts in police support staff numbers. Inevitably these have meant greater amounts of police time spent on desk bound and administrative work, reducing the visibility and efficiency of policing. In the longer term this will have an effect on police capacity – putting police behind desks mean something else doesn't get done.

A huge bail-out by the Government is the only way the Mayor will be able to balance his policing budget. He says an announcement is forthcoming. Hardly the way a Mayor in control should be leading this great City.

We will propose the following changes:

- We would halt the planned cuts of a further 150 sergeants and instead would invest further into local policing by targeting extra officers to those wards which have higher rates of youth violence, knife crime, robbery and burglary.
- We would seek to recover from Government the cost of policing the Diamond Jubilee celebrations. By recouping this expenditure we could pay for an additional 286 police officers.
- Residential burglary has increased 9% in the past year. We would identify burglary hotspots in the ten boroughs with the highest burglary crime rates and offer a crime prevention service by offering free locks, bolts and other security advice by a dedicated burglary action team.
- Last year saw a 13% increase in personal robbery across the Capital, with increases in 23 of London's boroughs. We would add additional officers to Safer Neighbourhood Teams in target wards and we are proposing to increase the

⁶ Latest available figure 31,332 at end of November 2011- figure provided by the MPA on 16/12/11

number of officers in Safer Transport Teams – this will provide extra visibility on local high streets (not just on buses) as an effective prevention. These officers would work in a more integrated way with borough police.

- Young people are disproportionately at a greater risk of crime. At the same time that we are seeing rises in serious youth violence and knife crime, funding is being reduced for intervention and prevention programmes. We would invest to support partnership work at the local level aimed at young people in addressing knife crime and gangs and would commit resources to Operation Connect which is currently being rolled out across 14 boroughs but is at risk of under investment.
- We would put resources back into Safer Schools Teams and would also work on tasking them in a more intelligence-led way and in closer partnership with Safer Neighbourhood Teams and Safer Transport Teams to offer joined-up and effective responses to local problems.
- Making London's roads safer is a priority. The Commissioner has recently stated the importance of combating vehicle crime, highlighting that "approximately 80 per cent of uninsured drivers are criminals. They're also more likely to be involved in crashes and have unsafe cars." We would invest in Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) technology and purchase extra vehicles to increase the number of units currently working across London.
- We believe there is scope to make increased efficiencies in office accommodation through co-location, and renting out spare capacity.
- Although 2012 will be a challenging year for the Met, we believe we can make better use of policing resources and cut down on overtime. The MPS must undertake work to develop a system whereby cover for desk jobs and low risk jobs are covered by officers on restricted and/or recuperative duties.
- We would make better use of portable technology or systems in place to enable officers to report crimes by telephone while will ensure the police remain on the beat engaged in visible policing, which will deliver a much more efficient police service.
- We insist that cuts should be made to non-essential spending, rather than cuts to front-line policing. We would ask officers to fly economy instead of first class; to stay in a budget hotel outside the central zone; cut the number of press officers in the MPS; and reduce the number of chauffeur driven cars.

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority	£127,739,727
No change	

London's Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) faces a 'backloaded' cut in grant which, combined with its historically large reserves, has meant that this year's budget-making has been relatively straightforward but creates a crisis situation for the following two years. For the second time, the Mayor has raided its reserves. While historically high and partly based on recurrent year-end underspends, the second raid on reserves poses a real risk. This is because of:

- The potential need for restructuring costs
- The apparent reliance on recurrent underspends to replenish reserves. In a changing world this cannot be guaranteed.

During the coming year, the Fire Authority will start its' review of London's Fire Safety Plan. Some form of restructure will almost certainly be needed because of budgetary challenges, changing demands and enhancement and modernisation of services for which a provision will almost certainly be needed. Diminished reserves will make this harder to manage. We note that on projections, in 2013/14 LFEPA's reserves will fall dangerously close to the recommended floor. While not opposing the shift in precept, we note that it places future risks on both the Fire and Police budgets.

In this year's budget, we identified a range of savings which in our view would seriously impact the quality of services and put at risk the progress made over the years to make LFEPA a world class service. These savings include some major areas such as community safety and health and safety. We would maintain the Authority's Investors in People Initiative.

We highlight and remain unhappy with two recent decisions of the Fire Authority which have major service, operational and budgetary impact. Both decisions are driven by political ideology to privatise services. The first is the unjustified decision to outsource training. The second is the Merton Control Centre providing emergency 999 services. The first decision has progressed to a point where its review would be difficult but an incoming Labour administration would see what options there are for damage limitation. On the second issue we would seek to reverse a decision to privatise this function.

We are also opposed to the proposal to impose a buy-out of terms and conditions of fire fighters. The world does change and employment conditions will need to change from time to time as a consequence but this should be approached through reasoned negotiation however, that the tactic of this administration is to deliberately provoke conflict, which we oppose. Our employees are professionals and their commitment and skills are a key asset of the authority. They should not be treated in this manner. As the Fire Safety Plan is reviewed the potential for changes in terms and conditions may

become apparent. That is the point at which changes would need to be considered properly.

Finally, we are opposed to the closure of the LFB Museum. This is an important asset for Londoners and its business plan should be developed.

The above forms a narrative to our budget amendment. It is written to highlight our very significant concerns and risks that LFEPA faces. We are proposing no change to LFEPA's budget at this stage. We do note, however, that by cancelling the proposed imposition of changes to Terms and Conditions, £3.106million would be released which would be used to reinforce reserves. After a review, a Labour administration will consider whether to reverse a number of the administration's savings decisions.

Transport for London

Transport for London Mayor's call upon the precept	£6,000,000
No change (but see below)	
Support for Londoners	
Cut Transport for London fares overall by 7% and bus fares by 11%, and restore Zone 2-6 Travel card facility (part-year cost)	£137,000,000
Tube station minimum staffing guarantee (equivalent to restoring 120 FT staff)	£ 5,000,000
Fund additional Transport Operational Command Units (Police teams on TfL) An additional 250 STT officers could be funded by £10 m	£10,000,000
Air Quality Improvement fund and acceleration of hybrid bus programme (50% Revenue/50% capital)	£20,000,000 (50% capital)
Commence safer junctions scheme – a programme of reworking of major traffic locations, red routes, junctions, roundabouts and gyratories most dangerous to cyclists and pedestrians. Capital Item.	£10,000,000 (capital)
Additional Step-Free Access Projects, Reinstate a target of at least 29% for step free stations by 2017 /2018 and 100% of bus stops to be accessible by 2017 /2018. Capital Item.	£45,000,000 (capital)
Total [£162,000,000 revenue £65,000,000 capital]	£227,000,000
Funded by:	
Anticipated unbudgeted surplus estimates (Operational & Financial Performance Report Transport for London 2 nd Quarter, 2011/12)	
Fares Income above budget	£59,000,000
Operating expenditure lower than budget	£131,000,000
Suspend Pedestrian Traffic lights removal project "Smoothing the Traffic"	£800,000
Total revenue available	£190,800,000
The £65,000,000 capital requirement can be funded by a mixture of the remaining revenue underspend and the capital underspend of £186,000,000	

Labour's priorities are:

- Supporting Londoners and London's businesses during the economic downturn
- Ensuring the public transport system is reliable, well run and affordable for Londoners
- Improving London's poor air quality
- Promoting health by encouraging more cycling and walking in the whole of London by making both activities safer and more convenient
- Improving the accessibility of the transport system for the entire community
- Combating rising crime on the transport network and ensuring passenger and staff safety

Labour members of the Assembly are committed to supporting the long term investment programme to upgrade the Underground and see the installation of the new Crossrail system for London. But additionally it's clear that alongside its investment and efficiency programmes Transport for London needs to refocus on improving the quality and reliability of its services to customers. Many of the problems with unreliability on the Underground and customer complaints about bus services are not financial issues but demonstrate a lack of senior political attention to the management and delivery of the service.

Our programme of changes proposed to the Mayor's plans for 2012/13 are based on the fact that Transport for London has reported unbudgeted operational surpluses for the previous 3 years and is showing evidence of regularly under-anticipating fares income and over estimation of other expenditures. Rather than accumulate these surpluses up as General Balances or pay off debts earlier than planned Labour would direct these resources to bringing financial relief to cash strapped passengers during the recession and improving the safety and accessibility of the journeys passengers, cyclists and pedestrians enjoy.⁷

Our priority is the people who use London's public transport and streets and our focus will be on the quality, safety, affordability and accessibility of the services they receive.

An affordable transport system The bus network serves the majority of Londoners well, but with four years of inflation busting increases the service is becoming unaffordable for some of the poorest and lower paid in our community. Travelling to work now costs a quarter of the take home pay of thousands of low paid Londoners and with high unemployment and many Londoners on frozen salaries the costs of living has become an urgent crisis. Cutting all fares back by 7% and slashing bus fares from

⁷ Note: Information on Transport for London surpluses is taken from Transport for London Operational and Performance Report -2nd Q (2011/12) Transport for London 23rd November 2012 Appendix Two : Financial Summary which showed Forecast Full year Operating margin of £202M surplus of income over expenditure on Transport Operations and Net Capital expenditure under spend of £186M (excluding Crossrail) . Previous years Operating surplus figures were £729M (2010/11) £206M (2009/2010) and £172M (2008/2009)

£1.35p back to £1.20p will save the average London commuter over £1,000 over the next four years.

Improving London's poor air quality Out of a total bus fleet of over 8,000 buses, only 300 will be hybrid models by the end of 2012.⁸ Converting the fleet to hybrid buses is an opportunity to reduce both carbon dioxide emissions and to tackle the dangerous particulates and oxides of nitrogen which cause injury and death to thousands of Londoners every year. We propose additional funding to the programme of replacement of existing diesel buses to fund an additional 50 hybrid buses entering the fleet in year.

Safer walking and cycling The Mayor's stated policy of 'Smoothing the Traffic' has focussed on a programme of rephasing and removing traffic lights which may affect pedestrians detrimentally. Unsurprisingly given the Mayor's narrow focus on speeding up vehicle traffic both pedestrian and cycling accidents have begun to rise again in London after decades of safety improvements.⁹

The Mayor initially announced plans to remove 145 traffic light sets across London but with localised campaigns and concerns from disability organisations, there has been a slowing of the programme. We propose the complete suspension of the programme and the protection of safe pedestrian crossing times for all traffic lights. More lights may need to have pedestrian phases introduced. We will also examine the prospects for improving cycling and pedestrian safety at many dangerous 'hotspot' locations and to make design improvements which focus on safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Many major junctions, gyratories and road schemes need improving to cope with the growing number of cyclists, and Boroughs all over London need additional funding support to install safe cycling facilities in towns and local district centres.

An additional air quality improvement pot would be added to the LIP funding programme to help local Councils fund small projects designed to reduce vehicle air pollution. This could include schemes to promote car clubs – successful schemes in Boroughs like Islington have shown that commercial car club schemes can dramatically reduce private car ownership and provide a practical and convenient alternative to occasional drivers. The net effect of this is to dramatically reduce overall car use.

Improving the accessibility of the transport system for the entire community

We intend to improve access to the transport network further and restore some of the projects dropped by the current Mayor – these improvements benefit everyone. We will reinstate some of the Step Free Access Programme at stations such as Harrow-on-the-Hill which Boris Johnson has cancelled. The Charity Transport for All has warned that

⁸ Source Group Budget Proposals and Precepts 2012-13 Mayor of London

⁹ Accidents including cyclists and pedestrians are rising (by 3% Pedestrians and 9% Cyclists) across London according to Transport for London figures 'Casualties in Greater London during 2010' published May 2011 Fact Sheet Better Routes and Places Directorate Transport for London Surface Transport

progress on making transport accessible is stalling. In the last year, Transport for London has:

- Cut the target to make stations step free to the platform from 29% to 26% by 2017/18
- Cut the target to make bus stops fully accessible from 75% to 65% by 2017/18
- Cut 650 of the frontline station staff on the Underground who provide the advice and assistance which enables older and disabled people to travel

Labour would re-instate the access targets and accelerate progress towards a target of at least 29% for step free stations and 100% of bus stops accessible by 2017/18.

Combating rising crime on the transport network

In 2002, the Transport Operational Command Unit was created, and has been subsequently expanded.

Overall London's Transport system is safe but with the twin pressures of economic recession and cuts to Metropolitan Police numbers crime is now growing on the transport network after declining steadily for nearly a decade.

The latest TfL published Crime Statistics Bulletin (Q2 July- September 2011/12) shows that on London's buses there was an increase in robberies of 19.8% compared to the same period last year. On the Underground and DLR sexual and drug offences rose and there have been dramatic increases in overall crime on both the TFL Overground and Tramlink systems.

We are also concerned that the combination of high fares and understaffed stations will deter more people from using public transport hence we aim to restore some of the station staffing cuts by Boris Johnson from quiet underground stations at night. The amendment makes some provision for restoring staffing levels at stations where staff and passengers are left feeling vulnerable. This will also add to the accessibility of these stations for elderly, disabled passengers or people needing help because of small children.

The Labour budget amendment therefore makes provision for increasing the number of uniformed police staff patrolling the transport system we will focus their services on the areas (and times) in the transport networks where passengers feel most vulnerable and in the Boroughs where crime on Transport is shown to be rising again. Most notably in bus services around Bromley, Lewisham, Lambeth Camden and Hounslow, plus in existing high bus related crime areas - Ealing, Westminster, Southwark and Newham. An additional 250 STT officers could be funded by £10m.

PART B: Proposal to approve, with amendments, the Draft Consolidated Budget for the 2012-13 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 2012-13 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 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 2012-13 for each constituent body as follows:

<i>Constituent body</i>	<i>Component council tax requirement</i>
Greater London Authority: Mayor of London	£87,050,000
Greater London Authority: London Assembly	£2,600,000
Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime	£711,394,960
London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority	£127,739,727
Transport for London	£6,000,000

3. The component council tax requirements shown in recommendation 2 above, give rise to a consolidated council tax requirement for the Authority for 2012-13 (shown at Line 56 in the attached Schedule) of **£934,784,687**

BUDGET RELATED MOTIONS

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

NOTES:

- a. 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.
 - b. To approve the Draft Consolidated Budget, without amendment, only a simple majority of votes cast is required. Again, abstentions are not counted.
 - c. The Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime replaces the Metropolitan Police Authority with effect from 16 January 2012 (Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 and SI 2011/3019)
 - d. The statutory budget calculations reflect the amendments made to sections 85 to 89 and Schedule 6 of the GLA Act under the Localism Act 2011 which came into force on 3 December 2011. The Mayor will from 2012-13 onwards be required to set a consolidated and component council tax requirement (rather than a budget requirement) and it is this which the Assembly will have 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 i.e. the budget requirement calculated under these sections in prior years net of general government grants (GLA General grant for the Mayor and Assembly, formula grant for LFEPA and MOPC - comprising revenue support grant and redistributed non domestic rates - and Home Office police grant for MOPC). These individual functional body requirements are consolidated to form the consolidated council tax requirement for the GLA Group.
 - e. The income estimates calculated under section 85 5(a) of the GLA Act are presented in three parts within the statutory calculations:
 - Income not in respect of government grant which includes fare revenues, congestion charging the Crossrail business rate supplement and all other income not received from central government (line 6 for the Mayor, line 17 for the Assembly, line 28 for MOPC, line 39 for LFEPA and line 50 for TfL);
 - Income in respect of specific and special government grants i.e. those grants which were not regarded as general grants. This includes the GLA Transport grant for TfL and specific grants for the GLA, LFEPA and MOPC (line 7 for the Mayor, line 18 for the Assembly, line 29 for MOPC, line 40 for LFEPA and line 51 for TfL);
 - Income in respect of general government grants i.e. GLA general grant, formula grant and Home Office police grant (line 8 for the Mayor, line 19 for the Assembly, line 30 for MOPC, line 41 for LFEPA and line 52 for TfL).
- In preparing amendments it should be noted that the latter two items relate to government grant income and are not directly in the control of the Mayor, the GLA or functional bodies.
- f. It is expected that the functions of the Olympic Park Legacy Company will be substantially transferred to a Mayoral Development Corporation during 2012-13. Neither of these bodies – ie neither the OPLC nor the MDC - is currently a constituent body for budget purposes and their budgets are therefore not reflected in the statutory calculations.

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)	£367,550,000	£393,638,800	estimated expenditure of the Mayor for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
(2)	£11,800,000	£11,011,200	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)	£0	£	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the Mayor under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
(5)	£379,350,000	£404,650,000	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)	-£146,000,000	£	estimate of the Mayor's income not in respect of Government grant or precept calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(7)	-£93,800,000	£	estimate of the Mayor's special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(8)	-£44,700,000	£	estimate of the Mayor's income in respect of redistributed non domestic rates, revenue support grant, police grant and GLA general grant calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(9)	-£7,800,000	-£33,100,000	estimate of Mayor's reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (1) and (2) above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
(10)	-£292,300,000	-£317,600,000	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for the Mayor (lines (6) + (7) + (8) + (9))
(11)	£87,050,000		the component council tax requirement for the Mayor (being the amount by which the aggregate at (5) above exceeds the aggregate at (10) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

The draft component council tax requirement for the Mayor for 2012-13 is £87,050,000

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
(12)	£7,700,000	£	estimated expenditure of the Assembly for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
(13)	£0	£	estimated allowance for contingencies for the Assembly under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
(14)	£0	£	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the Assembly under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
(15)	£0	£	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the Assembly under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
(16)	£7,700,000	£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for the Assembly (lines (12) + (13) + (14) + (15) above)
(17)	£0	£	estimate of the Assembly’s income not in respect of Government grant or precept calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(18)	£0	£	estimate of the Assembly’s special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(19)	-£5,100,000	£	estimate of the Assembly’s income in respect of redistributed non domestic rates, revenue support grant, police grant and GLA general grant calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(20)	£0	£	estimate of Assembly’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (12) and (13) above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
(21)	-£5,100,000	£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for the Assembly (lines (17) + (18) + (19) + (20))
(22)	£2,600,000	£	the component council tax requirement for the Assembly (being the amount by which the aggregate at (16) above exceeds the aggregate at (21) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

**The draft component council tax requirement for the Assembly for 2012-13 is:
£2,600,000**

Part 3: Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime ("MOPC") 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
(23)	£3,471,800,000	£	estimated expenditure of the MOPC calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
(24)		- £	estimated allowance for contingencies for the MOPC under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
(25)		- £	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the MOPC under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
(26)		- £	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the MOPC under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
(27)	£3,471,800,000	£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for the MOPC (lines (23) + (24) + (25) + (26) above)
(28)	-£292,400,000	£	estimate of the MOPC's income not in respect of Government grant or precept calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(29)	-£559,200,000	£	estimate of the MOPC's special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(30)	-£1,889,805,040	£	estimate of the MOPC's income in respect of redistributed non domestic rates, revenue support grant, police grant and GLA general grant calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(31)	-£19,000,000	£	estimate of MOPC's reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (23) and (24) above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
(32)	-£2,760,405,040	£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for the MOPC (lines (28) + (29) + (30) + (31))
(33)	£711,394,960	£	the component council tax requirement for MOPC (being the amount by which the aggregate at (27) above exceeds the aggregate at (32) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

The draft component council tax requirement for MOPC for 2012-13 is: £711,394,960

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
	Mayor’s Proposal	Budget amendment	Description
(34)	£448,100,000	£	estimated expenditure of LFEPA for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
(35)	£0	£	Estimated allowance for contingencies for LFEPA under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
(36)	£0	£	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of LFEPA under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
(37)	£0	£	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of LFEPA under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
(38)	£448,100,000	£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for LFEPA (lines (34) + (35) + (36) + (37) above)
(39)	-£27,400,000	£	estimate of LFEPA’s income not in respect of Government grant or precept calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(40)	-£10,900,000	£	estimate of LFEPA’s special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(41)	-£252,060,273	£	estimate of LFEPA’s income in respect of redistributed non domestic rates, revenue support grant, police grant and GLA general grant calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(42)	-£30,000,000	£	estimate of LFEPA’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (34) and (35) above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
(43)	-£320,360,273	£	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for LFEPA (lines (39) + (40) + (41) + (42) above)
(44)	£127,739,727	£	the component council tax requirement for LFEPA (being the amount by which the aggregate at (38) above exceeds the aggregate at (43) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

The draft component council tax requirement for LFEPA for 2012-13 is: £127,739,727

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
(45)	£10,040,000,000	£10,093,000,000	estimated expenditure of TfL for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the GLA Act
(46)		£0 £	estimated allowance for contingencies for TfL under s85(4)(b) of the GLA Act
(47)	£248,000,000	£	estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of TfL under s85(4)(c) of the GLA Act
(48)		£0 £	estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of TfL under s85(4)(d) of the GLA Act
(49)	£10,288,000,000	£10,341,000,000	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the GLA Act for the TfL (lines (45) + (46) + (47) + (48) above)
(50)	-£6,945,000,000	-£6,808,000,000	estimate of TfL’s income not in respect of Government grant or precept calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(51)	-£3,337,000,000	£	estimate of TfL’s special & specific government grant income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(52)		£0 £	estimate of TfL’s income in respect of redistributed non domestic rates, revenue support grant, police grant and GLA general grant calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the GLA Act
(53)		£0 -£190,000,000	estimate of TfL’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (45) and (46) above under s85(5)(b) of the GLA Act
(54)	-£10,282,000,000	-£10,335,000,000	aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the GLA Act for TfL (lines (50) + (51) + (52) + (53) above)
(55)	£6,000,000	£	the component council tax requirement for TfL (being the amount by which the aggregate at (49) above exceeds the aggregate at (54) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the GLA Act)

The draft component council tax requirement for TfL for 2012-13 is: £6,000,000

Part 6: The Greater London Authority ("GLA") draft consolidated budget

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
(56)	£934,784,687	£	the GLA's consolidated council tax requirement (the sum of the amounts in lines (11) + (22) + (33) + (44) +(55) calculated in accordance with section 85(8) of the GLA Act

The draft consolidated council tax requirement for 2012-13 is: £934,784,687