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1. **Apologies for Absence and Chair’s Announcements**

   To receive any apologies for absence and any announcements from the Chair.

2. **Declarations of Interests** *(Pages 1 - 2)*

   The Assembly is recommended to:

   (a) Note the list of memberships of functional bodies and London Borough Councils, as set out in the table at Item 2;

   (b) Note gifts and hospitality received by Members, as set out on the Authority’s gifts and hospitality register; and

   (c) Declare any other personal or personal prejudicial interests in specific items listed on the agenda over and above those items listed in the table above and including any interests arising from gifts or hospitality received within the previous three years or from the date of election to the London Assembly, whichever is the later, which are not at the time of this meeting reflected on the Authority’s register of gifts and hospitality.

3. **Minutes** *(Pages 3 - 278)*

   The Assembly is recommended to confirm the minutes of the London Assembly meetings held on 10 February 2011 (Plenary, Draft Budget) and 23 February 2011 (Mayor’s Question Time, Final Draft Budget) to be signed by the Chair as a correct record.

   The appendices to the minutes of the 10 and 23 February meetings (including the transcript of the question and answer sessions with the Mayor) are set out on pages 11 to 96 and 105 to 278 and are attached for Members only. Transcripts and written answers for past meetings can be downloaded from [http://www.london.gov.uk/who-runs-london/the-london-assembly/meetings/whole-assembly](http://www.london.gov.uk/who-runs-london/the-london-assembly/meetings/whole-assembly).
4. **Question and Answer Session: Olympic Park Legacy Company**

**Part A:**

The Chair will put the following question to the Chair and Chief Executive of the Olympic Park Legacy Company (OPLC), Baroness Ford and Andrew Altman: “What are the most important issues currently facing the OPLC?”.

Assembly Members will then ask oral questions regarding the work and priorities of the OPLC.

**Part B:**

Motion submitted in the name of the Chair:

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

5. **Proposal to Create a Mayoral Development Corporation for the Olympic Park and Surrounding Area** (Pages 279 - 282)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.
Contact: Richard Derecki, telephone: 020 7983 4899, richard.derecki@london.gov.uk

The Assembly is recommended to:

(a) Put questions to Sir Simon Milton, Deputy Mayor and Chief of Staff, on the Mayor’s proposals to create a Mayoral Development Corporation for the Olympic Park and surrounding area;

(b) Agree to delegate authority to the Chair, in consultation with the leaders of Assembly party Groups, to respond, on the Assembly’s behalf, to the Mayor’s consultation document: ‘Olympic Park Legacy Corporation: Proposals by the Mayor of London for public consultation’.

6. **Petition** (Pages 283 - 286)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat
Contact: Rebecca Arnold, rebecca.arnold@london.gov.uk tel: 020 7983 4421

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

7. **Petitions Update** (Pages 287 - 292)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat
Contact: Rebecca Arnold, rebecca.arnold@london.gov.uk tel: 020 7983 4421

The Assembly is recommended to note the responses received to petitions presented at recent Assembly meetings.
8. **Request for use of Section 60 (1) Powers - Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee** (Pages 293 - 342)

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat  
Contact: John Barry, telephone: 020 7983 4425, e-mail: john.barry@london.gov.uk

The Assembly is recommended to agree to the request of the Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee to use its powers under Section 60 (1) of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 (as amended) to request that the Mayor responds to the recommendations in the Committee’s report, *A Sporting Legacy for London*.

The appendix to this report is set out at pages 297 and 342 and is attached for Members only. The appendix can be downloaded from [http://www.london.gov.uk/who-runs-london/the-london-assembly/meetings/whole-assembly](http://www.london.gov.uk/who-runs-london/the-london-assembly/meetings/whole-assembly)

9. **Appointment of Head of Paid Service and Greater London Returning Officer (To follow)**

Report of the Assistant Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development  
Contact: Juliette Carter; telephone: 020 7983 4194; e-mail: juliette.carter@london.gov.uk


Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat  
Contact: John Bennett, telephone: 020 7983 4203, e-mail: john.bennett@london.gov.uk

The Assembly is recommended to agree and formally adopt, jointly with the Mayor, the recommendations of the GLA Advisory Panel on the 2009 SSRB review, as set out in sections 3.7, 4.7 and 5.8 of the Panel’s report (set out at Appendix 1), as the Authority’s formal response to the outstanding recommendations of the 2009 SSRB report.

11. **Motions** (Pages 353 - 354)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat  
Contact: Rebecca Arnold, rebecca.arnold@london.gov.uk tel: 020 7983 4421

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

12. **Date of Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting of the London Assembly will be the Mayor’s Question Time meeting which will take place at 10.00am on Wednesday 23 March 2011 in the Chamber, City Hall.
13. Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent
London Assembly
Membership of Functional Bodies and London Borough Councils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>(Personal) Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tony Arbour</td>
<td>Member, LFEPA; Member, MPA; Member, LB Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennette Arnold</td>
<td>Member, MPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gareth Bacon</td>
<td>Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Bexley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Barnbrook</td>
<td>Member, LB Hillingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Barnes</td>
<td>Member, MPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Biggs</td>
<td>Member, MPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Boff</td>
<td>Member, MPA; Member, Royal Borough of Kensington &amp; Chelsea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Borwick</td>
<td>Member, MPA; Member, Royal Borough of Kensington &amp; Chelsea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Cleverly</td>
<td>Member, MPA; Member, LDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Coleman</td>
<td>Chair of LFEPA; Member, LB Barnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee Doocie</td>
<td>Member, MPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len Duvall</td>
<td>Member, LB Havering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Evans</td>
<td>Member, LB Havering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicky Gavron</td>
<td>Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Lewisham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren Johnson</td>
<td>Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Lewisham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Jones</td>
<td>Member, MPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kit Malthouse</td>
<td>Chair, MPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne McCartney</td>
<td>Member, MPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve O’Connell</td>
<td>Member, MPA; Member, LB Croydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Pidgeon</td>
<td>Member, MPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murad Qureshi</td>
<td>Member, LFEPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navin Shah</td>
<td>Member, LB Harrow; Member, LFEPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Shawcross</td>
<td>Member, MPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Tracey</td>
<td>Member, LFEPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Tuffrey</td>
<td>Member, LFEPA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Note: LB - London Borough; LDA – London Development Agency; LFEPA – London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority; MPA – Metropolitan Police Authority.]

Recommendations:

(i) That the list of memberships of functional bodies and London Borough Councils, as set out in the table above, be noted;

(ii) That gifts and hospitality received by Members, as set out on the Authority’s gifts and hospitality register, be noted; and

(iii) That all Members declare any other personal or personal prejudicial interests in specific items listed on the agenda over and above those items listed in the table above and including any interests arising from gifts or hospitality received within the previous three years or from the date of election to the London Assembly, whichever is the later, which are not at the time of this meeting reflected on the Authority’s register of gifts and hospitality.

The above memberships of the GLA’s Functional Bodies and London Borough Councils are listed for the purposes of public transparency. However, Members should note that in accordance with the
GLA’s Code of Conduct, they must declare any other personal interests (except interests arising from gifts and hospitality that appear on the gifts and hospitality register at the time of the meeting) they have in any item on the agenda or as they arise during the course of the meeting. Members must say to which item their interest relates. If they have a personal interest Members must also consider whether or not that interest is a prejudicial personal interest and take the necessary action. When considering whether or not they have a declarable interest, Members should consult paragraphs 8-12 of the Code.

A personal interest is, generally, one that would affect a Member (either directly or through a connection with a relevant person or organisation) more than other people in London, in respect of the item of business under consideration at the meeting.

If a member of the public, knowing all the relevant facts, would view a Member’s personal interest in the item under consideration as so substantial that it would appear likely to prejudice the Member’s judgment of the public interest, then the Member has a prejudicial personal interest.

The Code of Conduct also specifically requires Members, where considering a matter which relates to or is likely to affect a person from whom they have received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25 within the previous three years or from the date of election to the London Assembly, whichever is the later, to disclose the existence and nature of that interest at any meeting of the Authority which they attend at which that business is considered.

The obligation to declare any gift or hospitality at a meeting as a personal interest is discharged, subject to the proviso set out below, by registering gifts and hospitality received on the Authority’s on-line database. The on-line database may be viewed here: http://www.london.gov.uk/gifts-and-hospitality-register. At Assembly meetings, under the declarations of interest agenda item, Members are then asked to note that gifts and hospitality received by Members are set out on the Authority’s register.

If any gift or hospitality received by a Member is not set out on the on-line database at the time of the meeting, and under consideration is a matter which relates to or is likely to affect a person from whom a Member has received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25, Members are required to disclose these at the meeting, either at agenda Item 2 or when the interest becomes apparent.

It is for Members to decide, in light of the particular circumstances, whether an interest arising from the receipt of a gift or hospitality is also a prejudicial personal interest. Where receipt of a gift or hospitality does give rise to a prejudicial interest the Member must withdraw from the room and not seek to improperly influence any relevant decision.

Consequences: If a Member has a personal interest: they must declare the interest but can stay, speak and vote. If the Member has prejudicial personal interest: they declare the interest, cannot speak or vote on the item and must leave the room.
MINUTES

Meeting: London Assembly (Plenary)
Date: Thursday 10 February 2011
Time: 10.00 am
Place: Chamber, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA

Copies of the minutes may be found at: http://www.london.gov.uk/who-runs-london/the-london-assembly/whole-assembly

Present:

Dee Doocey (Chair) Nicky Gavron
Jennette Arnold (Deputy Chair) Darren Johnson
Tony Arbour Jenny Jones
Gareth Bacon Kit Malthouse
Richard Barnbrook Joanne McCartney
Richard Barnes Steve O’Connell
John Biggs Caroline Pidgeon
Andrew Boff Murad Qureshi
Victoria Borwick Navin Shah
James Cleverly Valerie Shawcross
Brian Coleman Richard Tracey
Len Duvall Mike Tuffrey
Roger Evans
1. **Apologies for Absence and Chair’s Announcements (Item 1)**

1.1 There were no apologies for absence.

1.2 During the course of the meeting, the Chair welcomed to the public gallery students from Redbridge Primary School and Lucas School in Antwerp.

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

2.1 **Resolved:**

   (a) That the relevant Assembly Members’ membership of Functional Bodies and London Borough Councils, as set out in Item 2 on the agenda, be noted and recorded as personal interests;

   (b) That the Chair’s declaration of a personal interest in Item 3 (Draft Consolidated Budget 2011/12), arising from her position as a member of the London Youth Games Board, be additionally noted; and

   (c) That gifts and hospitality received by Members, as set out in the Authority’s gifts and hospitality register, be noted.

3. **Draft Consolidated Budget 2011/12 (Item 3)**

   **Report of the Mayor (Item 3a)**

3.1 The Assembly received the Mayor’s Draft Consolidated Budget proposals for 2011/12.

3.2 The Mayor made an oral statement in support of his budget proposals. A copy of the Mayor’s statement is attached as **Appendix 1**.

   **Response by the London Assembly’s Budget and Performance Committee to the Mayor of London’s ‘GLA Group Budget Proposals and Precepts 2011/12 Consultation Document’ (Item 3b)**

3.3 The Chairman of the Assembly’s Budget and Performance Committee, John Biggs AM, presented that Committee’s response to the Mayor of London’s ‘GLA Group Budget Proposals and Precepts 2011/12 Consultation’ document. A copy of the Chairman of the Assembly’s Budget and Performance Committee’s statement is attached as **Appendix 2**.

3.4 **Resolved:**

   That the response by the London Assembly’s Budget and Performance Committee to the Mayor of London’s ‘GLA Group Budget Proposals and Precepts 2011/12 Consultation’ document be received and noted.
Questions to the Mayor (Item 3c)

3.5 Assembly Members put questions to the Mayor on each of the component budgets contained within his Draft Consolidated Budget proposals.

3.6 The record of the questions put by Members, together with the Mayor’s answers, is attached as Appendix 3.

3.7 Sir Simon Milton, Deputy Mayor and Chief of Staff, and Martin Clarke, Executive Director of Resources, were also in attendance for this item.

Consideration by the London Assembly of the Mayor of London’s Draft Consolidated Budget proposals 2011/12 (Item 3d)

3.8 The substantive motion before the Assembly was: “To approve the Draft Consolidated Budget for 2011/12, together with the draft component budgets comprised within it, with or without amendment.”

3.9 A formal budget amendment, presented on behalf of the London Assembly’s Conservative Group, was moved by Gareth Bacon AM and seconded by Roger Evans AM (and is attached as Appendix 4).

3.10 A formal budget amendment, presented on behalf of the London Assembly’s Green Group, was moved by Darren Johnson AM and seconded by Jenny Jones AM (and is attached as Appendix 5).

3.11 A formal budget amendment, presented on behalf of the London Assembly’s Liberal Democrat Group, was moved by Mike Tuffrey AM and seconded by Caroline Pidgeon AM (and is attached as Appendix 6).

3.12 A formal budget amendment, presented on behalf of the London Assembly’s Labour Group, was moved by John Biggs AM and seconded by Valerie Shawcross AM (and is attached as Appendix 7).

3.13 At 12.50pm, the Chair adjourned the meeting until 1.35pm. The meeting reconvened at 1.35pm.

3.14 The Assembly then turned to debate of the Mayor’s Draft Consolidated Budget 2011/12 and the four formal budget amendments.
Following the debate and upon being put to the vote:

The formal budget amendment proposed by Gareth Bacon AM was declared lost (with 11 votes being cast in favour and 13 votes being cast against).

The formal budget amendment proposed by Darren Johnson AM was declared lost (with 2 votes being cast in favour and 22 votes being cast against).

The formal budget amendment proposed by Mike Tuffrey AM was declared lost (with 3 votes being cast in favour and 19 votes being cast against).

The formal budget amendment proposed by John Biggs AM was declared lost (with 8 votes being cast in favour and 14 votes being cast against).

John Biggs AM moved and Darren Johnson AM seconded the following budget related motion:

‘This Assembly considers that in his draft budget for 2011/12 the Mayor has failed to respond to Londoners’ concerns to protect frontline policing, failed to deliver sustained investment to tackle London’s deep-seated environmental problems, and failed to keep London’s public transport affordable.

The Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor to change his budget by:

• Putting more money and police numbers into borough and safer neighbourhood policing and reversing some of the budget reductions to Territorial Policing;
• Providing a higher level of continuous sustained investment for measures to address London’s environmental challenges, including air pollution and energy efficiency;
• Reducing the impact of his fares package.’

At 2.52pm the Chair adjourned the meeting until 3.07pm. The meeting reconvened at 3.07pm.

Roger Evans AM moved and Darren Johnson AM seconded the following budget related motion:

‘This Assembly considers that in his draft budget for 2011-12 the Mayor should take account of the £6m cost of the 101 project that is unjustified and unaffordable in the current economic climate. The funding for this project should be removed in time for the final consolidated budget’s publication’

Upon being put to the vote, the budget related motion in the name of John Biggs AM, namely:

‘This Assembly considers that in his draft budget for 2011/12 the Mayor has failed to respond to Londoners’ concerns to protect frontline policing, failed to deliver sustained investment to tackle London’s deep-seated environmental problems, and failed to keep London’s public transport affordable.'
The Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor to change his budget by:

- Putting more money and police numbers into borough and safer neighbourhood policing and reversing some of the budget reductions to Territorial Policing;
- Providing a higher level of continuous sustained investment for measures to address London’s environmental challenges, including air pollution and energy efficiency;
- Reducing the impact of his fares package.’

was carried (13 votes in favour and 11 votes against).

3.20 Upon being put to the vote, the budget related motion in the name of Roger Evans AM, namely:

‘This Assembly considers that in his draft budget for 2011-12 the Mayor should take account of the £6m cost of the 101 project that is unjustified and unaffordable in the current economic climate. The funding for this project should be removed in time for the final consolidated budget’s publication’

was carried (unanimously).

[Note: Kit Malthouse AM was not present for the vote on this budget related motion.]

3.21 There being no other formal budget amendments or budget-related motions, the substantive motion, namely:

“To approve the Draft Consolidated Budget for 2011/12, together with the draft component budgets comprised within it, without amendment.”

was put to the vote. Upon being put to the vote, it was not carried (11 votes in favour and 13 votes against).

3.22 However, it was noted that, as no amendment to the Draft Consolidated Budget had attracted a simple majority of votes cast in its favour, the Draft Consolidated Budget for 2011/12, as submitted by the Mayor, was deemed to have been approved without amendment, in accordance with Paragraph 5(5) of Schedule 6 to the GLA Act 1999 (as amended).

3.23 The Chair announced that this concluded the Assembly’s consideration of the Draft Consolidated Budget and that the Assembly would consider the Final Draft Consolidated Budget at its meeting on 23 February 2011.
4. **Review of the Post of Chief Executive (Item 4)**

4.1 The Assembly received the report of the Executive Director of Resources and of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

4.2 **Resolved:**

(a) *That, noting that this is a joint decision to be formally taken with the Mayor, and following a review into the roles and functions currently undertaken by the Chief Executive of the Greater London Authority, it be agreed formally to consult the Chief Executive and affected staff on the proposal to delete the post of Chief Executive; and*

(b) *That, noting that this is a joint decision with the Mayor and in accordance with the Protocol for Statutory Officers, it be agreed that the GLA should seek expressions of interest from internal postholders to undertake the Head of Paid Service and Greater London Returning Officer roles and functions which must continue to be carried out in the event that the Chief Executive post is subsequently approved for deletion.*

5. **Date of Next Meeting (Item 5)**

5.1 It was noted that the next meeting of the Assembly would be the Mayor’s Question Time meeting on Wednesday 23 February 2011 at 10.00 am in the Chamber, City Hall.

5.2 This meeting would be used principally to consider the Final Draft Consolidated Budget 2010/11.

6. **Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent (Item 6)**

6.1 The Chair of the Assembly explained that she had agreed, in accordance with section 100(B)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), to admit the item at 6(b) of the supplementary agenda to the agenda for this meeting as an item of urgent business in order to allow its consideration at the earliest opportunity, noting that the information set out in the report was not available at the time of the publication of the agenda for the meeting.

6.2 Brian Coleman AM referred to an article which had appeared on the Evening Standard’s website earlier that day in relation to the report and, noting that the report at 6(b) had been circulated to Assembly Members on the basis that it was exempt from publication, requested that the Chair ask officers to initiate an internal enquiry into how the information had been made public. The Chair stated that she had already been in discussion with officers on this matter. The Executive Director of Secretariat was to prepare options in relation to the possible conduct of such an investigation which the Chair would discuss with the Leaders of the party Groups as soon as possible but outside of the meeting.
Exclusion of Public and Press (Item 6a)

6.3 Resolved:

That it be agreed to exclude the public and press from the meeting and consider the report at Item 6(b) in private, noting that consideration of the report will involve the likely disclosure of exempt information, namely 'information relating to an individual', as defined under Paragraph 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

[Note: The remainder of the meeting took place in Committee Room 5, City Hall.]

Review of the post of Chief Executive of the GLA (Item 6b)

6.4 Resolved:

That the recommendations set out in the report be agreed.

7. Close of Meeting

7.1 The meeting closed at 3.36pm.

Chair

Date

Contact Officer: Rebecca Arnold
Committee Services Manager
GLA Secretariat, City Hall
The Queen’s Walk, London SE1 2AA

Telephone: 020 7983 4421
Email: rebecca.arnold@london.gov.uk
Dee Doocey (Chair): Mr Mayor, if you would like to set out your budget, please?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Thank you very much, Dee. At a time when the rising cost of living is foremost in people’s minds, I hope Londoners will welcome my proposals to freeze my share of the Council Tax for the third year running. By the end of this year this will amount to a 10% cut in real terms in the precept since I was elected. I have secured a good deal for London at a time of unprecedented national austerity as the coalition gets to grips with the appalling deficit bequeathed by the last Government.

I do not want to understate the challenges we face but this Government has listened to all of us here. It understands that London is the engine of the UK economy and has not reduced our funding by as much as elsewhere. Again, this is in contrast with the record of the last Government when London was treated less generously than any other region.

I had hoped to put before you details of the London Development Agency (LDA) budget for the coming year but we are still awaiting an official announcement from Government. Negotiations between my office and the Treasury have concluded and I am confident that the proposals in my draft budget will be fully funded through the economic development pot that Ministers have promised London. You will just have to wait a little bit longer for the full detail.

On transport, we have secured Crossrail in full; the Tube upgrades in full; protected our bus service and the most comprehensive concessions protecting vulnerable people in the country; and we will get the Thameslink upgrade. In the last 12 months we have seen the East London line completed ahead of time and on budget and now, ten months after it was opened, 70,000 passengers are travelling on it every day; more than double the numbers on the old line. We have seen the launch of the Barclays cycle hire scheme which has seen them pedalled around London a distance of ten million kilometres, the equivalent of 13 trips to the moon and back, on 2.5 million journeys. It may be miles next time. This year will see it expanded east.

I delivered on my promise to abide by the consultation of West London residents and I have removed the west extension zone of the congestion charge. I have reviewed the projected local improvement plans funding (LIPs), in Transport for London’s (TfL) business plan, which is projected to fall from £147.8 million in 2011-2012 to £143 million in 2012-13, to £130 million in 2013-14. The boroughs are crucial to the delivery of my transport strategy and so I have decided to ask TfL to keep this allocation level at £147.8 million over all three financial years.

My administration is well on the way to delivering a record number of affordable homes in the face of the worst recession since the Great Depression. We are close to planting the 10,000 new street trees I promised. This past year has been an important one also in our preparation for the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Work on the Olympic Park site is nearer completion and we are more advanced in our legacy planning than any other city in Olympic
I have secured a deal with the London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG) that will give one in eight London school children a free ticket to enjoy the games up close, and 34,000 have so far signed up to be a London Ambassador.

The last year saw the delivery of my promise to quadruple London’s provision of rape crisis centres. Three new centres have opened in the west, the north and the east of the City. I thank the boroughs that have helped in delivering the commitment I made three years ago. This is particularly important to me and to all of us in view of the increase that we have seen in sexual violence.

Generally we are succeeding in bearing down on crime and people assume that this would be difficult in view of the worst recession in our country for generations. There has been no such corresponding rise in crime. Said crime is down almost 8% across the board and youth violence is down 15% since I was elected, murder is now at its lowest rate since 1978. The new leadership in the Metropolitan Police Service has brought about pragmatic and sensible reforms that have had a real effect on bearing down on crime in London. Like allowing officers to patrol singly, a fantastically pragmatic measure that could up to double the number of police patrols. In fact, by 2012 there will be one million more patrols than when I was first elected.

Operation Blunt Two has taken more than 10,000 knives off the streets and my initiatives to address the root causes of serious youth violence are beginning to make a difference. The Heron Unit at Feltham Young Offenders Institute is being expanded after a brilliantly successful first year. The recidivism of people who have been through the Heron Unit is just 21% compared to over 80% in other units. My mentoring project which aims to recruit 1,000 black men to be positive role models for vulnerable teenagers has already had over 800 expressions of interest from people applying to be mentors.

I remember in 2008 people’s concern about crime on public transport. My measures, such as deploying safer transport teams as well as simple things such as banning booze on TfL services have resulted in crime being forced down by 30% on the buses and 20% on the Tube and the Docklands Light Railway (DLR). That is a fantastic achievement and I pay tribute to all the officers who have done such great work.

But I believe we can go further in bearing down on crime, so in my budget today I am proposing to increase funding for the Metropolitan Police Service by some £42 million. This investment means that as of next week we are starting up recruitment again for the Metropolitan Police Service in order to reach a target of 32,510 full-time warranted police officers. By the end of my first term of office London will have significantly more police officers than I inherited in 2008. We are also going to expand our Safer Transport Teams by more than 400 officers, meaning our buses, tubes and stations will become ever safer. We are also increasing by 70 the number of police officers based in schools and creating a new pool of 120 officers to work in partnership with the boroughs to hit crime hotspots and problem areas. We are protecting Safer Neighbourhood Teams and the ward based system that has proven so successful and so popular. By streamlining the management of some of the capital’s smaller and quieter wards, performance will be improved. All of this on top of the 6,700 specials we will have this year; up from 1,250 when we started.
So at a time when police forces around England are reducing in size we are going in the opposite direction. In part this is down to the strong case that we put to government but it is also thanks to the excellent stewardship of the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) resources led by Deputy Mayor for Policing, Kit Malthouse AM, and the leadership of the Metropolitan Police Service headed by Sir Paul Stephenson [Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis].

This is a budget that builds on the achievements of my mayoralty, delivering my priorities - our priorities - whilst protecting Londoners from increases in Council Tax. We are fighting London’s corner, we are building a lasting legacy for the Olympics, and we are making London a safer place and giving our young people opportunities for the future. By constantly working to improve Londoner’s quality of life through improving our parks and green spaces, upgrading our transport system and delivering homes for people to live in, we are continuing, in short Members of the Assembly, to lengthen London’s lead as the best big city on earth to live in. Thank you very much.
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John Biggs (AM): Just for interested members of the public, my job is to speak as Chairman of the Budget and Performance Committee at this stage and obviously that differs from perhaps the role I will carry out later on when we take perhaps slightly more party political positions.

I want to just really start by thanking my colleagues on the Committee for our ability to overwhelmingly throughout the year address issues of budgetary scrutiny in a consensual way. I wanted to also thank the Mayor’s office and the Mayor for their co-operation with our committee because our purpose is essentially to, on behalf of the Assembly, scrutinise the early versions of the budget, to ask probing questions. That both helps to improve the Mayor’s budget, it also helps to furnish the political groups with better information so that we can better consider from a political perspective, as we are expected to, the Mayor’s proposals.

The position we are in as a budget committee is we recognise that this is a difficult budgetary climate because of cutbacks in Government grant. We are frustrated at the timing of this because, of course, it has been delayed because of delays in Government grant announcements. I think we are a little frustrated also that the Mayor can speak with confidence that he knows what the budget settlements are, whereas they have not actually been formally announced yet. So that does leave the Assembly in a slightly difficult position in terms of being able to properly scrutinise and hold to account what the Mayor is proposing to do. I think that is an issue we need to return to. It does mean the budgets in front of us are rather incomplete and I think that probably means that all the party groups, unless they have privileged information, have amendments which are based on an incomplete understanding of the Mayor’s budget.

Running through the different parts of the Mayor’s Functional Bodies, we noticed, as a Budget and Performance Committee, that there is a significant cut in the grant funding for policing in the next year. We recognise that the Mayor is changing the allocation of precept money to help cushion the effect of that but that, nevertheless, this does mean some downward pressure on police budgets which will have an impact on his ability to provide the level of cover that we would be used to having in London. We will debate that at greater length later on.

I think we note also that on the question of warranted officers - some warranted officers not being full-time officers are not quite the same as other full-time warranted officers - and that is a matter that maybe can be discussed later on.

On the TfL budget, we continue to be frustrated that the TfL budgets are somewhat out of sync with the budget making of the Assembly and so we have seen what approximately seem to be the TfL’s proposals for budgets in the next year. Even more frustrating is that the LDA budget is incomplete because we do not know what that is. We are reassured by some of the statements of the Mayor about what he wants to fund but we do need to see further what the detail of that might be.
On the fire service budgets, we have looked at that in some detail and we do acknowledge as a Committee that its reserves can be used to help other parts of the Greater London Assembly (GLA) family in the coming year. But we note also that the backdated budget settlement, the back-loaded budget settlement for fire means that in future years, next year and the year after that, there are some pretty awful decisions, potentially, for the fire service and we would like to have a transparent debate within the GLA about the implications of that for fire cover in London. Let us see how that rolls out in the coming year.

The other comments I think we would want to make is that TfL has enormous ambitions to make back office savings through efficiencies and the GLA family as a whole, through shared services. We have not yet seen the evidence that these are going to bear all of the fruit that they promise, although we take it at face value that they will do. So we commend our reports to the Assembly.

If you look at the Mayor’s budget today, it does cover our key recommendations. We made four in our recent report and we are grateful that the Mayor has addressed those. This is a somewhat surreal experience for me because I always stand in this Chamber in a slightly less bureaucratic fashion. But can I thank my Members of the Committee for their help in producing our budget responses and may it shed further light on today’s deliberations.
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Introduction

The Conservative Assembly Group is producing its second alternative budget under a Conservative Mayor and administration in City Hall. Whereas under the previous administration we proposed wide-ranging alterations across all of the GLA Group to hold the Council Tax precept down to a more reasonable and realistic level in the face of a Mayor keen to squeeze every penny out Londoners, we now have in Boris Johnson a far more responsible Mayor who is pressing down on costs across all the functional bodies and favouring a more realistic budget than his predecessor.

We welcome the freeze in the precept for an unprecedented third year running. By doing so the Mayor is able to take advantage of the Government's promise to pay 2.5% of budget to any local authority freezing Council Tax in 2011-12 and means an extra £23.2m in funding to the GLA. As an added statistical basis, freezing the precept for three years equates in real terms after inflation to a 6% cut.

Where things have changed is in this responsible approach to balancing the budget and we only wish that Ken Livingstone had had the financial control to have got anywhere near doing the same thing during his time in office. This is especially damning considering he was Mayor during a time of financial prosperity for the country.

Instead, Mr Livingstone saw fit to increase the precept burden on all Londoners whilst at the same time indulging in RPI+10% fare increases for TfL in non-election years followed by a cynical fare cut as the ballot box loomed. During his eight years, Ken Livingstone increased the precept by 152% overall with a record in his first term of the annual increases being 23%, 15%, 29%, 7.5% - the fourth year was presumably another election sweetener. That is the legacy of Labour. A return to Mr Livingstone as Mayor would only bring more of the same.

Table 1: Boris Johnson’s annual precept: 2008-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Johnson precept - £</th>
<th>Johnson increase - £</th>
<th>Johnson increase - %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>£309.82</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>£309.82</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>£309.82</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Ken Livingstone’s annual precept: 2000-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Livingstone precept - £</th>
<th>Livingstone increase - £</th>
<th>Livingstone increase - %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>£122.98</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>£150.88</td>
<td>£28.00</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>£173.88</td>
<td>£23.00</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>£224.40</td>
<td>£50.52</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>£241.33</td>
<td>£16.93</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>£254.62</td>
<td>£13.29</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>£288.61</td>
<td>£33.99</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>£303.88</td>
<td>£15.27</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>£309.82</td>
<td>£5.94</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 2000-08</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>£186.84</strong></td>
<td><strong>+152%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What we hope for the future is that the freezing of the precept for three years presages reductions in the precept in future years. The GLA saw massive precept increases when the economy was good and the Conservative group would not want to see a return to fiscal irresponsibility as the economy picks up again. This can be achieved through sensible budgeting and strategic placement of the GLA rather than the grand empire building of the previous administration.

As Boris Johnson has said frequently, London is the engine of the nation’s economy. It needs to be built up and allowed to flourish not hamstrung by the prospect of yet more Labour bureaucracy and mismanagement.

The successes outlined in the Mayor’s budget and the measures that he has had to take are despite the last Labour government’s miserable failure with the public finances that left the country paying £120m per day in interest alone, spending more on borrowing than the NHS and Defence combined and a public sector debt that more than doubled from £351bn in 1997 to £893bn in April 2010 – all during a time of economic boom. Not only was the roof not fixed by Labour, the tiles were sold off and the building company went bust under Labour’s red tape.
**Conservative Group Amendment**

**Core GLA – Mayor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLA Core</th>
<th>Mayor’s draft</th>
<th>Conservative proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11 Budget requirement</td>
<td>£131.8</td>
<td>£131.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings &amp; efficiencies</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New initiatives &amp; service improvements</td>
<td>+35.1</td>
<td>+29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government funding</td>
<td>-13.7</td>
<td>-13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in use of reserves</td>
<td>-18.9</td>
<td>-18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency available for the Group budget</td>
<td>+10.2</td>
<td>+10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2011-12 total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget change from 2010-11</th>
<th>£138.6</th>
<th>£132.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+6.8</td>
<td>+0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The previous Mayor took what was supposed to be a *'lean and strategic authority'* and turned it into a bloated bureaucracy that topped 700 permanent members of staff rather than the original 450 that City Hall was designed for. Once the Olympics was added in, the annual budget for the GLA increased by over £100m from 2000 to 2008 and the GLA provided an easy excuse for the Livingstone empire building to run amok.

Since the change of Mayor in 2008, the theme of the administration has been to reduce the burden on taxpayers whilst maintaining the work provided by the organisation. At the same time, new successes have included:

- 3 new rape crisis centres and extra funding for the existing centre after closures during the Livingstone years
- Investment into London parks and street trees
- Economic recovery plan launched
- Preventing violence against women strategy developed
- Protection for London’s green spaces rather than allowing them to be concreted over by developers using the Labour government’s planning guidelines that turned back gardens into brown field sites
- City Hall establishment reduced to cut the burden on the taxpayer
- Cutting waste and making savings across the group of £1bn

The Conservative Group is proposing a £6m reduction in the GLA’s spend on new initiatives’ funding for old LDA projects. This can instead continue to be covered by the LDA through vireing the funding across to the GLA using s120 and 121 of the GLA Act if necessary. The LDA can then re-evaluate the projects it continues to fund and decide which can be removed and the funds used for more useful projects. A prime case for removal is the £6m for the long overdue 101 phone number. The project can be cut and the £6m saved passed to the GLA for old LDA projects whilst the LDA tidies up what it funds internally. This will mean money is not wasted and will reduce the GLA call on the precept.

---

1. John Prescott MP, Hansard, 14th December 1998
The Conservative Assembly Group is happy to see proposals from the Assembly for a £600,000 saving from the budget. However, the Mayor asked for a 10% reduction to be looked at and the savings made represent only 7%. The Mayor said in a letter to the Chair of the Assembly;

“GLA officials are developing a fourth option for the Mayoral component for 2011-12 which involves a saving of 10% on the 2010-11 budget.

It would be prudent for the same option to be worked up for the Assembly component for 2011-12. This would amount to a saving of £860,000 in total on the Assembly budget for 2010-11.

“Therefore I expect to see a fourth option of 10% savings for 2011-12 exemplified by the Assembly when it considers its savings.”

Whilst the Mayor didn’t quite make the 10% target himself, the Conservative Group proposes to take a responsive lead on this issue and cut the cost of Member Services for the political groups by 15% from that proposed or £360,000. This figure not only means the Assembly meets its overall 10% reduction from 2010-11, but it also goes another £100,000 beyond.

---

3 28th July letter from Mayor of London to Chair of the Assembly re: supplementary budget guidance.
The Police remain the largest call upon the precept with over 70% of the investment made by Londoners to the GLA group going to the MPA. Projects that this investment supports include maintaining the Safer Neighbourhood Teams for local policing, reducing youth violence and knife crime and preparing for the security of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

Last year we applauded the Mayor for promoting Operation Herald to free up 550 warranted officers from back office roles to return to the front line for London’s benefit. In a time of austerity when the Met have had to instigate a recruitment freeze for new police officers, it is only right that public authorities maximise their resources and use fully trained and experienced officers in the roles they are trained for.

This year the Mayor has shown his commitment to policing in London through the reallocation of £30m of resources from across the GLA group to the Met. Rather than reduce funding even further in the current financial situation, the MPA is still proposing an increase in its overall budget.

No doubt one of the criticisms from the opposition will be of the Mayor cutting police officer numbers. What the Mayor has always said is that officer numbers will be higher at the end of his four year term than they were at the beginning. This is exactly what will happen. In April 2008 the Met had 31,398 warranted officers and the prediction for 2011-12 is 32,510.4

On top of this Special Constables are estimated to reach over 5,000 this year and rising to 6,667 in 2011-12. Considering they each patrol for four hours per week they equate to 10% of a paid officer, this means that the Met has the equivalent of an extra 500 officers, rising to over 660 next year. The Met are also expected to re-start warranted officer recruitment in the next few months.

---

4 Policing London Business Plan 2011-14, January 2011
Conservative Group Amendment thereby replacing officers that do leave the service and, in addition, the move to single patrolling in appropriate areas is worth an extra 330 officers as well.\(^5\)

The truth is that even on the most pessimistic estimate, the MPS will still be almost 750 warranted officers more in 2011-12 than it was under the previous administration in 2008 and updated estimates put that at over 1,100 higher. The Special Constables and the single patrolling make this increase even higher. The Mayor is fulfilling his promise to provide more policing for London and the opposition should recognise this fact.

\(^5\) Deputy Commissioner Tim Godwin, GLA Budget Committee, 7\(^{th}\) December 2010
London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mayor’s draft</th>
<th>Conservative proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LFEPA</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11 Budget requirement</td>
<td>437.3</td>
<td>437.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td>Change:</td>
<td>Change:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+2.6</td>
<td>+2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed savings in existing services and programmes</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New initiatives &amp; service provisions</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New savings &amp; efficiencies</td>
<td>-10.9</td>
<td>-10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in use of reserves</td>
<td>-19.3</td>
<td>-19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12 total</td>
<td>409.4</td>
<td>409.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget increase from 2010-11</td>
<td>-27.9</td>
<td>-27.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The big issue for LFEPA over recent months has been the divisive union dispute over shift patterns. Despite ongoing discussions over six years it is only recently that an agreement has been successfully concluded. Now that LFEPA has resolution on this issue, it, and the LFB, can concentrate on doing what it does best and provide fire cover for London.

The Mayor maintains his key deliverables as the reduction and prevention of fires and the undertaking of 230,000 home fire safety visits over the next three years. Budget wise LFEPA has had £19.3m reduced from its reserves in favour of that funding reallocating to the MPA, so the financial pressures on LFEPA remain after having been the most robustly financially managed of the functional bodies through recent years.

Where LFEPA has succeeded is in the good stewardship from its leadership in building up the reserves and steering the ship successfully to the strong point that it currently is in, which has allowed the Mayor the flexibility to channel additional resources into the MPA where they were needed. The Chairman and his team should be congratulated for their work over the last three years to improve the authority so that this flexibility has proven possible.
Conservative Group Amendment

The Conservative group are pleased to see the precept taken from TfL reduced to £6m for the coming year. We have long argued that with the high income levels of TfL to factor in a small precept was unnecessary, so halving it is a very positive step for the council tax payer in London.

Whilst we hope that all sides on the London Assembly welcome the reduction in the precept, the main controversies to be debated will no doubt centre on the fares package for 2011 and the scrapping of the western extension zone of the Congestion Charge.

The position needs to be stated very clearly, Boris Johnson was bequeathed a £1.3bn black hole in TfL’s finances by the previous administration that cynically used fares as a political football to try and bribe Londoners. Such a terrible heritage needed to be addressed and Boris Johnson set about doing so by instituting £5bn in savings over the course of TfL’s business plan.

Ken Livingstone and his cohort complain about the RPI+2% fare increase, but what they do not bother to mention is that in the 3 years after the 2004 election the former Mayor raised fares by RPI+10% each year. Between 2005 and 2007 the Oyster fare increased by 42%.

In his first term, Mr Livingstone targeted the Council Tax payer, in his second term he moved on to the transport fare payer, so to complain now about fare increases to invest in the transport system is just a touch hypocritical, especially when the suspicion remains that the former Mayor only reduced fares in 2008 as an electoral bribe and not because TfL could afford the loss in income.

All free and concessionary fares have been protected by the Mayor, which means that 40% of bus passengers will continue to have free or subsidised travel. Even with January’s necessary fare increase the average bus fare will be just 60p per journey compared with a typical fare of around £1 in other UK cities.
The real question to Ken Livingstone’s objections is how in earnest they are and not just voiced out loud to appease his union paymasters that house and fund the Livingstone campaign?

The removal of the western extension has also proved divisive despite the Mayor’s consultation that found 67% of respondents, including 86% of businesses in the area, voted for removal. Rational thought would say that having a large majority of residents and businesses in favour of a schemes removal would be a clear indicator of what should be done. It seems though that the Labour party (and the rest of the opposition) do not work in rational thought though or they would never have ignored the majority who did not want the western extension created in the first place. The WEZ really was a case of Ken Livingstone ignoring the people who put him in office in favour of the usual left wing ‘we know better’ policy.

The loss in revenue is also a question to be addressed. Some sources have said £55m, Mr Livingstone has £70m on his website and the net congestion charge revenue listed in the consultation budget is £47m less than was listed in last years budget. A big reason why Congestion Charge income will be less is the new direct payment option brought in by the Mayor as a benefit for Londoners. TfL will see a reduction in income because there will be a big reduction in fines.

The opposition will see this as a point to attack the Mayor on, but the fact is that the Mayor is responding to the votes of thousands of affected residents who wanted the zone removed and means that he is following his manifesto pledge and doing what Londoners elected him to do.
London Development Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LDA</th>
<th>Mayor’s draft £m</th>
<th>Conservative proposal £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11 requirement</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change:</td>
<td>Change:</td>
<td>Change:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12 total</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget increase from 2010-11</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The LDA remains a nil impact upon the precept but the GLA remains in the dark about the details of this years grant funding from central government. The historic problems created by the previous administration that led to the widely reported £160m black hole in their finances have now led to the LDA being scrapped along with the rest of the RDA’s in England.

With the removal of their grants and the planned closure of the LDA in April most of the business and skills programmes are returning to central government and the continuing programmes transferring to the LDA are being reduced in number and scope. The Mayor is replacing the promotional work of the LDA with a new Promote London company funded by the GLA.

We look forward to the LDA being merged in with the GLA.
Summary of Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base 2010-11</th>
<th>Mayor’s proposals 2011-12</th>
<th>Alternative proposals 2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPA</td>
<td>£2,673.3m</td>
<td>£2,713.0m</td>
<td>£2,713.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFEPA</td>
<td>£437.3m</td>
<td>£409.4m</td>
<td>£409.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL</td>
<td>£12.0m</td>
<td>£6.0m</td>
<td>£6.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core GLA - Mayor</td>
<td>£131.8m</td>
<td>£138.6m</td>
<td>£132.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core GLA - Assembly</td>
<td>£8.6m</td>
<td>£8.0m</td>
<td>£7.64m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDA</td>
<td>£0.0m</td>
<td>£0.0m</td>
<td>£0.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total budget</td>
<td>£3,263.0m</td>
<td>£3,275.0m</td>
<td>£3,268.65m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax income</td>
<td>£923.0m</td>
<td>£934.8m</td>
<td>£928.45m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precept increase</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+£0.00</td>
<td>-£2.11 (-0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Band D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Band D precept</td>
<td>£309.82</td>
<td>£309.82</td>
<td>£307.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART B: Proposal to approve, with amendments, the Draft Consolidated Budget for the 2011-12 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 2011-12 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) 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 budget requirement for 2011-12 for each constituent body as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent body</th>
<th>Component budget requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority: Mayor of London</td>
<td>£ 132,617,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority: London Assembly</td>
<td>£ 7,640,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Police Authority</td>
<td>£ 2,713,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority</td>
<td>£ 409,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport for London</td>
<td>£ 6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Development Agency</td>
<td>£ 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The component budget requirements shown in recommendation 2 above, give rise to a consolidated budget requirement for the Authority for 2010-11 (shown at Line 55 in the attached Schedule) of –

£3,268,657,000

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.
SCHEDULE

Part 1: Greater London Authority: Mayor of London ("Mayor") draft component budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft consolidated budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor's proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>£212,696,000</td>
<td>£212,696,000</td>
<td>estimated expenditure of the Mayor calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>£10,621,000</td>
<td>£10,621,000</td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for the Mayor under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>£5,000,000</td>
<td>£5,000,000</td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the Mayor under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the Mayor under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>£228,317,000</td>
<td>£228,317,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for the Mayor (lines (1) + (2) + (3) + (4) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>-£80,200,000</td>
<td>-£80,200,000</td>
<td>estimate of Mayor's income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>-£9,500,000</td>
<td>-£9,500,000</td>
<td>estimate of Mayor's reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (1) and (2) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>-£89,700,000</td>
<td>-£89,700,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for the Mayor (lines (6) + (7))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>£138,617,000</td>
<td>£138,617,000</td>
<td>the component budget requirement for Mayor (being the amount by which the aggregate at (5) above exceeds the aggregate at (8) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for the Mayor for 2011–12 is: £132,617,000
NOTE: Amendments to the draft consolidated budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>£8,000,000</td>
<td>£7,640,000</td>
<td>estimated expenditure of the Assembly for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for the Assembly under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the Assembly under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the Assembly under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>£8,000,000</td>
<td>£7,640,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for the Assembly (lines (10) + (11) + (12) + (13) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>estimate of the Assembly’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>estimate of the Assembly’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (10) and (11) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for the Assembly (lines (15) + (16))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>£8,000,000</td>
<td>£7,640,000</td>
<td>the component budget requirement for the Assembly (being the amount by which the aggregate at (14) above exceeds the aggregate at (17) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for the Assembly for 2011-12 is: £7,640,000
NOTE: Amendments to the draft consolidated budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>£3,547,200,000</td>
<td>£3,547,200,000</td>
<td>estimated expenditure of the MPA for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>£25,100,000</td>
<td>£25,100,000</td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for the MPA under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the MPA under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the MPA under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>£3,572,300,000</td>
<td>£3,572,300,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for the MPA (lines (19) + (20) + (21) + (22) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>-£824,500,000</td>
<td>-£824,5000,000</td>
<td>estimate of the MPA’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>-£34,800,000</td>
<td>-£34,800,000</td>
<td>estimate of MPA’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (19) and (20) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>-£859,300,000</td>
<td>-£859,300,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for the MPA (lines (24) + (25))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>£2,713,000,000</td>
<td>£2,713,000,000</td>
<td>the component budget requirement for the MPA (being the amount by which the aggregate at (23) above exceeds the aggregate at (26) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for the MPA for 2011-12 is: £2,713,000,000
Part 4: London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (“LFEPA”) draft component budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft consolidated budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>£459,600,000</td>
<td>£459,600,000</td>
<td>estimated expenditure of LFEPA for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for LFEPA under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of LFEPA under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of LFEPA under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>£459,600,000</td>
<td>£459,600,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for LFEPA (lines (28) + (29) + (30) + (31) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>-£30,900,000</td>
<td>-£30,900,000</td>
<td>estimate of LFEPA’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>-£19,300,000</td>
<td>-£19,300,000</td>
<td>estimate of LFEPA’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (28) and (29) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>-£50,200,000</td>
<td>-£50,200,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for LFEPA (lines (33) + (34))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>£409,400,000</td>
<td>£409,400,000</td>
<td>the component budget requirement for LFEPA (being the amount by which the aggregate at (32) above exceeds the aggregate at (35) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for LFEPA for 2011-12 is: £409,400,000
**Part 5: Transport for London ("TfL") draft component budget requirement calculations**

NOTE: Amendments to the draft consolidated budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor's proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>£8,441,000,000</td>
<td>£8,441,000,000</td>
<td>estimated expenditure of TfL for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>£154,000,000</td>
<td>£154,000,000</td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for TfL under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>£245,000,000</td>
<td>£245,000,000</td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of TfL under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of TfL under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41)</td>
<td><strong>£8,840,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>£8,840,000,000</strong></td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for TfL (lines (37) + (38) + (39) + (40) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>-£8,834,000,000</td>
<td>-£8,834,000,000</td>
<td>estimate of TfL’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>estimate of TfL’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (37) and (38) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>-£8,834,000,000</td>
<td>-£8,834,000,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for TfL (lines (42) + (43))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45)</td>
<td><strong>£6,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>£6,000,000</strong></td>
<td>the component budget requirement for TfL (being the amount by which the aggregate at (41) above exceeds the aggregate at (44) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for TfL for 2011-12 is: **£6,000,000**
### Part 6: London Development Agency ("LDA") draft component budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft consolidated budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor's Proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>£213,700,000</td>
<td>£213,700,000</td>
<td>estimated expenditure of the LDA for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>£3,000,000</td>
<td>£3,000,000</td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for the LDA under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the LDA under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the LDA under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>£216,700,000</td>
<td>£216,700,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for the LDA (lines (46) + (47) + (48) + (49) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>-£216,700,000</td>
<td>-£216,700,000</td>
<td>estimate of the LDA’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>-£0</td>
<td>-£0</td>
<td>estimate of the LDA’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (46) and (47) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>-£216,700,000</td>
<td>-£216,700,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for the LDA (lines (51) + (52))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>the component budget requirement for the LDA (being the amount by which the aggregate at (50) above exceeds the aggregate at (53) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for the LDA for 2011-12 is: £0
Part 7: The Greater London Authority ("GLA") draft consolidated budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft consolidated budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s proposed consolidated budget requirement</th>
<th>Budget amendment’s proposed consolidated budget requirement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>£3,275,017,000</td>
<td>£3,268,657,000</td>
<td>the GLA’s consolidated budget requirement (the sum of the amounts in lines (9) + (18) + (27) + (36) + (45) + (54)) calculated in accordance with section 85(8) of the Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft consolidated budget requirement for 2011-12 is: £3,268,657,000
PART A: INTRODUCTION & COMMENTARY

At a time of huge government spending cuts affecting London wide and borough services, the Green Group amendment has three principal objectives:

1. to protect low income and vulnerable Londoners;
2. to guarantee continuous funding to tackle climate change and London’s other serious environmental problems;
3. to protect neighbourhood and borough level policing.

The Mayor’s budget relies on a steep rise in public transport fares, well above inflation, at a time when many Londoners are already facing real pay cuts or the prospect of losing their job. A typical working family would pay around £160 extra a year in fares. We will bring down the fare increase to the inflation level, and instead raise the congestion charge to £16 and reintroduce the Western Extension. Our budget includes other measure to protect the most vulnerable such as guaranteed funding for pan London homelessness projects which are currently at risk of funding cuts.

The Green amendment will address London’s most serious immediate environmental problem affecting the health of thousands: air pollution. Our budget will fund a Very Low Emission Zone in central London to exclude all polluting vehicles. The changes to congestion charge will also improve London’s air quality by cutting overall traffic levels. The substantial funding for the London Cycle Network will help cut traffic and air pollution in outer London. And the reinstatement of the funding for the expansion of the Green Grid of linked open spaces will deliver lengthy off road walking and cycling routes as well as putting in place a structure to defend London against flood risk. Our budget will provide extra funding to enable London to make up for lost time in insulating its homes, a vital measure to tackle climate change.

We consider that the Mayor’s budget gives too much weight to the international marketing of London and too little to investment in physical projects which will make

---

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.
London a cleaner and healthier city for the long term. So our amendment reduces the budget for international promotion. We will also cut the outdated single telephone number (saving £6.1m) and will look for further savings (through sharing services) in the media, marketing and external relations budgets of City Hall, TfL, the Police and Fire Service. We agree with the Mayor that the Fire Service’s huge reserves should be put to work, and will go further than he has done with this.

Londoners want the police to focus on delivering safe communities, not on excessive surveillance aimed at deterring legitimate dissent. Therefore, we will reduce police budgets for the Territorial Support Group and for surveillance, and increase the budget to support neighbourhood and borough level policing, as well as that for policing our roads where far too many Londoners continue to be killed or maimed. Further savings will be made in the large police overtime bill, since the police budget continues to provide over £100m for officer overtime and nearly £30m for staff overtime.

Green budget amendment (2011/12) – detailed breakdown

Greater London Authority (Mayor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor’s proposed budget requirement</td>
<td>138,617,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional spending:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing – stop gap funding to secure pan London homelessness projects</td>
<td>+ 3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape crisis centres – additional funding to improve services</td>
<td>+ 700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase funding for home energy efficiency to reach an extra 50k homes</td>
<td>+ 6,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide funding to extend London’s linked green spaces (All London Green Grid) to provide flood protection, off-road cycling and walking routes, wildlife habitats and recreational open space.</td>
<td>+ 300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Savings:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External relations, press and marketing – increase savings by sharing services with other GLA bodies</td>
<td>- 300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut energy spending for City Hall by additional 3% (total of 5%)</td>
<td>- 16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote London – reduce spending</td>
<td>- 2,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green budget requirement (+ £8,084,000)</strong></td>
<td>146,701,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greater London Authority (Assembly)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor’s proposed budget requirement</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green budget requirement (no change)</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Metropolitan Police Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mayor’s proposed budget requirement</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional spending:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase policing to prevent deaths &amp; injuries on London’s roads, to reverse long term cuts</td>
<td>+ 3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve training of regular police officers on public order policing</td>
<td>+ 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain an alternative entry route to the police officer profession which does not require working as a Special Constable (for a proportion of recruits)</td>
<td>+ 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional support for safer neighbourhood policing</td>
<td>+ 6,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional resources for borough policing</td>
<td>+ 5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinstate part of Basic Command Unit Fund for preventative and diversionary initiatives</td>
<td>+ 3,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerate energy efficiency programme</td>
<td>+ 300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Savings:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce police officer overtime spending by further 4% (in addition to planned 11%)</td>
<td>- 5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce staff overtime by additional 20% (in addition to planned 4.7%)</td>
<td>- 6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce public affairs spending</td>
<td>- 650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut back on surveillance, databases of personal information, DNA sampling</td>
<td>- 2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Territorial Support Group</td>
<td>- 5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further reduce spending on flights and hotels</td>
<td>- 550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further reduce use of cars and drivers for senior officers</td>
<td>- 500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut energy use in buildings by additional 3% (5% in total)</td>
<td>- 300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green budget requirement (no change)</strong></td>
<td>£2,713,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mayor’s proposed budget requirement</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional spending:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerate building energy efficiency programme</td>
<td>+ 600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Savings:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce energy use by extra 2% (already being reduced by 3% a year)</td>
<td>- 60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce press/ public affairs spending through shared services</td>
<td>- 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reserves:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make greater use of reserves</td>
<td>- 10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green budget requirement (- £9,560,000)</strong></td>
<td>£399,840,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transport for London

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mayor’s proposed budget requirement</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional spending:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Emission Zone implementation</td>
<td>+ 10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faster introduction of low emission hybrid buses</td>
<td>+ 15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase funding for borough transport schemes, especially:</td>
<td>+ 25,030,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Biking Boroughs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• London Cycle Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pedestrian improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Road safety schemes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Borough wide 20 mph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Savings:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain articulated buses</td>
<td>- 5,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancel research work on additional aviation capacity</td>
<td>- 4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut planning work on road river crossings in Thames Gateway</td>
<td>- 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce press spending through shared services</td>
<td>- 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate a reduction in Crossrail’s budget for media and marketing work</td>
<td>- 200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income changes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut “above inflation” element of fare rise</td>
<td>+ 40,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintroduce Western Extension of Congestion Charge (part year’s income)</td>
<td>- 17,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase standard congestion charge to £16</td>
<td>- 50,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase congestion charge for more highly polluting vehicles to £30</td>
<td>- 15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green budget requirement (+ £1,476,000)</strong></td>
<td>7,476,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

London Development Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mayor’s proposed budget requirement</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional spending:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase funding for home energy efficiency to reach an extra 50k homes</td>
<td>+ 6,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Savings:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut funding for academies</td>
<td>- 400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut funding for single 101 telephone number (from international promotion budget)</td>
<td>- 6,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green budget requirement (no change)</strong></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART B: Proposal to approve, with amendments, the Draft Consolidated Budget for the 2011-12 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 2011-12 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 budget requirement for 2011-12 for each constituent body as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent body</th>
<th>Component budget requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority: Mayor of London</td>
<td>£146,701,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority: London Assembly</td>
<td>£8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Police Authority</td>
<td>£2,713,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority</td>
<td>£399,840,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport for London</td>
<td>£7,476,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Development Agency</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The component budget requirements shown in recommendation 2 above, give rise to a consolidated budget requirement for the Authority for 2011-12 (shown at Line 55 in the attached Schedule) of -

   £ 3,275,017,000

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.
**SCHEDULE**

**Part 1: Greater London Authority: Mayor of London (“Mayor”) draft component budget requirement calculations**

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>£212,696,000</td>
<td>£220,780,000</td>
<td>estimated expenditure of the Mayor calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>£10,621,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for the Mayor under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>£5,000,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the Mayor under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the Mayor under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>£228,317,000</td>
<td>£236,401,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for the Mayor (lines (1) + (2) + (3) + (4) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>-£80,200,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimate of Mayor’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>-£9,500,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimate of Mayor’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (1) and (2) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>-£89,700,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for the Mayor (lines (6) + (7))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>£138,617,000</td>
<td>£146,701,000</td>
<td>the component budget requirement for Mayor (being the amount by which the aggregate at (5) above exceeds the aggregate at (8) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for the Mayor for 2011-12 is: £146,701,000
Part 2: Greater London Authority: London Assembly (“Assembly”) draft component budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>£8,000,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimated expenditure of the Assembly for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for the Assembly under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the Assembly under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the Assembly under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>£8,000,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for the Assembly (lines (10) + (11) + (12) + (13) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimate of the Assembly’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimate of the Assembly’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (10) and (11) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for the Assembly (lines (15) + (16))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>£8,000,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>the draft component budget requirement for the Assembly (being the amount by which the aggregate at (14) above exceeds the aggregate at (17) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for the Assembly for 2011-12 is: £8,000,000
### Part 3: Metropolitan Police Authority ("MPA") draft component budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>£3,547,200,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimated expenditure of the MPA for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>£25,100,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for the MPA under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the MPA under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the MPA under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>£3,572,300,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for the MPA (lines (19) + (20) + (21) + (22) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>-£824,500,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimate of the MPA’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>-£34,800,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimate of MPA’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (19) and (20) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>-£859,300,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for the MPA (lines (24) + (25))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>£2,713,000,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>the draft component budget requirement for the MPA (being the amount by which the aggregate at (23) above exceeds the aggregate at (26) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for the MPA for 2011-12 is: £2,713,000,000
Part 4: London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority ("LFEPA") draft component budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>£459,600,000</td>
<td>£460,040,000</td>
<td>estimated expenditure of LFEPA for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for LFEPA under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of LFEPA under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of LFEPA under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>£459,600,000</td>
<td>£460,040,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for LFEPA (lines (28) + (29) + (30) + (31) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>-£30,900,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimate of LFEPA’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>-£19,300,000</td>
<td>-£29,300,000</td>
<td>estimate of LFEPA’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (28) and (29) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>-£50,200,000</td>
<td>-£60,200,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for LFEPA (lines (33) + (34))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>£409,400,000</td>
<td>£399,840,000</td>
<td>the draft component budget requirement for LFEPA (being the amount by which the aggregate at (32) above exceeds the aggregate at (35) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for LFEPA for 2011-12 is: £399,840,000
**Part 5: Transport for London ("TfL") draft component budget requirement calculations**

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s proposal (37)</th>
<th>Budget amendment (38)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>£8,441,000,000</td>
<td>£8,484,476,000</td>
<td>estimated expenditure of TfL for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>£154,000,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for TfL under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>£245,000,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of TfL under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of TfL under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>£8,840,000,000</td>
<td>£8,883,476,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for TfL (lines (37) + (38) + (39) + (40) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>-£8,834,000,000</td>
<td>-£8,876,000,000</td>
<td>estimate of TfL’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimate of TfL’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (37) and (38) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>-£8,834,000,000</td>
<td>-£8,876,000,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for TfL (lines (42) + (43))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>£6,000,000</td>
<td>£7,476,000</td>
<td>the component budget requirement for TfL (being the amount by which the aggregate at (41) above exceeds the aggregate at (44) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The draft component budget requirement for TfL for 2011–12 is: £7,476,000**
Part 6: London Development Agency ("LDA") draft component budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s Proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>£213,700,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimated expenditure of the LDA for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>£3,000,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for the LDA under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the LDA under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the LDA under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>£216,700,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for the LDA (lines (46) + (47) + (48) + (49) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>-£216,700,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimate of the LDA’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>estimate of the LDA’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (46) and (47) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>-£216,700,000</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for the LDA (lines (51) + (52))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>the component budget requirement for the LDA (being the amount by which the aggregate at (50) above exceeds the aggregate at (53) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for the LDA for 2011-2012 is: £0
Part 7: The Greater London Authority ("GLA") draft consolidated budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft consolidated budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s proposed consolidated budget requirement</th>
<th>Budget amendment’s proposed consolidated budget requirement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>£3,275,017,000</td>
<td>the GLA’s consolidated budget requirement (the sum of the amounts in lines (9) + (18) + (27) + (36) + (45) + (54)) calculated in accordance with section 85(8) of the Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft consolidated budget requirement for 2011-12 is: £3,275,017,000
Report to the Assembly on the Mayor’s Draft Consolidated Budget for 2011 – 2012

Report to: London Assembly
Date: 10 February 2011
Report of: Liberal Democrat group

Proposed by: Mike Tuffrey
Seconded by: Caroline Pidgeon

PART A: INTRODUCTION & COMMENTARY

The Liberal Democrat budget invests more resources in essential frontline services in policing, transport and the environment, cuts wasteful expenditure and ensures no rise in the GLA’s share of the Council Tax.

In summary, we seek to:

• Protect the structure of Safer Neighbourhood Teams to maintain neighbourhood policing while consultation continues; increase resources for neighbourhoods most at risk of gun and knife crime; expand police work in combating child trafficking; and reduce spending on press officers and perks for senior officers.

• Bring in a better fares package: the One Hour Bus Ticket to mitigate the effect on Londoners of the large fare rises on London’s bus network; and re-introduce Zone 2 to 6 and 2 to 9 Travelcards, so that those in Outer London are not forced to pay Zone 1 fares when they don’t need to.

• Provide support for sustainable travel and better river services.

• Ensure that vital initiatives to take forward environmental projects in London are protected and improved, including speeding up the rate at which London’s buses and taxis become cleaner and studying the feasibility of a Clean Air Zone.

• Take effective action to build more affordable housing in London and speed up the creation of an integrated housing and regeneration function at City Hall.

• Cut waste at City Hall and ensure that the lowest paid are properly rewarded.

Our budget package will cost a Band D Council Tax payer £309.82, so ensuring no rise in the GLA precept.

---

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.
**Sustaining London’s emergency services and investing in their future**

Scrutiny of the MPA’s large budget has been hindered this year by the poor level and late provision of information to Authority Members. The changes in spending we want the MPA to make include:

- Continue funding sergeant posts in Safer Neighbourhood Teams across London while consultation on the future structure continues so as not to pre-empt the review and close off options. The saving from removing 300 police sergeants by the end of 2013/14 has been estimated at £15million so we would restore £4.5million to the MPA’s budget to ensure continuity of neighbourhood policing.

- Increase funding of £6.7million for SNTs in 20 neighbourhoods most at risk from gun and knife crime, to allow flexible shift patterns and additional hours.

- Put £1.4million in expanding the Paladin team of officers who work to stem the flow of children being trafficked into the UK.

- Reduce the number of Commander posts by 50% over a 3 year period. This would save £900,000 in the financial year 2011/12.

- A £5.67 million reduction in the Metropolitan Police’s Directorate of Public Affairs budget and in its 70 strong staff team, cutting press officer numbers.

The net cost of these changes is £4.08million, to be funded by an increase in the MPA’s share of the precept, with a balancing amount of £4.08million from LFEPA’s reserves to support these changes.

In the LFEPA budget we will propose at the Authority meeting in March to provide additional support for the LIFE scheme – a well-regarded initiative that allows teenagers referred by youth offending services to spend a week working alongside firefighters, learning about personal responsibility, teamwork and basic firefighting. The scheme is co-funded by boroughs and charities. To ensure this investment in fire risk reduction is maintained in the current tight financial settlement, we will urge LFEPA when setting its final budget in March to invest £500,000 from its reserves so that this important project can continue operating.

**Keeping London Moving**

Our budget changes the priorities within **Transport for London’s** budget and moves ahead with important initiatives.

- Introduce a ‘One Hour’ bus ticket, a fair way to charge passengers who have to take more than one bus in order to reach their destination – included in the 2012 fares package from January.

- Reintroduce Zone 2-6 and 2-9 Travelcards immediately, which would cost less than £1m, but save passengers, who do not need to travel into Zone 1 paying higher fares.
• Kick start work to clean up London’s bus and taxi fleet to improve air quality and fund a feasibility study into a central London Clean Air Zone.

• Promote walking, cycling and other sustainable transport initiatives.

• Support river transport.

These costs will be met by withdrawing the free travel for TfL staff nominees, reducing management consultancy costs and delaying the roll out of the next phases of Cycle Superhighways.

**Cutting wasteful expenditure and delivering on the environment and housing**

**Core Greater London Authority**

• Honour the commitment made by the Assembly’s cross party Business Management and Administration Committee to award all GLA staff on Grade 3 or below who are earning less than £23,000 pa – a pay rise of 4.6%, at a cost of £50,000. This mirrors the payments being made to low paid staff in the Civil Service.

• Ensure the continuity of important environmental projects currently funded by the LDA, including the RE:NEW (homes retrofit), RE:FIT (public buildings retrofit) and Low Carbon Zones programmes and especially ensuring the retention of specialist staff, by creating a transitional fund of £6 million within the £12.8 million already provided in the GLA budget.

• Maintain and increase investment in affordable housing, particularly to attract private sector investment, by guaranteeing the £740,000 currently at risk for the London Housing Company. The priority for 2011/12 must be to bring into productive use the LDA land assets for affordable housing in London – a first step to an accelerated housing and regeneration function at City Hall.

• Ensure existing marketing budgets are truly focussed on promoting London, as this function transfers from the LDA, and ensure that LOCOG starts actively marketing London ahead of the 2012 Games.

These measures will be funded by a £50,000 reduction in the use of temporary staff which in the financial year 2010/11 cost the GLA £1.5 million, and by refocusing spending already in the core GLA budget.

**Effective scrutiny for Londoners**

This year the London Assembly’s budget is separately identified. The Assembly has proposed reductions so spending is effectively frozen – a real terms efficiency gain – at a time when the GLA’s responsibilities and its £13 billion overall budget are growing. The Assembly must continue to examine its effectiveness and to demonstrate it delivers value-for-money public accountability.
### Explanatory notes to our proposals

**Metropolitan Police Budget Proposals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased expenditure – Liberal Democrat proposals</th>
<th>Additional cost 2011/12</th>
<th>Explanatory notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reverse the proposed deletion of 100 Sergeant posts from Safer Neighbourhood Teams in 2011/12, since Safer Neighbourhood Policing has been hugely popular with all communities in London, and one of the MPS’s greatest success stories.</td>
<td>£4.5 million</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Increased resources for selected Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNT)**  
We believe that the current model of Safer Neighbourhood Teams just working day shifts needs to be augmented in those Boroughs with highest incidence of knife and gun crime. We therefore propose providing funding to allow more flexible shift patterns and additional hours of working in these areas. | £6.7 million | Note 2 |
| **Additional police to deal with child trafficking**  
The practice of trafficking children to the UK continues to cause real concern. In particular, at main transport hubs such as St Pancras, and Heathrow. A small team (known as Paladin) consisting of police and immigration officers do excellent work trying to stem the flow. We believe it is essential to expand the Paladin team, to enable rail entry points to London to be more appropriately policed. | £1.4 million | Note 3 |
| **Total additional spending** | **£12.6 million** | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liberal Democrat proposals for savings in the MPA</th>
<th>Identified Savings 2010/11</th>
<th>Explanatory notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce payments to the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) and institute a review of all the services contracted by the MPS to ACPO to ensure value for money.</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
<td>Note 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce spending in the Directorate of Public Affairs. We believe that the budget can be cut, and the number of press officers should be significantly reduced from 74 to 10.</td>
<td>£5.67 million</td>
<td>Note 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in the number of Commander Posts by 50% over a three-year period. This excludes Borough Commanders, who are generally of the rank Chief Superintendent.</td>
<td>£900,000</td>
<td>Note 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in the MPS’s use of consultants by 50%.</td>
<td>£1.45 million</td>
<td>Note 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liberal Democrat proposals for savings</strong></td>
<td><strong>£8.52 million</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Metropolitan Police Budget Proposals cont..

Note 1 Plans presented to the Metropolitan Police Authority in January 2011 include the proposal to remove 100 Sergeants from Safer Neighbourhood Teams, at a saving of £4.5 million in 2011/12. We believe Sergeants are an essential element of Safer Neighbourhood Teams, and we would therefore reverse this proposal.

Note 2 We would fund four additional Safer Neighbourhood Teams in five of the Boroughs with the highest incidences of gun/knife crime. We have assumed the following costs for each additional Safer Neighbourhood Team:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank and number</th>
<th>Salary including on costs</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sergeant</td>
<td>£80,000</td>
<td>£80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Police Constables</td>
<td>£60,000</td>
<td>£120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 PCSOs</td>
<td>£45,000</td>
<td>£135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£335,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total cost of 20 extra Safer Neighbourhood Teams (4 teams in each of 5 Boroughs) is £6.7 million.

Note 3 We propose to expand the existing Paladin team by funding the following additional posts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost including overheads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Detective Sergeant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Detective Constables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current MPS proposals would delete the existing post of Detective Inspector within the Paladin Team. We would re-instate this position, and have allowed £100,000 for this including on-costs.

In addition, we have allowed £580,000 to be used for appropriate accommodation for the team in key locations.

**TOTAL PALADIN COST:** £1,400,000

Note 4 The MPA is currently withholding its subscription payment of £180,000 to ACPO. We would institute a review of all services currently supplied to the MPA/MPS by ACPO to reduce payments by at least £500,000 in the year 2011/12.

Note 5 The budget for the Directorate of Public Affairs in 2010/11 is £6.7 million, with 74 staff. We would reduce this to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary level</th>
<th>Salary plus on costs</th>
<th>Number of staff</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>£200,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>£200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£60,000</td>
<td>£120,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>£600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£40,000</td>
<td>£80,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>£80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£25,000</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1,030,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Saving would therefore be £5,670,000. We suggest that any redundancy payments be treated in the same way as existing MPS redundancy payments, i.e. through earmarked reserves.

Note 6 The intention would be that by the end of 2013/14 the number of Commander posts will be reduced by half. 5 Commander posts would be lost in 2011/12. A Commander’s salary starts at c. £90,000. With on-costs this would be £180,000, so there would be a saving of £900,000 in the year 2011/12.

Note 7 In 2010/11 the Met was budgeted to spend £2.7m on consultants, with a forecasted spend of £2.9 million. In keeping with central government drives we would reduce the amount spent by 50%, saving £1.45 million.
### Transport for London Budget Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liberal Democrat Proposals: Increased expenditure</th>
<th>Additional cost 2011/12</th>
<th>Explanatory notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A ‘One Hour’ bus ticket for London</strong>&lt;br&gt;The ‘One Hour’ bus ticket is a fair way to charge passengers who have to take more than one bus in order to reach their destination. Tube passengers already enjoy this service and it is only right that London bus passengers can enjoy a time limited bus ticket, as passengers do in many other cities. We would introduce this scheme with the next fares package in January 2012.</td>
<td>£15million</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bring back the outer London Travelcards</strong>&lt;br&gt;The recent fares announcements for 2011 saw the removal of the Zones 2-6 and 2-9 Travelcards. This penalises those who live in outer London, forcing many to pay for travel in Zone 1 which they don’t need. We would reintroduce these Travelcards immediately.</td>
<td>£1million</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tackling poor air quality</strong>&lt;br&gt;Air quality in London remains dangerously polluted, with London facing the prospect of large fines from the EU if action is not taken quickly. Radical proposals are needed in order to tackle poor air quality. We would fund specialist research and development work to be carried out in expanding the number of electric vehicles in use in the public sector, and to conduct in-depth feasibility studies into the use of electric vehicles for London’s bus and taxi fleet. We would also fund a feasibility study to set up a Clean Air Zone for central London, as London’s air quality continues to break health-based legal limits, focusing action where the problem is worst.</td>
<td>£350,000</td>
<td>Note 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable travel fund</strong>&lt;br&gt;We would introduce a fund for small grants available to schools, businesses and other community organizations to encourage people to walk and cycle, to help relieve the pressure on the current transport system, improve air quality and encourage healthy living.</td>
<td>£2million</td>
<td>Note 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensuring cycling investment really works</strong>&lt;br&gt;The initial two pilot Cycle Superhighways are still at their early stage. We believe that the pilot superhighways need to be fully evaluated over the year, to assess what has worked and not worked from the £23million</td>
<td>£5million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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investment before any further cycle superhighways are completed and rolled out. We also believe that money will need to be spent adjusting the existing pilot routes to ensure they are as safe as possible for cyclists, particularly at some of the complex junctions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London Promenade Scheme</th>
<th>£30,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Thames and the river walkway should be accessible for all Londoners. The London Promenade is a proposal to broaden and improve the two and a half kilometres of walkway from Gabriel’s Wharf to Butler’s Wharf on the South Bank. This would encourage more people to walk to reach destinations up and down the Thames. We would fund a feasibility study looking at the business and economic case for this project.</td>
<td>Note 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support for River transport</th>
<th>£5million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger use of the River Thames plays an important part in London’s transport network. Despite the Mayor’s River Concordat in November 2009, progress remains slow on fully integrating river services to make them accessible to both the leisure and commuter market.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will fund work on branding piers, trialing a system of contactless payment, developing real time information at piers, reviewing maps, bringing back evening river services and reviewing the subsidy for services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We propose a real revolution in promoting and encouraging the use of services on the river.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Expenditure | £28,380,000 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liberal Democrat proposals: savings</th>
<th>Identified Savings 2011/12</th>
<th>Explanatory notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delaying the roll out of Cycle Superhighways - routes 2 and 8 and 5 and 12</td>
<td>£10million</td>
<td>Note 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From evidence gathered by the Transport Committee in the publication “Pedal Power”, (November 2010), we are concerned that the cycle superhighways are being rolled out without a full evaluation and any modifications to the style that may be needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are therefore delaying the second phase of construction of cycle superhighways 2 and 8 and the design phase for routes 5 and 12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We will carry out a full evaluation of the initial two pilot routes and will ensure learning takes place to help shape the next four routes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Removing TFL Staff Nominee Travel</strong></th>
<th>£14.94million</th>
<th>Note 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At this time of tight financial settlements we think resources are better allocated to delivering services. TfL employees would retain their right to free travel themselves, but their right to nominate one other person of their choice to travel for free would be withdrawn. We would introduce this from October 2011.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reduction in Management Consultancy</strong></th>
<th>£3.44million</th>
<th>Note 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We would reduce just under 10% from the budget for management consultants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Total savings 2011/12</strong></th>
<th>£28,380,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Note 1**  
There were in the region of 450 million PAYG bus journeys in 2009/10, the latest figures available. According to TfL around 18% of these passengers went on to make a 2nd bus journey within the hour.  
18% of 450 million at £1.30 = £105million a year (Mayor’s Question 3210/2010), but taking the daily cap into account, TfL advise us the cost would be £60million per year.  
Therefore aiming to introduce the One Hour Bus Ticket to start with the next fares package in January 2012:  
£60 million/4 = £15million

**Note 2**  
In answer to Mayor’s question 3889/2010, the Mayor replied that TfL estimated that it would cost less than £1million per year to reintroduce Zone 2-6 and 2-9 Travelcards. This includes lowering the cap on Oyster.

**Note 3**  
For consultation, design and planning of low carbon public service vehicle provision – including Electric Vehicles. This estimate was taken from a leading Environmental Scientist, specialising in air quality and also includes funding for a study into a Clean Air Zone.

**Note 4**  
100 x £20,000 grants available for schools, community organisations or businesses to promote sustainable travel, for example walking, cycling or car-share for employees.

**Note 5**  
See London Assembly Transport Committee report “Walk This Way” (Rapporteur Caroline Pidgeon AM), page 26 for further details. Costings of the feasibility study were supplied from Thames Promenade Limited.

**Note 6**  
Figures taken from Mayor’s Question No: 5/2011  
How many Cycle Superhighways are planned for the next financial year and at what cost? Caroline Pidgeon

Written answer from the Chair and the Commissioner
Two Barclays Cycle Superhighways are scheduled to open in financial year 2011/12: Route 8 (Wandsworth to Westminster), and Route 2 (Bow to Aldgate). The total combined budget for these routes is some **£22.33 million**, which includes infrastructure and supporting measures costs, as well as an allowance for risk and contingency.

Further information from TfL has confirmed that in the 2011/12 financial year £11.33 million is due to be spent to complete the construction of routes 2 and 8. We would delay the final construction phase, pushing some spend into the 2012/13 financial year, making a saving of £5 million.

In the 2011/12 financial year design work is underway on routes 5 and 12. Design work is normally around 20% of the project, so delaying this for the year would save a further £5 million.

### Note 7  Abolishing TfL Staff Nominee Travel

As of 7 December 2010, there are 14,827 Staff Nominee Oyster cards issued to TfL employees. The annual cost of the Zone 1 to 6 Travelcard offered to nominees is £2016. The total is therefore £29,891,232 per annum.

Under our proposals TfL Staff nominee’s travel would be withdrawn from the 1st October 2011 therefore giving a saving of **£14.94 million** in the financial year 2011/12. TfL staff will still retain their free Oyster cards.

### Note 8  Reduction in Management Consultancy

TfL has budgeted for £36 million for management consultancy. We have reduced this by just under 10%
**LFEPA Budget Proposals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased expenditure - Liberal Democrat proposals</th>
<th>Additional Cost 2010-11</th>
<th>Explanatory Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer to the MPA</strong></td>
<td>£4.08million</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the need to support the budget of the MPA while investigations take place into the future structure of Safer Neighbourhood Teams, we would redirect money from LFEPA’s reserves to the MPA to support this work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Increased expenditure</strong></td>
<td>£4.08million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Increased expenditure funded by:                   |                         |                   |
| **Liberal Democrat Proposals for savings in LFEPA**|                         |                   |
| Identified savings 2010-11                          |                         |                   |
| **Use of excess LFEPA reserves**                   | £4.08million            | Note 1            |
| LFEPA’s officers advise a prudent level of General Reserves for 2010-11 to be £10.9million. However the Authority currently anticipates holding far more by the end of 2010 -11. |
| **Total Savings**                                  | £4.08million            |                   |

**Explanatory notes on identified savings**

| Note 1 | The 7% reserves that LFEPA hold compares to the 1.5% the MPA are suggesting. The announcement of the local government finance settlement was favourable to LFEPA (because of the reworking of the distribution formula for the national fire grant) and the Authority has had a better settlement for next year (2012/13). |
Greater London Authority Budget Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased expenditure Liberal Democrat proposal</th>
<th>Additional cost 2011/12</th>
<th>Explanatory notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Award cost of living pay increase of 4% to the lowest paid staff at the GLA</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This would affect 45 members of staff. Such a move would be in keeping with the policy of national Government to protect the lowest paid working in the Civil Service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total additional expenditure 2011/12</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings identified in the GLA: Liberal Democrat proposals</td>
<td>Identified Savings 2011/12</td>
<td>Explanatory notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce use of Temporary Staff</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the financial year 2010/11 to date, for which we have figures available, the GLA spent £1,552,141.81 on agency and temporary agency staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total savings 2011/12</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanatory notes to our proposals

**Note 1**
Assembly Members supported a motion on 19 January which called on the GLA’s chief executive to to award a 4% pay increase to the 45 GLA staff on Grade 3 and below. [http://www.london.gov.uk/media/press_releases_london_assembly/assembly-backs-modest-pay-rise-lowest-paid-gla-staff](http://www.london.gov.uk/media/press_releases_london_assembly/assembly-backs-modest-pay-rise-lowest-paid-gla-staff)

**Note 2**
In the financial year 2010/11 to date, for which we have figures available (i.e. Periods 1 to 10, or 1 April 2010 to 8 January 2011), the GLA spent £1,552,141.81 on agency and temporary agency staff. Data from payments over £1000 and over £500 lists: [http://www.london.gov.uk/who-runs-london/greater-london-authority/expenditure](http://www.london.gov.uk/who-runs-london/greater-london-authority/expenditure)
PART B: Proposal to approve, with amendments, the Draft Consolidated Budget for the 2011-12 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 2011-12 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 budget requirement for 2011-12 for each constituent body as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent body</th>
<th>Component budget requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority: Mayor of London</td>
<td>£138,617,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority: London Assembly</td>
<td>£8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Police Authority</td>
<td>£2,717,080,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority</td>
<td>£405,320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport for London</td>
<td>£6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Development Agency</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The component budget requirements shown in recommendation 2 above, give rise to a consolidated budget requirement for the Authority for 2011-12 (shown at Line 55 in the attached Schedule) of -

£ [3,275,017,000]

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.
### SCHEDULE

#### Part 1: Greater London Authority: Mayor of London ("Mayor") draft component budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>£212,696,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated expenditure of the Mayor calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>£10,621,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for the Mayor under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>£5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the Mayor under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the Mayor under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>£228,317,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for the Mayor (lines (1) + (2) + (3) + (4) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>-£80,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of Mayor’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>-£9,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of Mayor’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (1) and (2) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>-£89,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for the Mayor (lines (6) + (7))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>£138,617,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>the component budget requirement for Mayor (being the amount by which the aggregate at (5) above exceeds the aggregate at (8) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for the Mayor for 2011–12 is: £138,617,000
Part 2: Greater London Authority: London Assembly ("Assembly") draft component budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>£8,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated expenditure of the Assembly for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for the Assembly under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the Assembly under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the Assembly under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>£8,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for the Assembly (lines (10) + (11) + (12) + (13) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of the Assembly’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of the Assembly’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (10) and (11) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for the Assembly (lines (15) + (16))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>£8,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>the draft component budget requirement for the Assembly (being the amount by which the aggregate at (14) above exceeds the aggregate at (17) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for the Assembly for 2011-12 is: £8,000,000
Part 3: Metropolitan Police Authority ("MPA") draft component budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor's proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>£3,547,200,000</td>
<td>£3,551,280,000</td>
<td>estimated expenditure of the MPA for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>£25,100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for the MPA under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the MPA under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the MPA under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>£3,572,300,000</td>
<td>£3,576,380,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for the MPA (lines (19) + (20) + (21) + (22) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>-£824,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of the MPA’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>-£34,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of MPA’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (19) and (20) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>-£859,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for the MPA (lines (24) + (25))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>£2,713,000,000</td>
<td>£2,717,080,000</td>
<td>the draft component budget requirement for the MPA (being the amount by which the aggregate at (23) above exceeds the aggregate at (26) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for the MPA for 2011-12 is: £2,717,080,000
Part 4: London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority ("LFEPA") draft component budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>£459,600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated expenditure of LFEPA for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for LFEPA under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of LFEPA under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of LFEPA under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>£459,600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for LFEPA (lines (28) + (29) + (30) + (31) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>-£30,900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of LFEPA’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>-£19,300,000</td>
<td>-£23,380,000</td>
<td>estimate of LFEPA’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (28) and (29) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>-£50,200,000</td>
<td>-£54,280,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for LFEPA (lines (33) + (34))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>£409,400,000</td>
<td>£405,320,000</td>
<td>the draft component budget requirement for LFEPA (being the amount by which the aggregate at (32) above exceeds the aggregate at (35) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for LFEPA for 2011-12 is: £405,320,000
Part 5: Transport for London ("TfL") draft component budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>£8,441,000,000</td>
<td>£8,455,940,000</td>
<td>estimated expenditure of TfL for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>£154,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for TfL under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>£245,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of TfL under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of TfL under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>£8,840,000,000</td>
<td>£8,854,940,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for TfL (lines (37) + (38) + (39) + (40) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>-£8,834,000,000</td>
<td>-£8,848,940,000</td>
<td>estimate of TfL’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of TfL’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (37) and (38) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>-£8,834,000,000</td>
<td>-£8,848,940,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for TfL (lines (42) + (43))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>£6,000,000</td>
<td>£6,000,000</td>
<td>the component budget requirement for TfL (being the amount by which the aggregate at (41) above exceeds the aggregate at (44) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for TfL for 2011–12 is: £6,000,000
Part 6: London Development Agency ("LDA") draft component budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s Proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>£213,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated expenditure of the LDA for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>£3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for the LDA under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the LDA under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the LDA under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>£216,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for the LDA (lines (46) + (47) + (48) + (49) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>-£216,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of the LDA’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of the LDA’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (46) and (47) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>-£216,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for the LDA (lines (51) + (52))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>the component budget requirement for the LDA (being the amount by which the aggregate at (50) above exceeds the aggregate at (53) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for the LDA for 2011-2012 is: £0
Part 7: The Greater London Authority ("GLA") draft consolidated budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft consolidated budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s proposed consolidated budget requirement</th>
<th>Budget amendment’s proposed consolidated budget requirement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>£3,275,017,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>the GLA’s consolidated budget requirement (the sum of the amounts in lines (9) + (18) + (27) + (36) + (45) + (54)) calculated in accordance with section 85(8) of the Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft consolidated budget requirement for 2011-12 is: £3,275,017,000.
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Introduction
The Greater London Authority is the strategic authority for London. Its decisions, leadership, and priorities will help to determine the future prosperity of our City. And the priorities and leadership of our Mayor, working in partnership with Government and driven by his priorities for our City, are key determinants of the success of London’s economy and the prosperity and security of its citizens.

We note the GLA budget is substantially driven by Government funding, cuts to which we consider to be excessive and being implemented too fast, placing the UK economy at grave risk of a prolonged recession and a failure of future growth. This will undo the work of the previous Labour Government which led and oversaw the longest period of continuous economic growth in modern UK history and rescued the country from potential banking collapse and the incalculable consequences that would have bought the UK economy. The two key insights to understanding the Mayor’s responsibilities to London in this spending climate are that public investments – in infrastructure, in skills, in building strong institutions and in the reduction of poverty and unlocking the potential of all of our communities – are a key part of the investment that achieved that growth, and that the London Mayor must make a strong case to Government to secure that investment.

Each year the Mayor has the opportunity through his budget to make clear to Londoners his vision for, and to show leadership to, our City. We believe that the Mayor, as shown through this budget, is making the wrong choices, is failing in his leadership and that London is heading in the wrong direction. In his laissez-faire approach he massively underestimates the need for leadership. And he has failed to stand up for London against the cuts being made by Government – indeed he is one of their greatest cheerleaders.

Making the correct decisions at the GLA, as the strategic authority for London, is fundamental to maintaining the strength of London’s economy. To add to the challenge, while our City faces challenges to secure growth, City Hall itself is going through change. The collapse in funding for job creation and regeneration at a time of economic challenge is an act of political vandalism. The scaling back of investment in London’s transport and failure to plan for the future is similarly jeopardising our ability to manage and nurture growth. And the cuts in police budgets, and reductions in police numbers, risk a reduction in the sense of safety, and an increase in the fear of crime, that are so fundamental to the prosperity and safety of our City. On each of these matters the Mayor has failed to properly stand up for London and show leadership.

The impact of the Cuts
We note that the impact of the cuts on London’s services will be severe and that, in particular, the severest cuts have been imposed on the poorest communities. As far as City Hall is concerned, the savings, when added to those imposed last year, mean that Londoners are substantially worse off under Boris Johnson and will mean a real reduction in the capacity of City Hall to serve Londoners. Our position is that:

- We understand in particular the hardship being experienced by Londoners, and the very real threat of a ‘double-dip’ recession precipitated by spending cuts and consequential loss to the economy and to Londoners quality of life. We believe the role of our Mayor is to speak up for London. While we note he has lobbied on some matters, his position has been essentially to stand up for the Government rather than for the people who elected him. A Mayor who understood London’s needs would lobby Government on the impact of the cuts and other tax rises on the London economy, and would understand not just their risk to Londoners but to the wider UK economy.

- We support the freeze in Council Tax precept. However, this is happening in parallel with substantial above-inflation fare increases which, together with rises in other taxes, means most Londoners will be far worse off. We note that the additional grant awarded for the freeze offsets only a small proportion of the overall cuts we face. It is less the
case that its award is a reward than that the threat of its non-payment is a threat of further punishment for Londoners.

- Other than in his first year, when he inherited Labour’s last budget, each year under Boris Johnson has seen a reduction in full-time officer numbers. We note that this year the slide quickens, accelerated by a recruitment freeze, and that there will be a reduction in the number of full-time police officers of about 600, plus a reduction in PCSO numbers. Together with other cuts in the Metropolitan Police Service, this is a dramatic loss in capacity and risks a loss in public confidence, with many years progress in reversing levels of recorded crime and the fear of crime placed under threat. This problem is exacerbated by a growing lack of transparency under the MPA’s current Chairman which has made our scrutiny of the budget proposals difficult, as for example exemplified by the ambiguity of his position on neighbourhood policing, which the Mayor both claims to support and is currently proposing to cut. This does not auger well for the accountability of policing under the new arrangements, and the willingness of the Mayor to be held to account for his decisions. The Mayor should be lobbying the Government vigorously about this threat to Londoner’s safety.

- While we support the abolition of the London’s RDA, the London Development Agency, and the vesting of its powers in City Hall (indeed, this was first proposed by a Labour Government), this is meaningless without the resources to do its job. The catastrophic cut in its grant funding, combined with the Government’s centralisation of skills funding, compounds the risks to London’s economy at a time when public intervention is required. Whilst we note that the Mayor is engaged in a frantic rearguard action to secure some funding, his ambitions are inadequate and the crisis would not have happened if he had not failed to make London’s case. This highlights a fundamental difference between the Labour position and that of the Mayor and his coalition Government – a time of economic stress is precisely the wrong time to cut investment in Londoners skills and in preparing London’s businesses for the future. The Mayor and the coalition, on the other hand, see such investment as an essentially unnecessary overhead. Londoners need leadership from their Mayor on skills and employment, on tackling unemployment, particularly youth unemployment, such as through training and apprenticeships, and are not receiving it. Finally, we remain concerned that an increased proportion of residual LDA funding will be devoted to the Mayor’s vanity projects and not to the basic needs of Londoners.

- While there are no catastrophic cuts to the Fire & Rescue Services in the current year, we note that the continuing budgetary pressure resulting from the CSR means far greater cuts will be needed in years 2013/14 and 2014/15. Under the Coalition Government spending plans, massive savings to the tune of £78m will be required for these last two years. There is no clear indication of how LFEPA is planning to avoid a potential crisis with its budget over the next few years and how it will maintain efficient and quality services to Londoners as set out in the Authority’s London Safety Plan. What is certain is that ill-thought out proposals by the Chairman of the Authority to cut 27 fire engines without any form of risk assessment or consultation is unwelcome.

Londoners need clarity and assurance on the level of services they will receive. We call for a public debate so that people can see what the far-reaching effects of any planned cuts will mean for their frontline services. It will be a betrayal of his duty to Londoners if the Mayor chooses to silence this debate until the Mayoral elections are over in the hope that his lack of leadership on these issues is not exposed.

- Transport budget cuts are being funded by a combination of high fare rises and a retreat from ambition in investment and growth in London’s transport network. While services are being maintained this year, the fall in bus subsidy while cost pressures rise risks service cuts in future years. And the post-PPP tube service appears to lurch from one breakdown to the next. As regards investment, and while we welcome Crossrail,
albeit delayed, and the tube upgrades programme, even though this has been scaled back, we note that no new transport projects of significance have been announced under the Mayor – merely a retreat from previous ambition. Indeed, there has been no significant transport investment proposal under the current Mayor – merely the programme inherited from his predecessor minus the cuts to it he eagerly made on his election in 2008. We note also that the closure of the Western Extension of the Congestion zone, while doubtless welcome in some circles, has led to a loss of TFL’s income equivalent to a 2% fare rise for all Londoners – it is important that the Mayor is reminded, and Londoners are aware, of the consequences of his decisions. Investment in and growth to our transport system is vital for London’s future and we note that a wide range of stakeholders take this view. We want to resume the debate on how to achieve a transport system fit for London, and to highlight the failures of ambition, and leadership, under Boris Johnson.

- While there have been efficiency savings in City Hall the number of higher-paid staff supporting the Mayor has increased substantially in the past year. This represents a predictable double-standard by those who preach efficiency but do not practice it when they are personally involved. It highlights the detachment of the administration at City Hall from the lives of most Londoners.

- The budget statement is deficient in addressing a range of other issues, including sustainability, on which it is largely silent and gives little sense of priority, and equality. As an example of the latter, if one looks at the impact of the Mayor’s decisions on women, for example with the affordable childcare programme, which is cut, or on domestic violence, where priority is slipping, we can see a Mayoralty which claims to address concerns but which in detail does not.

- City Hall is, in addition, receiving new powers during the next 12 months. The budget proposals in front of us do not contain a strategic view in anticipation of this. As an example, the Mayor will assume major new powers over housing investment. He needs to be clearer about the priority this will need to have, including the need to lobby for the extra resources our city will need to meet existing demand and future growth, with good design and a focus on sustainability. The budget in front of us is largely silent on these challenges and how in the coming year we will prepare for and assume those duties.

The Greater London Authority under the Mayoralty is a powerful vehicle for change. In order to fulfil this potential it must be driven by a vision, and by ambition. Fundamentally, that is what this ‘tail-end’ budget, with its retreat on policing and its failure to understand the concerns and insecurity of many Londoners, and its failure to offer leadership to ensure a growing city maintains its place as a World City, lacks. The risk is not that we simply fail to meet new challenges but that, in as highly competitive world, we go backwards. His budget contains a fragmented and disjointed set of proposals that shows little understanding of the leadership our city needs.

**Labour’s Alternative Budget**

We note that the budget settlement is not yet totally clear, as the Mayor awaits final decisions on a settlement for the LDA. We will of course welcome additional funding. This does however also mean that our draft alternative budget cannot be finalised until these matters are resolved.

Our alternative strategy contains the following principle elements:

- A further recruitment of police officers, to lessen the cut in numbers in the Mayor’s budget.

- A partial reversal of the transport fares increase.

- Programmes and projects to reverse cuts in the LDA budgets
• A range of other initiatives to tackle priorities for Londoners.

They are spelt out in greater detail in the following pages. They are designed to mitigate the effects of the cuts but we recognise that the scale of savings dictated by Government policy cannot happen without real losses to Londoners. Only a change of direction for London, starting with a different Mayor, can secure change.
Core Greater London Authority - Mayor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Greater London Authority Mayor’s Budget</th>
<th>£138,617,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil change (but see below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional spending on London’s priorities and needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund the final year of the Childcare Affordability Programme</td>
<td>£2,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a Targeted Employment fund</td>
<td>£4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand the Re:New initiative, providing for a further 25,000 homes</td>
<td>£3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinstate the London Zoo &amp; Wetlands Centre agreements</td>
<td>£600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiencies and Savings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce contingency element of budget to</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Majority of our proposals are to fund projects previously funded by the LDA. As the Mayor has stated, and as reported to the LDA Board in January this year, this creates massive uncertainties. Our proposals are designed to create vital interactions to help Londoners at this time of economic stress and instability. However, as the Mayor has not yet received a budget for the LDA, or made clear his proposals, this section is in a very draft form and will be reviewed once his intentions are clear.

Childcare Affordability Programme
We would fund the final year of the recently aborted Childcare Affordability Programme, which has helped thousands of parents into work who otherwise would remain outside the workforce due to high childcare costs: Cost £2.6 million (this is based on the £8 million total cost of the CAP09 programme over a 3 year period), to be funded from the £10.2 million contingency held in the Core GLA budget. The abrupt ending of the programme, announced in January 2011 means that little no or no alternative subsidised childcare is available to those currently taking part in the programme.

This would help keep many parents with children under 5 in work over the next year. The continuation of the programme during 2011/12 can also be justified on the basis of its broader economic value, but also its fairness, a vital theme that any Mayor should consider. As well as providing a valuable service for families, childcare workers release earnings potential by allowing parents to continue working. They also unlock social benefits in the shape of the learning opportunities that children gain outside the home. This is illustrated clearly by the New Economics Foundation’s ‘A Bit Rich’ report, which found that for every £1 they are paid, childcare workers generate between £7 and £9.50 worth of benefits to society.

Targeted Employment Fund
Around 7% of London’s working-age population are unemployed, compared to 6% in the rest of England. After beginning to rise again in 2008, the level of unemployment in London is back
to where it was in the late 1990s. Clearly, poverty in London has accelerated as a result of the economic downturn and, as such, we propose ring-fencing £4 million of the contingency reserved in the 2011/12 core budget for projects specifically aimed at mitigating downturn induced poverty in London through improving employment prospects and supporting and promoting economic growth. One of the components of the fund will be aimed at providing a public to private sector transition programme for those former public sector employees in London who lost their jobs as a result the Coalition Government’s cuts to local government grants.

The unemployment rate among young adults in London is disproportionately high and higher than at any time in the previous 17 years. One in three of London's unemployed population are aged under 25. While the government continues to provide programmes aimed at 16-24 year old ‘NEETs’ (Not in Employment Education or Training), the brokerage schemes being financed do not meet the needs of those hardest to reach; particularly the Black and Minority Ethnic Community, which has an unemployment of almost 50% amongst 16-24 year olds. As such, £1.5 million of the £4 million Targeted Employment Fund budget will be provided in the form of a grant to the London Voluntary Service Council to finance a team with the remit of liaising with the 32 boroughs, providing them with borough-by-borough skills and employment training opportunities provided by the voluntary sector.

**RE:NEW**

The RE:NEW programme is an admirable and timely scheme that saves householders money on ever-rising fuel bills and reduces London’s CO2, thus helping contribute to our carbon reduction programme. By streamlining various initiatives and funding streams into one scheme which targets an area, going direct to people’s homes to provide information and practical measures to reduce energy consumption, the initial cost to the provider is recouped by the householder in reduced fuel bills in just two years. It should therefore be supported and brought to as many homes as possible, as quickly as possible.

The pilots and trials have shown that initial, easy energy saving measures can be brought to people's homes for an average cost of £157, but we are confident that with economies of scale and by bringing in the energy companies to support RE:NEW as part of their national obligations, we can reduce the cost per home to an average of £120.

The current programme proposes to reach 200,000 homes by 2012, but we feel the value of this scheme is such that we want to see it rolled out faster. For this reason, we want to commit an additional £3 million in order to reach an additional 25,000 homes in 2011/12.

The Mayor has allocated funding for the current phase of RE:NEW which runs until 2012, by which time the Mayor hopes that central Government will take over, fulfilling the RE:NEW aspiration of treating 1.2 million homes with energy saving measures by 2015. As central Government is already making deep and substantial cuts across what are perceived to be soft budgetary targets, we believe this transition to centrally provided funding is unlikely to take place. Unless the programme is stepped up now, with GLA funding, we have serious doubts that the ambitious target of 1.2 million homes will be reached.

**London Zoo and Wetland Centre**

This scheme, which began receiving funding from the GLA in 2001, will come to an end in March 2011. Boris Johnson personally signed a mayoral decision form in November to bring it to an end.

In 2007 98,330 school children visited London Zoo - more than three quarters did so for free through the funding programme. The cash from the GLA currently gives pupils from every one of the 2,583 state schools in London the opportunity to take part in a free educational visit to London Zoo or the Wetland Centre in Barnes each academic year.
We believe that these types of visits are important and should not be decided upon purely by
the income of a child's parents or the type of school they attend to determine whether they can
access fantastic educational facilities like these and these successful schemes should continue.
This programme helps to both broaden educational experience and to bring this in particular to
those without the family background or resources to ordinarily enjoy this enrichment.
We note that the Assembly Budget has, in percentage terms of like-for-like revenue spending, achieved a greater saving than the Mayor’s budget. Were the Assembly Budget to achieve the same level of savings as the mayor’s budget it would be set at £8.49million.

Although we propose no change in the Assembly’s budget this year, it is important to note that just as the Mayor is taking on new responsibilities as part of the government’s Localism Bill, and is already increasing the staffing of the GLA to accommodate this, the Assembly will also be taking on more scrutiny responsibilities to ensure the Mayor fulfils his duties, and a re-evaluation of support staff for the Assembly will be necessary over the coming months. We make this point because we, and we understand a majority of Assembly Members, reject the Mayor’s assertion in his budget report that whatever additional duties the Assembly secures can be supported from within its existing budget.

The work of the Assembly is a core and vital part of the work of London’s Government. In particular, during this year the Assembly will, together with other additional duties, be taking over the scrutiny of policing, a service with annual budgets in excess of £3billion.
Metropolitan Police Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Police Authority</th>
<th>£2,713,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change (but see below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Initiatives in support of Londoners

- **Save 200 Police Officers posts**: £10,170,000
- **Restore the 32 Safer School Team PCSOs**: £1,020,000
- **Youth, Gangs and Knife Crime**: £4,000,000
- **Initial bursary fund for qualifying new police officer recruits**: £90,000
- **Co-locating Borough Child Protection Teams with Local Authority Teams**: £156,000

### Efficiencies and savings

- **Cut unnecessary 1st and Business Class air travel**: £1,500,000
- **Cut the MPS media department by 50%**: £3,400,000
- **Cut the consultants budget by 50%**: £1,450,000
- **Reduce the Senior Officer Cars budget**: £138,000
- **Move to more leased contracts for cars, rather than hiring them**: £298,000
- **Increase revenue from events**: £1,000,000
- **Reduced overtime budget**: £4,400,000
- **Reduced subscription to Association of Chief Police Officers**: £110,000
- **Reduction in hotel budget of 50%**: £140,000

### Estates budgets:

- **Co-location of offices and rent raised from lettings**: £1,000,000
- **Additional Corporate Real Estate Savings**: £2,000,000

Our aim is to minimise cuts to policing arising from the Mayor’s budget.

The Coalition government is making drastic cuts to the funding that the MPS receive and the Mayor’s response is to cut 581 Police Officers and 790 PCSOs. We note that the Mayor has made cuts in the number of police in London in all of his budgets, despite a promise to retain police numbers at the historically high levels achieved by the previous Mayor. We are deeply
concerned that these further cuts will jeopardise the safety and confidence of Londoners. In addition to recruiting 200 police officers, we will lobby the government to rethink its policy of cutting police funding and put in adequate resources to enable London to restore its pre-budget level. And whilst there are undoubted efficiency savings to be made, further cuts to the number of police support staff also risk reducing time officers are able to spend on our streets and risk forcing them back behind desks.

The Commissioner had stated that the MPS will “shrink” and that this is a very difficult time in policing as a result of the extent of the budget cuts. Partners, such as local authorities, are also facing shrinking budgets and having to make difficult choices as to which services to axe. This means that there is a real risk partners will withdraw from contributing to the ‘purchase’ of additional police officers and funding for crime prevention work, all of which adds additional pressure to an already stretched police force. In the longer term, particularly post Olympics in 2012, we expect things to get much more difficult for the MPS, especially in maintaining police numbers.

We are proposing the following changes:
We plan to put back onto the streets an extra 200 police officers and will retain an additional 32 PSCOs in the Safer Schools Teams. We would halt the planned halving of the number of safer neighbourhood team sergeants.

Knife crime and serious youth violence is rising. We believe that investment in crime-prevention programmes are vitally important and in the long-term interests of London. We are extremely concerned that the Mayor is retreating from funding many prevention programmes across our City. The removal of the BOCU fund (£8m) which supported partnership work in every London Borough and cuts to officer numbers working in Safer Schools Teams are evidence of this approach. We believe that this funding is essential in preventing our young people from starting a life of crime, joining a gang, or becoming a victim of the rise in serious youth violence and knife crime. As a result we plan to allocate £4m to support partnership work at local and pan-London level aimed at young people in addressing knife crime and gangs. We would also ensure that the number of officers dedicated to Safer Schools Teams are enhanced.

As we stated last year, we will set aside money in order to implement the recommendation of the Laming Progress Report regarding co-location of child protection teams. We will roll-out the process of co-locating MPS Public Protection Desks and Local Authority child protection teams that has begun successfully in Haringey.

A police force that is diverse and reflects London’s citizens is important in maintaining the public’s trust. The MPS have made great strides in this over the last decade. However, we are concerned that new arrangements of recruiting police officers primarily through the MSC risks making it difficult for certain groups to embark on a career in the MPS. In order to alleviate the hardship some will undoubtedly face, we will set up a bursary scheme to help those who are less well off or are time poor and need help to overcome these initial hurdles.

We believe that rather than make cuts to the frontline the Mayor should be looking at making further cuts to non-essential spending. We would ask police staff to fly economy and not first class; we will ask them to stay in a budget hotel outside the central zone; we would cut the number of spin doctors in the MPS and the number of consultants they employ; we would reduce the number of chauffeur driven cars the top officers use; we will ask the MPS to acquire any cars they do need on a long lease rather than a short hire deal; we would reduce the MPS fees to ACPO; we would make more savings on rationalising the estate in this financial year; and we would make further savings to the overtime budget.

---

2 There was an 8.3% increase in knife crime during 2010, but the number of young people that have been a victim of knife crime has gone up by a staggering 17.8%. The increase in knife crime is mirrored by a 3.1% increase in serious youth violence.
3 The Protection of Children in England: A Progress Report
We note that the MPS are currently in discussions with the government regarding the costs of policing the Royal Wedding. At this welcome national celebration it is estimated that policing costs could amount to £5M. We believe national government should pay the costs of this operation which we would use to further increase police officer numbers.

All of our savings proposals will mean less waste and more police on the streets, which is what Londoners want too.
We propose no change to LFEPA’s budget. However, the raid by the Mayor on LFEPA’s reserves to the tune of £20m will leave a tough legacy and difficult choices for the 2013/14 and 2014/5 budgets due to the unprecedented level of savings to be found. We would bring forward the review of the budget strategy so that there is transparency before the next stage of budget cuts approaches. This is vital in order that Londoners and decision-makers understand the funding challenges we face. Crucial questions need to be addressed on the deployment of resources across the GLA family as a whole, and, significantly, how and whether this should be applied to mitigate or avoid cuts to LFEPA front-line operations and to assess any impact on the London Safety Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority</th>
<th>£409,400,00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Mayor needs to get back to basics in delivering a sound, affordable and reliable transport service.

The bus service serves the majority of Londoners well, but with 2 years of inflation busting increases the service is becoming unaffordable for some of the poorest and lower paid in our community.

We intend to improve access to the transport network further and restore some of the Mayor’s dropped projects - these improvements benefit everyone.

We are 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 lost from quiet underground stations at night. This, combined with the loss of the zone 2-6 travel card facility, has led to the Mayor undermining transport services in outer London.

We are not able to reverse the abolition of the Western Extension of the Congestion Charging Zone, as it has been scrapped following due consultation and revision of the transport strategy. However, we believe it is important to highlight to Londoners the opportunity cost of its abolition. With net revenues of £55million, its cost to Londoners is equal to

- approximately 2% on fares, or
- 183 hybrid double-decker buses, which give out fewer emissions and would help with London’s poor air quality, or
- Reinstall the Step Free Access Programme at stations such as Harrow-on-the-Hill, or

| Transport for London Mayor’s call upon the precept | £6,000,000 |
| Support for Londoners | £24,000,000 |
| Reduce the 7% bus fares rise by cutting the RPI+2% increase to RPI | £500,000 |
| Restore the 2-6 Travel card facility | £50,000,000 |
| Additional Step-Free Access Projects | £5,000,000 |
| Tube Station minimum staffing levels guarantee (equivalent to restoring 100 full-time staff) | £24,000,000 |
| Income Growth and savings in support of Londoners | £12,000,000 |
| Revised and more realistic growth in Public Transport ridership | £12,000,000 |
| Suspend Pedestrian Traffic lights removal project “Smoothing the Traffic” | £800,000 |
| Transfers from Reserves | £66,700,000 |
• Build the Surrey Canal road Station on Phase 2 of the East London Line, or
• Retrofitting over 280 TfL buildings in 2011 / 12.

While it is perfectly proper, if he chooses, to scrap the zone, a responsible Mayor would have considered the consequences of abolition for all Londoners, rather than purely buying the votes of a small group of Londoners. And Londoners need to be reminded of the consequences of his decision.
London Development Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London Development Agency</th>
<th>£ NIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The London Development Agency makes no call on the precept, but its duties and, therefore, budget remain central to the Authority’s remit of promoting economic development and wealth creation in Greater London, promoting social development in Greater London, and promoting the improvement of the environment in Greater London.

However, given the estimated cut of 49% in LDA thematic programme expenditure - from £166.6 million to £85.6 million - between the 2010/11 and 2011/12 budgets periods, the ability of the LDA to contribute to the delivery of this remit is much diminished. This assertion is supported by the LDA board’s July 2010 conclusion that a cut in government grant of 13% or greater to the £275 million in 2010/11 (after in-year cuts) in the 2011/12 grant would be “a break even point, beneath which critical mass would be an issue”. If we extrapolate on this conclusion in specific relation to LDA’s thematic programme expenditure the LDA’s ability to ‘deliver’ in 2011/12 is highly questionable.

The current economic climate and, in particular, the Office for National Statistics’ January announcement that the UK economy had shrunk by 0.5% in the fourth quarter of 2010, means that prioritising LDA funding towards job creation and retention should be an essential feature of the 2011/12 LDA thematic programme budget. It is of concern, then, that the LDA budgets for the Regeneration, Sustained Employment, Business Support, and International Promotion programmes have been cut so significantly in comparison with 2011/12: -56% -36%, -54%, and –73% respectively.

The LDA’s record as a driver of economic growth for London is impressive - as illustrated by the fact that Agency has created total of 24,407 jobs since May 2008. Its ability to continue creating jobs or support people to remain in work should not be discounted and must be amongst the Agency’s highest priorities in its wind-down year.

While the Mayor has acknowledged that “the job creation rate achieved by the LDA is good for London” and that he has “been actively lobbying the Government for the best possible settlement for economic development investment in London”, he has accepted that it is “inevitable that there will be cutbacks in investment”.

This is an unacceptably defeatist position for the Mayor to take and, with this in mind, we are proposing that the LDA administrates the projects highlighted under the Core GLA Budget heading in this document.

**As with the Core GLA Budget, the work on this section of our amendment remains work in progress while we await a budget settlement from Government. However, we do not envisage a departure from the headline of a zero call on precept.**
PART B: Proposal to approve, with amendments, the Draft Consolidated Budget for
the 2011-12 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 2011-12 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
budget requirement for 2011-12 for each constituent body as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent body</th>
<th>Component budget requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority: Mayor of London</td>
<td>£138,617,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority: London Assembly</td>
<td>£8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Police Authority</td>
<td>£2,713,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority</td>
<td>£409,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport for London</td>
<td>£6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Development Agency</td>
<td>£Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The component budget requirements shown in recommendation 2 above, give rise to a
consolidated budget requirement for the Authority for 2011-12 (shown at Line 55 in
the attached Schedule) of -

£ 3,275,017,000

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.
### SCHEDULE

**Part 1: Greater London Authority: Mayor of London (“Mayor”) draft component budget requirement calculations**

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>£212,696,000</td>
<td><strong>£222,896,000</strong></td>
<td>estimated expenditure of the Mayor calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>£10,621,000</td>
<td><strong>£421,000,000</strong></td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for the Mayor under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>£5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the Mayor under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the Mayor under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td><strong>£228,317,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for the Mayor (lines (1) + (2) + (3) + (4) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>-£80,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of Mayor’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>-£9,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of Mayor’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (1) and (2) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>-£89,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for the Mayor (lines (6) + (7))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td><strong>£138,617,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>the component budget requirement for Mayor (being the amount by which the aggregate at (5) above exceeds the aggregate at (8) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for the Mayor for 2011–12 is: **£ 138,617,000**

[insert Line 9 figure]
Part 2: Greater London Authority: London Assembly ("Assembly") draft component budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>£8,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated expenditure of the Assembly for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for the Assembly under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the Assembly under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the Assembly under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>£8,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for the Assembly (lines (10) + (11) + (12) + (13) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of the Assembly’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of the Assembly’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (10) and (11) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for the Assembly (lines (15) + (16))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>£8,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>the draft component budget requirement for the Assembly (being the amount by which the aggregate at (14) above exceeds the aggregate at (17) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for the Assembly for 2011-12 is: £8,000,000 [insert Line 18 figure]
### Part 3: Metropolitan Police Authority (“MPA”) draft component budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>£3,547,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated expenditure of the MPA for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>£25,100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for the MPA under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the MPA under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the MPA under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>£3,572,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for the MPA (lines (19) + (20) + (21) + (22) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>-£824,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of the MPA’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>-£34,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of MPA’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (19) and (20) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>-£859,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for the MPA (lines (24) + (25))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>£2,713,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>the draft component budget requirement for the MPA (being the amount by which the aggregate at (23) above exceeds the aggregate at (26) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for the MPA for 2011-12 is: **£2,713,000,000**

[insert Line 27 figure]
**Part 4: London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (“LFEPA”) draft component budget requirement calculations**

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>£459,600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated expenditure of LFEPA for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for LFEPA under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of LFEPA under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of LFEPA under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>£459,600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for LFEPA (lines (28) + (29) + (30) + (31) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>-£30,900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of LFEPA’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>-£19,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of LFEPA’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (28) and (29) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>-£50,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for LFEPA (lines (33) + (34))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>£409,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>the draft component budget requirement for LFEPA (being the amount by which the aggregate at (32) above exceeds the aggregate at (35) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for LFEPA for 2011-12 is: £409,400,000

[insert Line 36 figure]
Part 5: Transport for London ("TfL") draft component budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor's proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>£8,441,000,000</td>
<td>£8,495,700,000</td>
<td>estimated expenditure of TfL for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>£154,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for TfL under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>£245,000,000</td>
<td>£178,300,000</td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of TfL under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of TfL under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>£8,840,000,000</td>
<td>£8,828,000,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for TfL (lines (37) + (38) + (39) + (40) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>-£8,834,000,000</td>
<td>£8,822,000,000</td>
<td>estimate of TfL’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of TfL’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (37) and (38) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>-£8,834,000,000</td>
<td>£8,822,000,000</td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for TfL (lines (42) + (43))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>£6,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>the component budget requirement for TfL (being the amount by which the aggregate at (41) above exceeds the aggregate at (44) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for TfL for 2011-12 is: £6,000,000
[insert Line 45 figure]
Part 6: London Development Agency ("LDA") draft component budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft component budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor’s Proposal</th>
<th>Budget amendment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>£213,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated expenditure of the LDA for the year calculated in accordance with s85(4)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>£3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated allowance for contingencies for the LDA under s85(4)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimated reserves to be raised for meeting future expenditure of the LDA under s85(4)(c) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of reserves to meet a revenue account deficit of the LDA under s85(4)(d) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>£216,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in s85(4) of the Act for the LDA (lines (46) + (47) + (48) + (49) above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>-£216,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of the LDA’s income calculated in accordance with s85(5)(a) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>estimate of the LDA’s reserves to be used in meeting amounts in lines (46) and (47) above under s85(5)(b) of the Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>£216,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>aggregate of the amounts for the items set out in section 85(5) of the Act for the LDA (lines (51) + (52))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>the component budget requirement for the LDA (being the amount by which the aggregate at (50) above exceeds the aggregate at (53) above calculated in accordance with section 85(6) of the Act)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft component budget requirement for the LDA for 2011-2012 is: £0 [insert Line 54 figure]
Part 7: The Greater London Authority ("GLA") draft consolidated budget requirement calculations

NOTE: Amendments to the draft consolidated budget 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Mayor's proposed consolidated budget requirement</th>
<th>Budget amendment's proposed consolidated budget requirement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>£3,275,017,000</td>
<td>£3,275,017,000</td>
<td>the GLA's consolidated budget requirement (the sum of the amounts in lines (9) + (18) + (27) + (36) + (45) + (54)) calculated in accordance with section 85(8) of the Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft consolidated budget requirement for 2011-12 is: £3,275,017,000

[insert Line 55 figure]
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1. **Apologies for Absence and Chair's Announcements (Item 1)**

1.1 There were no apologies for absence.

1.2 The Chair explained that, following consultation regarding the order of business for this meeting, the first item of substantive business at this meeting would be, as set out on the agenda, the consideration of the Draft Consolidated Budget 2011/12.

1.3 During the course of the meeting, the Chair welcomed to the public gallery students from St Lawrence University in New York.

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

2.1 Resolved:

(a) That the relevant Assembly Members’ membership of Functional Bodies and London Borough Councils, as set out in Item 2 on the agenda, be noted and recorded as personal interests;

(b) That the Chair’s declaration of a personal interest in Item 4 (Final Draft Consolidated Budget 2011/12), arising from her position as a member of the London Youth Games Board, be additionally noted; and

(c) That gifts and hospitality received by Members, as set out in the Authority’s gifts and hospitality register, be noted.

3. **Minutes (Item 3)**

3.1 Andrew Boff AM raised a concern in relation to statements made by the Chair at the Assembly Plenary meeting on 19 January 2011.

3.2 The Chair acknowledged that she may have inadvertently given the impression that she had not received an e-mail in relation to a motion which had been discussed at that meeting. She explained that she had intended to indicate that the e-mail that she had received did not set out the point which Andrew Boff AM had made at the 19 January meeting in relation to that motion. The Chair stated that, in order to conclude the discussion and proceed to other business, she apologised for any confusion caused.

3.3 Resolved:

The minutes of the London Assembly meetings on 19 January 2011 (Plenary) and 26 January 2011 (Mayor’s Question Time) were agreed as correct record of those meetings, for signature by the Chair.
4. **Draft Consolidated Budget 2011/12 (Item 4)**

**Report of the Mayor (Item 4a)**

4.1 The Assembly received the Mayor’s Final Draft Consolidated Budget for 2011/12.

4.2 The Mayor made an oral statement in support of his budget proposals. A copy of the Mayor’s statement is attached as **Appendix 1**.

**Questions to the Mayor (Item 4b)**

4.3 Assembly Members put questions to the Mayor on his Draft Consolidated Budget proposals. The record of the questions put by Members and the Mayor’s answers is attached as **Appendix 2**.

4.4 Martin Clarke, Executive Director of Resources, was also in attendance for this item.

4.5 During the course of the question and answer session the Chair, noting that John Biggs AM had persistently disregarded the Chair’s rulings in relation to the conduct of the debate, and in accordance with Standing Order 2.10B, moved, “That John Biggs AM not be further heard”. Upon being put to the vote, this was agreed (15 votes in favour and 7 votes against).

**Consideration by the Assembly of the Mayor of London’s Final Draft Consolidated Budget proposals 2011/12 (Item 4c)**

4.6 The Assembly turned to debate of the Mayor’s Final Draft Consolidated Budget 2011/12.

4.7 The Chair, noting the undertaking given by John Biggs AM to abide by the rules of debate, moved, “That John Biggs AM be heard”. Upon being put to the vote, this was agreed (13 votes in favour and 10 votes against).

4.8 A formal budget amendment, presented on behalf of the London Assembly’s Conservative Group, was moved by Gareth Bacon AM and seconded by Roger Evans AM (and is attached as **Appendix 3**).

4.9 A formal budget amendment, presented on behalf of the London Assembly’s Green Group, was moved by Darren Johnson AM and seconded by Jenny Jones AM (and is attached as **Appendix 4**).

4.10 A formal budget amendment, presented on behalf of the London Assembly’s Liberal Democrat Group, was moved by Mike Tuffrey AM and seconded by Caroline Pidgeon AM (and is attached as **Appendix 5**).

4.11 A formal budget amendment, presented on behalf of the London Assembly’s Labour Group, was moved by John Biggs AM and seconded by Valerie Shawcross AM (and is attached as **Appendix 6**).

4.12 During the course of the debate, Tony Arbour AM moved, in accordance with Standing Order 4.5, “That the question now be put to a vote”. The Chair having been satisfied that there had
been sufficient debate, and upon being put to the vote, this was agreed (15 votes for and 10 votes against). Accordingly, the four formal amendments to the Final Draft Consolidated Budget for 2011/12 were then put to the vote. In accordance with Standing Order 6.6E(1), a named vote was taken on each amendment.

4.13 Upon being put to the vote, the votes in respect of the amendment in the name of Roger Evans AM were cast as follows:

For the amendment: Tony Arbour AM, Gareth Bacon AM, Richard Barnbrook AM, Richard Barnes AM, Andrew Boff AM, Victoria Borwick AM, James Cleverly AM, Brian Coleman AM, Roger Evans AM, Kit Malthouse AM, Steve O’Connell AM and Richard Tracey AM.

Against the amendment: John Biggs AM, Len Duvall AM, Nicky Gavron AM, Darren Johnson AM, Jenny Jones AM, Joanne McCartney AM, Caroline Pidgeon AM, Murad Qureshi AM, Navin Shah AM, Valerie Shawcross AM, Mike Tuffrey AM, Jennette Arnold AM (Deputy Chair) and Dee Doocey AM (Chair).

4.14 The amendment was declared lost, with 12 votes being cast in favour and 13 votes being cast against.

4.15 Upon being put to the vote, the votes in respect of the amendment in the name of Darren Johnson AM were cast as follows:

For the amendment: Jenny Jones AM and Darren Johnson AM.

Against the amendment: Tony Arbour AM, Gareth Bacon AM, Richard Barnes AM, John Biggs AM, Andrew Boff AM, Victoria Borwick AM, James Cleverly AM, Brian Coleman AM, Len Duvall AM, Roger Evans AM, Nicky Gavron AM, Kit Malthouse AM, Joanne McCartney AM, Steve O’Connell AM, Caroline Pidgeon AM, Murad Qureshi AM, Navin Shah AM, Valerie Shawcross AM, Richard Tracey AM, Mike Tuffrey AM, Jennette Arnold AM (Deputy Chair) and Dee Doocey AM (Chair).

4.16 Richard Barnbrook AM abstained from voting on this amendment.

4.17 The amendment was declared lost, with 2 votes being cast in favour, 22 votes being cast against, and with one Member abstaining from voting.

4.18 Upon being put to the vote, the votes in respect of the amendment in the name of Mike Tuffrey AM were cast as follows:

For the amendment: Caroline Pidgeon AM, Mike Tuffrey AM and Dee Doocey AM (Chair).

Against the amendment: Tony Arbour AM, Gareth Bacon AM, Richard Barnes AM, John Biggs AM, Andrew Boff AM, Victoria Borwick AM, James Cleverly AM, Brian Coleman AM, Len Duvall AM, Roger Evans AM, Nicky Gavron AM, Kit Malthouse AM, Joanne McCartney AM, Steve O’Connell AM, Murad Qureshi AM, Navin Shah AM, Valerie Shawcross AM, Richard Tracey AM and Jennette Arnold AM (Deputy Chair).

4.19 Richard Barnbrook AM, Darren Johnson AM, and Jenny Jones AM abstained from voting on this amendment.
4.20 The amendment was declared lost, with 3 votes being cast in favour, 19 votes being cast against, and with 3 Members abstaining from voting.

4.21 Upon being put to the vote, the votes in respect of the amendment in the name of John Biggs AM were cast as follows:

For the amendment: John Biggs AM, Len Duvall AM, Nicky Gavron AM, Joanne McCartney AM, Murad Qureshi AM, Navin Shah AM, Valerie Shawcross AM and Jennette Arnold AM (Deputy Chair).

Against the amendment: Tony Arbour AM, Gareth Bacon AM, Richard Barnes AM, Andrew Boff AM, Victoria Borwick AM, James Cleverly AM, Brian Coleman AM, Roger Evans AM, Kit Malthouse AM, Steve O’Connell AM, Caroline Pidgeon AM, Richard Tracey AM, Mike Tuffrey AM and Dee Doocey AM (Chair).

4.22 Richard Barnbrook AM, Darren Johnson AM and Jenny Jones AM abstained from voting on this amendment.

4.23 The amendment was declared lost, with 8 votes being cast in favour, 14 votes against and with 3 Members abstaining from voting.

4.24 The following budget related motion was moved by Mike Tuffrey AM and seconded by Joanne McCartney AM:

“This Assembly notes the success of Neighbourhood Policing and regrets the Mayor’s proposal to remove 100 Sergeants from the Safer Neighbourhood Teams over the coming year. We do not believe a case for these reductions has been made given that the review of SNTs is still underway. We ask the Mayor to reverse this decision.”

4.25 Upon being put to the vote, the budget related motion in the name of Mike Tuffrey AM, namely:

“This Assembly notes the success of Neighbourhood Policing and regrets the Mayor’s proposal to remove 100 Sergeants from the Safer Neighbourhood Teams over the coming year. We do not believe a case for these reductions has been made given that the review of SNTs is still underway. We ask the Mayor to reverse this decision.”

was carried (13 votes in favour and 11 votes against).

4.26 There being no other formal budget amendments or budget-related motions, the substantive motion, namely:

“To approve the Final Draft Budget for 2011/12 without amendment.”

was put to the vote.

4.27 This was not carried (11 votes were cast in favour, 13 votes were cast against and one Member abstained from voting).
4.28 However, it was noted that, as no amendment to the Final Draft Consolidated Budget had attracted the requisite two thirds majority of votes cast in its favour, the Final Draft Consolidated Budget for 2011/12, as submitted by the Mayor, was deemed to have been approved without amendment, in accordance with Paragraph 8(5) of Schedule 6 to the GLA Act 1999 (as amended).

4.29 The Chair announced that this concluded the Assembly’s consideration of the Final Draft Consolidated Budget.

5. **Mayor’s Report (Item 5)**

5.1 **Resolved:**

That the Mayor’s Report for the period from 13 January 2011 – 9 February 2011 be noted.

6. **Questions to the Mayor (Item 6)**

6.1 **Resolved:**

That it be noted that written answers will be provided by Monday 28 February 2011 to all questions submitted to this meeting under the Mayor’s Question Time procedure.

6.2 The written answers subsequently provided by the Mayor are attached at Appendix 7.

7. **Review of Post of Chief Executive (Item 7)**

7.1 The Chair explained that this report had been marked ‘to follow’ on the agenda for the meeting and had been circulated under a Supplementary Agenda for this meeting.

7.2 The Chair had agreed to accept this late report in order to allow its consideration at the earliest opportunity.

7.3 The report set out on the Supplementary Agenda proposed that an Appointments Panel to interview internal candidates for the posts of Head of Paid Service and Greater London Returning Officer be established and meet on 1 March 2011, on the rising of the meeting of the Assembly’s Business Management and Administration Committee.

7.4 The Chair explained that, subject to the Assembly’s approval to the establishment of that Panel, it was now proposed that the Panel meet instead in the week beginning 7 March 2011, on a date to be determined.
Resolved:

(a) That it be agreed, following a review into the roles and functions currently undertaken by the Chief Executive and formal consultation with the Chief Executive and affected staff, to delete the post of Chief Executive, noting that this was subject to a decision by the Mayor;

(b) That the appointment process set out in paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3 of the report, for the Head of Paid Service and Greater London Returning Officer roles and functions which must continue if the Chief Executive’s post is approved for deletion, be agreed, noting that this was subject to a decision by the Mayor;

(c) That the following Members be appointed to the informal Appointments Panel established in accordance with resolution (b) above: Gareth Bacon AM, Andrew Boff AM, Len Duvall AM, Murad Qureshi AM, Caroline Pidgeon AM, and Jenny Jones AM; and

(d) That the appointment of Martin Clarke, Executive Director of Resources, as Interim Head of Paid Service and Mark Roberts, Executive Director of the Secretariat, as Interim Greater London Returning Officer be approved, whilst the appointment process is undertaken, noting that this was subject to a decision by the Mayor.

8. **Date of Next Meeting (Item 8)**

8.1 It was noted that the next meeting of the London Assembly (Plenary) would be held on Wednesday 16 March 2011 at 10.00am in the Chamber, City Hall.

8.2 This meeting would be used to put questions to the Chair and Chief Executive of the Olympic Park Legacy Company.

8.3 Further to discussions with Groups, it was proposed that the Assembly additionally invited Sir Simon Milton to the 16 March 2011 London Assembly Plenary meeting to answer questions in relation to the proposed Mayoral Development Corporation for the Olympic area.

8.4 **Resolved:**

That it be agreed additionally to invite Sir Simon Milton to the 16 March 2011 London Assembly Plenary meeting to answer questions in relation to the proposed Mayoral Development Corporation for the Olympic area.
9. **Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent (Item 9)**

9.1 There was no other urgent business requiring consideration.

10. **Close of Meeting**

10.1 The meeting closed at 12.39pm.
Dee Doocye (Chair): We are now going to turn to the consideration of the final budget, the Mayor’s Consolidated Budget for the GLA group 2011/12. Can I just perhaps explain the procedure? Good morning Mr Mayor.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Morning Dee.

Dee Doocye (Chair): First of all I will ask the Mayor to present his budget, focussing in particular on any changes since we last looked at the budget on 10 February, and the Mayor will have up to ten minutes to do that. We will then move on to one question and two supplementary questions from each of the Groups on the Assembly and I will call them in the following order: Greens, Labour, Liberal Democrat and Conservatives. After that we will have a general debate. For those two latter sections we will have up to an hour.

So first of all can I ask you, Mr Mayor, to present any changes that you might have had since 10 February.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): There are a few changes I would like to update the Assembly about. The first is that the GLA is in receipt of three new grants from central Government. The Government has granted the GLA £34 million over four years to help end rough sleeping. This is a real vote of confidence in City Hall’s ability to identify and commission projects that genuinely work in getting the most entrenched rough sleepers into secure accommodation. I would like to pay tribute to Richard Blakeway [Mayoral Advisor, Housing] and the London Delivery Board which he set up for all the excellent work being done in this area.

Secondly, the Government has announced its intention to pay the Community Safety Grant for crime reduction activities to the GLA rather than the boroughs, and given how late into the budget preparation cycle this has been announced we have written to all the boroughs to reassure them for this year we intend to passport through pro rata their share of this grant.

Finally, the GLA is to administer the £400,000 Seaside and Country Homes Scheme, which has been going for few years.

I have also of course been carefully considering the amendments that you have proposed to the budget. On funding the police, I think it is a little bit of a shame that Members did not change their motions after actually receiving my budget because I am already increasing funding to the Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) by £42 million. Because of this and because of all the sensible economies that are being made by the MPA service, we, unlike any other English force, are able to turn back on the taps of officer recruitment, which will mean that London will have more fully warranted police officers on the streets at the end of this term than there were when I was elected.

I am sorry I cannot yet announce the full detail of the London Development Agency (LDA) settlement but I can return to the points I made on 10 February and reassure you that I remain committed to a 60% reduction in CO₂ emissions, on delivering our promise of 10,000 new street
trees, improving 11 parks across London and with the RE:NEW and RE:FIT programmes funded this can be a truly green budget.

On fares, of course I understand some of the points that Members are trying to make. What we have tried to do under this administration is maintain a steady and predictable fair fares policy, in contrast to previous administrations, who have not only put fares up by more than this one but also played cynical politics with fares, leaving Transport for London (TfL) with a huge black hole that has had to be filled. My fares policy, our fares policy, is paying for the record levels of investment in London’s creaking transport infrastructure and one that will see real benefits for Londoners. We cannot put that at risk with a volatile and unpredictable fares policy.

Of course I listened carefully to the views of the Assembly on the Access for London project. We are analysing the business case for this carefully and I can assure you that your views will be taken fully in due consideration as the long-term future of this project is decided.

So, after considering all the amendments as discussed and proposed by the Assembly, I do not believe, interesting though they were, that they in any way improved this budget, which is one that delivers for Londoners’ priorities. It makes London safer by: increasing the number of warranted officers in our streets, in our schools and on our public transport system; continuing the investment in our transport system; extending the Barclays cycle hire scheme eastward; upgrading the tube and delivering Crossrail. It means improving London’s public spaces with more trees, better parks and fantastic urban realm schemes and environmental projects that actually deliver reduced carbon emissions and reduce bills for Londoners. It gives young people, who we know are suffering most from our country’s economic problems, more opportunities. By freezing the Council Tax for a third year in a row, we have offered, in real terms, a 10% reduction on our share of the Council Tax since I was elected and I therefore commend this budget to you and to the Assembly.
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Jenny Jones (AM): Your final budget states, “At a time when police forces around England are reducing uniformed officer numbers, the Mayor is going in the opposite direction”. But do you think the public would be astonished to learn that in fact, compared to last year’s budget, your budget for this year actually assumes a net loss of 581 police officers, a net loss of 790 Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs), a net loss of 210 traffic wardens and 212 police staff? Because what you have done is played with figures and you have actually compared this year’s budget with some figures that happened earlier this year that are not representative; that are actually being kept artificially low. So you used two sets of figures that were not like for like.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): No, I mean --

Jenny Jones (AM): Compared with your last budget there is actually a reduction in police officers, police staff.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): What is certainly true is that if you look at what we have been doing, if you look at the graph of overall police staff and police officers – and it is certainly true that we have been making savings in the overall number of police staff – we have been increasing the number of warranted police officers. As I say, and it cannot be repeated too often, if you look at the figures in 2012 and you compare them to 2008 there is a net increase of about 1,000 warranted police officers, and I think, in the face of an incredibly difficult financial crisis, precipitated by the policies that the Honourable Lady supported, it is actually very remarkable that we are able to increase police numbers.

On the point about traffic wardens, which you mentioned Jenny, yes it is true that there is a discussion underway about the future of a couple of hundred traffic wardens, but many of those will be deployed as PCSOs or designated detention officers or in other functions. On PCSOs, which I know you are about to raise, we are confident that we can go ahead with our reforms, increasing the number of warranted officers, putting an extra 413 officers on the transport system, another 70 in schools without --

Jenny Jones (AM): Mr Mayor, you have avoided answering my question.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): -- without any redundancies in PCSOs.

Jenny Jones (AM): My question is your claim --

Dee Doocey (Chair): Mr Mayor, can I just remind you that particularly --

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): What was the question? What was the question?

Dee Doocey (Chair): Can I just remind you that particularly the smaller Groups have a very limited amount of time and if you could just address the question that would be much appreciated.
Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): What was the question?

Dee Doocey (Chair): Quiet please.

Jenny Jones (AM): That is not fair to any --

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): The question was something like, “Would Londoners be astonished”, or some blah blah blah blah fishcakes. There was no question there at all. It was a morass.

Jenny Jones (AM): Do you think, Mr Mayor, you should show some more respect to the Assembly and its questions?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): As I say, I did my very best to answer several points in your question as I understand them. I could not detect a solid question.

Jenny Jones (AM): Then I will ask it again, much more simply, OK. In claiming that you have more officers, that we will have a bigger police force this year than in last year’s budget, you used figures that were not like for like. You found some figures that were artificially low and you used them to compare the new figures with.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): No. As I said, the key point is that we have been able, through economies in the MPA budget --

Jenny Jones (AM): What can I do? He is not answering.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): -- and in adroit usage of the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) reserve, which is very sensible in the current circumstances, we have been able to put more frontline officers out there where people want to see them.

Jenny Jones (AM): He is not answering my question. What can I do if he does not answer --

Dee Doocey (Chair): No I think he is answering your question.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): I think that is a very considerable achievement.

Jenny Jones (AM): You did not answer my questions because you did not refer to the specific point I made about the figures you have used: that you used artificially low figures compared with this year’s budget. That is fudge and flannel, Mr Mayor.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): I am afraid I do not know which figures --

Jenny Jones (AM): Thank you. That is my questions over.

Dee Doocey (Chair): The next Group to lead off is Labour, and I understand John Biggs is leading on behalf of Labour. You have one question and two supplementary questions.

John Biggs (AM): That is very kind of you, Chair. To you, through the Chair, Mr Mayor: do you think that Ken Livingstone’s, your predecessor’s, final budget for London was a good budget for London or do you stand by your previous position --
Several Members: That is out of order.

John Biggs (AM): -- that it was wasteful --

Dee Docey (Chair): I am terribly sorry. I was dealing with a procedural matter and I did not hear the question.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): You can be forgiven for not listening to John’s question; I will tell you what it was. He was asking my views on the budget of the last Mayor.

Dee Docey (Chair): That is out of order.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): If you rule that in order then I am happy to answer it.

Dee Docey (Chair): No, Mr Mayor, sorry, if that was the question - and I do apologise to the Assembly because I really was dealing with a procedural matter and I did not hear, genuinely - if that was your question John, that is out of order, so can you ask another question please.

John Biggs (AM): I can only ask the question that I am ready to ask which is about this year’s budget, Chair --

Dee Docey (Chair): Ask about this year’s budget by all means.

John Biggs (AM): -- and I do not want you to waste my time by getting the clock ticking when I am asking a perfectly valid question, Chair. The question is this: do you think that your predecessor, Ken Livingstone’s, final budget was a good budget for London given that it is the foundation on which you can make a claim that there will be more uniformed police officers at the end of your term than there were at the beginning on the grounds that you have been slashing their budgets year on year?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): I look to you Dee for guidance as to whether you think that pseudo-question is in order.

Dee Docey (Chair): I am advised that that is in order so please answer.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): What I think John is trying to get at is a question about the budget set by the last Mayor. I think the budget set by the last Mayor was riddled with incredible waste and it was our job to set about a root and branch reform of the system of spending in this authority - and John sat on the board of the LDA at a time when it presided over gross mismanagement of public funds. If you ask me of whether I approve of the last Mayor’s budget, no I do not. By the way, nor do I approve of the raising of the Council Tax by 153% which went on under the budget of the last Mayor. Nor do I approve of the raising of fares by 10% year after year.

John Biggs (AM): OK, so I move onto my supplementary then, Chair.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): What I will say --

John Biggs (AM): He is not answering the question.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): -- because there was a nugget, a crouton of substance that floated to the surface of the minestrone of nonsense from the Member --
John Biggs (AM): This is --

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): What I will say is that thanks to --

John Biggs (AM): Chair --

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Can I answer the question?

John Biggs (AM): This is quite a serious matter. We are asking the Mayor about how he is going to spend almost £14 billion of people’s money and he is coming out with his trivial, jokey nonsense.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Then you have to ask serious and sensible questions.

John Biggs (AM): It is an abuse of Londoner’s trust in the Mayoralty for him to answer in that way.

Dee Doocey (Chair): I think there are faults on both sides.

John Biggs (AM): It is disgraceful.

Dee Doocey (Chair): John, you asked a very open question and the Mayor is therefore giving you a very open answer. So far so good. I do think, Mr Mayor, that you ought to be a little less flippant - that is just my observation - and John, will you now continue please.

John Biggs (AM): The foundation of my question, as you perfectly well know, is that the only grounds on which you can claim that there might be more uniformed officers at the end of your four year term is that the first budget was the one you inherited from your predecessor which facilitated over 1,000 additional police officers.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Absolute nonsense.

John Biggs (AM): I am still asking the question.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Well can I just say, absolute nonsense.

John Biggs (AM): I am still asking the question and the question for you then is this: you are now boasting that you have put £41.9 million extra into policing out of taxpayers’ money to help preserve numbers; do you feel comfortable given that half of that is simply restoring a cut that you took in your previous two budgets?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Look I think you --

John Biggs (AM): That is the question. Can you answer the question? That is what you are here to do.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): My answer to you, John, if you will allow me, is that the budget of the last Mayor which you started on --

John Biggs (AM): We have moved on from that.
Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): -- was in my view grossly wasteful. We were able to hack back a lot of completely pointless spending and direct resources where Londoners want to see them spent. I think that you have been, if I may say so, wrong-footed by the ability of the MPA and Kit Malthouse [Deputy Chair for Policing] and others, to redirect funds into the frontline and to get more police out there where the public want to see them. I know that you are obliged if you possibly can to credit this achievement to the last Mayor. It is absolutely stupefying that three years on you think it credible that we have been able to put more police officers out on the street at the end of 2012 thanks to a budget, a wasteful and profligate budget, set by the last Mayor, but if you want to continue in that delusion then I think that you are - well I will not say you are an apple short of a picnic - but I do think that you need to go away and look again at your argument.

Through serious reforms of the police budgets and by wise manipulation of the LFEPA reserves, we are able to get more police officers out on the street now and indeed in 2012 than there were when I was elected. I think that is very, very important. By the way, just to go back to the point that I think Jenny was making --

Dee Doocey (Chair): No, you are answering a question from John.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Well I will make it anyway. Insofar as this year’s headline figure is 33,000 that represents police established but it does not represent the actual number of police out there on the street.

Dee Doocey (Chair): You have to be fair. You are answering John’s question in the Labour Group’s time, so you cannot go backwards and forwards and deal with other questions.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): I think it would be greatly to the advantage of John to know this, and indeed it is important for Londoners to understand that in spite of the real financial difficulty that we have been placed under, thanks by the way to a fiscal crisis caused entirely by the hopeless policies that they supported - let us get that point across - in spite of the very difficult financial circumstances we found ourselves in, we are able --

John Biggs (AM): The fiscal crisis, Chair --

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): -- to increase spending on police.

John Biggs (AM): This is a waste of our time Chair.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Not only that, the acid test of our success --

John Biggs (AM): The fiscal crisis was caused by --

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): -- is that we have been able to continue to drive down crime in the face of one of the most severe recessions in the last 50 years. For that achievement I pay tribute to the Metropolitan Police Service and everybody in the MPA.

Dee Doocey (Chair): Now listen very carefully. I will say this only once: do not speak over each other all the time because it is very difficult for anyone who is trying to follow this remotely to be able to understand what is going on. You just cannot hear. Please, one question and then one answer. John, you have another supplementary question.
**John Biggs (AM):** I think we know that Londoners find Boris Johnson quite charming, but I think they will also recognise that he is incapable of answering questions.

**Dee Doocye (Chair):** Your question, John?

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** What is your question?

**John Biggs (AM):** The problem is that the previous Mayor was very clear that there is an opportunity cost, which is, if you do not collect people’s taxes you will not be able to spend them on services. I think frankly you should be ashamed of the duplicitous dishonesty --

**Dee Doocye (Chair):** That is not a question, John.

**John Biggs (AM):** OK, right, let us go to the nub of the question, which is that in your Evening Standard article on 10 February this year, it was written very cleverly so it does not actually tell a mistruth, but it creates the impression that more is less, by which I mean, police numbers are going down by over 1,000 this year --

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** I think you mean less is more.

**John Biggs (AM):** -- and were it not for the fact that you have unfrozen recruitment in the eleventh month, it is a bit like this, as an example, Mayor: if you were to starve someone for 23 hours of the day and then give them a beef steak at three minutes to midnight, you could then argue at the end of the day that they were getting food into their belly, but reality is that you have been overseeing a reduction in police officer numbers this year and that is not being reversed by your unfreezing of recruitment. Is that not the case?

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Just to go back on what I take to be the substance of your point which is you think that we somehow froze --

**John Biggs (AM):** It is offensive Chair, for this man to --

**Dee Doocye (Chair):** John, you have had your question; now the Mayor.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** I do not think I should have to sit here and listen to this sort of gibbering.

**John Biggs (AM):** It is just outrageous. This is outrageous. You should be ashamed of yourself.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** Can I just try and get to the point rather than him endlessly interrupting and barracking when I try to answer his, what I take to be, question.

**Dee Doocye (Chair):** Actually, you are both as bad as each other, Mr Mayor, so I have little sympathy.

**Boris Johnson (Mayor of London):** I do not agree.

**John Biggs (AM):** You are a shameful disgrace, you are.

**Dee Doocye (Chair):** Right can you just answer the question please and John --
John Biggs (AM): Disgraceful Mayor.

Dee Doocey (Chair): -- can you please stop talking over the Mayor. He is now answering his question.


Dee Doocey (Chair): I will name you if you continue, John.

John Biggs (AM): You cannot be bothered. You cannot be bothered to research your time for Mayor’s Question Time --

Dee Doocey (Chair): Stop, that is out of order --

John Biggs (AM): You then fluff your way through answering questions --

Dee Doocey (Chair): John, I am telling you --

John Biggs (AM): -- you abuse the good trust of Londoners which has been placed in you. It is disgraceful.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Actually --

Dee Doocey (Chair): Right, you are on a last warning, John.

John Biggs (AM): It is disgraceful.

Dee Doocey (Chair): You are on a last warning. If you continue to interrupt I will name you and have you removed from the Chamber. Mr Mayor, will you please answer the question.

John Biggs (AM): This man is disgraceful, Chair.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): I can appreciate the anger of the Labour Party because --

Dee Doocey (Chair): Answer the question please.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): -- they have been I think confounded in their expectation that we were going to cut police numbers. As I said, by intelligent reform of the MPA budgets and by using the reserves that are available to us from LFEPA we have been able to increase police numbers this year and next year, and I think that is a very, very important thing to do.

John Biggs (AM): That is completely untrue. That is a lie.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): I might point out, I know that there are complaints about --

John Biggs (AM): That is a bare faced lie, Chair.

Dee Doocey (Chair): Excuse me.
John Biggs (AM): That is a bare faced lie, Chair.

Dee Doocy (Chair): John, I am sorry, I warned you.

John Biggs (AM): It is a lie.

Dee Doocy (Chair): I am now going to suggest to the Assembly that the Member be not heard. I need to put that to the vote. Can I see those in favour of John Biggs not being heard, please show?

Ed Williams (Head of Committee and Member Services): 15 votes, Chair.

Dee Doocy (Chair): Those against?

Ed Williams (Head of Committee and Member Services): Seven against.

John Biggs (AM): What does it mean though?

Dee Doocy (Chair): I think that means you need to leave the Chamber, or not be heard. Certainly not be heard.

John Biggs (AM): Is that right. I think the Mayor should leave the Chamber.

Dee Doocy (Chair): Right, John, please do not make it any worse. I do not want to do this. I really do not want to during a meeting where we are discussing the Mayor’s budget but I will have no hesitation in abandoning the meeting if this continues. I will not have a meeting where we are not going to get through the business. Now, Mr Mayor, can I ask you also to show restraint. Can you answer the question please? Do not look innocent, just show restraint.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Well as I have now said repeatedly, Dee, and with great respect to you and to all Labour Members, what we have been able to do is increase spending on the police last year by 33 million and we are able to continue the expansion of police numbers over and above the establishment when I came in. If you remember it was about 31,000-something when I came in, it is going to 32,198 or so in 2012, at the end of this Mayoral term. As I say, that is a very, very considerable achievement. I know that it is politically confusing for the Labour Party but it is the reality and it reflects the ability of this administration to put spending where people want to see it and getting officers out there on the front line where people want to see them. John, I know you cannot be heard but you can be seen, and I hope you understand that problem.

John Biggs (AM): No, apparently I cannot be seen either.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): That is what people want to see. The acid test of the success of this policy is that we are continuing to drive down crime. You will have seen that this week we were able to announce that crime on public transport has fallen to a six year low. That is very, very important for our city.

Caroline Pigeon (AM): In your budget you state, in the revised budget, that you are streamlining the management of some of the capital’s smaller and quieter wards, but in reality we know from questions we have asked of the Police Authority that this means removing 100 sergeants from Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNT). These are not bureaucrats sitting in offices as I think you implied last time. These are police officers who do patrol the streets as well as
managing the teams locally. The thing that gets me is the Metropolitan Police Service have yet
to finish their review of SNTs and what an effective SNT should looks like, so how on earth do
you think this decision can be justified?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): I understand, Caroline, the point that you are making.
We think that there is scope for capable sergeants to have oversight of more than one SNT and
that is the way that we are going to allow things to go. We think therefore that those reforms
are sensible. I have always said, the key thing is we are going to keep SNTs in every one of
London’s wards. I think they are a fantastic thing and they are vital to the sense of security that
we want to continue to improve in the city, but you can manage them differently. What I have
said to you repeatedly is that I am not going to impose a cookie cutter template from City Hall
on all SNTs.

Caroline Pigeon (AM): You have said “we think” that sergeants should manage more than
one ward. I am not sure who the “we” actually is. At the MPA last week the Metropolitan
Police Service were clear that no decisions have been made, yet clearly your budget shows
decisions have been made. If the review comes out and says, “Actually we want to keep 100
sergeants”, that means you are going to have to cut officers elsewhere in territorial policing.
Does it not show that it is a bit short-sighted? You should not be budgeting for these cuts.
You need to look at the review and then make a decision on how SNTs should be shaped in the
future.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Clearly this decision, this budgetary decision has been
taken on the basis of prolonged consultations with the Metropolitan Police Service about the
way they see things going and the potential that they see for allowing experienced officers to
have oversight over more than one SNT. So this has not emerged from nowhere, this idea. This
is something that we are developing pari passu with the Met and I should be very surprised
frankly if, at the end of the day and the end of the process that you describe, if they come to a
very different conclusion.

Caroline Pigeon (AM): OK, but the review obviously is still ongoing, but I am quite interested
that you talk about discussions with the Metropolitan Police Service and so on. Do you see the
shape of SNTs as a decision for you, as Mayor, or the MPA? Or do you see this as a
Metropolitan Police Service operational decision? Because it is clear --

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): It is a very good question.

Caroline Pigeon (AM): -- the Metropolitan Police Service see it as their decision and you see
it as yours. Who is actually ultimately in charge of how many officers we have in SNTs?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): It is a very good question but I think I have given plenty
of guidance already from here about how I see this going. I think it is pretty obvious to
everybody in London that we want an SNT in every ward; that is the political imperative; that is
what people want to see.

Caroline Pigeon (AM): You are saying the buck stops with you, is that what you are saying?
The buck stops with you?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): I believe that that is a political matter, I do, yes.

1 Pari passu. A Latin phrase that literally means “equal footstep” or “equal footing”.
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Caroline Pigeon (AM): So if 100 sergeants go it is down to you?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Well, as I say, what I also think is that there is scope to have discussions between ourselves and the Metropolitan Police Service about how you can maximise the time and the skills of some experienced officers --

Caroline Pigeon (AM): Thank you, OK.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): -- and if a sergeant can manage more than one SNT, as has been repeatedly proposed to us, then that seems to me to be potentially an acceptable way forward.

Dee Doocey (Chair): OK, thank you very much.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): In no way does that mean that we are not committed to a SNT in every ward.

Gareth Bacon: Mr Mayor, I think the debate over police numbers, amusing as it is from this side, is because you have shot the fox of the Labour Party and the scaremongering they want to put in place for their forthcoming election campaign next year. Now that they are sort of killed in terms of police numbers I think they are trying to start other scaremongering stories. At the regressive London conference last week I gather the leader of one of the London boroughs claimed that you have a secret agenda to abolish the Freedom Pass which is scaremongering story we have heard many times before. Can you confirm that there is no truth whatsoever in that story?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): I am amazed. Did they really say that?

Gareth Bacon: Yes.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): It is incredible. It just shows the complete paucity of their agenda. What have they got to say about life? It is unbelievable. No, absolutely not. The Freedom Pass is 100% guaranteed with us; 1000% guaranteed. Indeed, I would point out that it was this administration, supported by you Gareth - many thanks - that introduced the 24 hour Freedom Pass that has proved so valuable to many older people who need to make doctor’s appointments or indeed go to work or whatever it happens to be.

Gareth Bacon: So the future of the Freedom Pass in the extended form that you introduced is absolutely certain and this budget guarantees it?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): It is absolutely certain. Any suggestion otherwise - I cannot speak for any future Labour Mayor.

Gareth Bacon: Indeed. Thank you Mr Mayor.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): In 2030.

Darren Johnson (AM): Mayor, in your final budget you say that following the Assembly’s motion the 101 telephone number project is now under review. If that review concludes that it is no longer needed and that it is not the best use of the money, will you transfer the £6.1 million funding to the RE:NEW project for home insulation - where you are looking at seriously being off target - with only 50,000 out of 200,000 homes being done by the deadline.
Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): As I said to you last time, Darren, I am confident that the retrofitting, the homes RE:NEW programme will accelerate and that we will see much more progress there. As to the 101 project, all I really want to say at this stage is that I think it is a good project. It is in principle a very good idea that Londoners should have a single portal, a single way through, a single way of communicating with “them”, as they think of us. Communicating with “them”, get “them” to do something that should be a simpler way of doing it. The modalities, how we actually deliver that, are a question that is currently under review.

Darren Johnson (AM): OK, you said the project is under review. If that review concludes that is not a good use of funding, will you consider putting that money into the RE:NEW programme?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): I will of course consider any submissions you make about where we put all our funds, and indeed I am happy to enter into a reasonable dialogue with all of you about that kind of thing.

Richard Tracey (AM): Mr Mayor, I wonder if I could ask you one or two questions about transport. I do not know whether you have seen the alternative suggestions made by the other parties - changes to your excellent budget. One though that does concern me is that the Labour Party appear to be suggesting that fares across London should be held down, which would cost £24 million.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): They are being held down.

Richard Tracey (AM): But they are actually planning to take a further reduction and this would cost an extra £24 million. Do you believe that this is just a return to the old gimmick of fare reductions, which was something certainly employed by your predecessor? What would be your calculation of the effect this would have on the TfL budget and is this not just part of the same sort of --

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Same old nonsense.

Richard Tracey (AM): -- crazy economics which the last Labour Government followed in this country.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Of course you could go down that kind of route. What you could do is do what the last administration did, supported by all of these guys, is you come in in 2000 or 2004 and you say, “Oh gosh, here we are, bit of honeymoon, whack the fares up”, and that is what they did. I think it went up 10% for three years in a row, overall I think 12.9% in at least a couple of those years. Then of course when you get into the election, suddenly, “Oops, I know what, let’s put the brakes on, let’s try and fool everybody by having some sort of fare reduction or fare freeze”. Again, that puts TfL in a very difficult financial position because suddenly you have a black hole and a great deal of uncertainty in your financing. I will not do that. What we will do is have certainty and stability and consistency. Fares in London, do not forget, bus fares in London are still overall far cheaper than most other comparable cities in this country and I think they represent exceptional value. If we were to pursue the line that you have outlined we would I think seriously jeopardise our ability to deliver important infrastructure improvements for London: Crossrail, the Tube upgrades and other things.

Richard Tracey (AM): One suggestion that has quite often been made by the Labour Party here and actually by other parties, is that by removing the western extension of the congestion charge zone, which you did of course with full approval of the people of the area affected, that
you had allegedly lost revenue of I think about £50 million. Sometimes we do hear extra estimates above that figure coming from your opponents. What is the true figure? I have asked Peter Hendy of TfL in the past to give us the figure, but it does appear from some of the statistics we get, some of the figures from TfL, that actually they know it is less than £50 million. Do you actually yet have an accurate figure so that we are not in any doubt as we go over the next year running up to the 2012 election.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Well, Dick, you are asking me to differentiate myself from TfL and the figures I am provided with by TfL. As far as I know the figure is £55 million. I do not have any reason to dispute that figure but since you urge me I will make sure we go back and check and double check that that indeed is the reality.

Richard Tracey (AM): Well there is in fact in some of the figures £47 million is quoted as a possible shortfall in the revenue that you were supposed to get from that. I think we really need to have some accurate figures.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): I think if the congestion charge were to be restored in West London by another administration it would be very interesting to see how much extra revenue that brought in, but as I say, I do not foresee that eventuality.

Richard Tracey (AM): The last one: can I ask you about some desire, I think from the Green Party, to impose a 20 mile an hour speed limit across all the boroughs of London. Is it not a fact actually that if vehicles were travelling at only 20mph it would increase pollution rather than reducing pollution across London?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Actually on 20mph limits there is a bit of sympathy I have on a purely localist basis, Brian [Coleman], with what the Greens say. If local people want and elect councillors who actually are in favour of 20mph zones in particular areas then I am not going to sit here in City Hall and tell those councillors and those local people that they are wrong. What I am also not going to do is I am not going to impose 20mph limits on the whole of London. We are at last starting to see an increase in average speeds in London, inching up to not quite supersonic levels of 9.4mph. We are starting to see some real wins now on reducing roadworks, smoothing traffic flow - I want to see that process continue.

Joanne McCartney (AM): I want to ask about policing and just follow some of the issues that Caroline picked up earlier. I think we on this side believe that cutting the number of sergeants by half over the next two years is a folly because they are local leaders for their teams. Have you had time to reflect on that at all and come to a different conclusion?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Yes, and I am grateful to you, Joanne, for the way you make your suggestion. We have looked at this issue. I still think that there is great merit in proceeding with a reform that allows experienced officers to have a bit more responsibility in the running of SNTs. Insofar as that is the way the police service themselves are keen to go - I do not want to stand in their way here in City Hall - so I am keen to do that, but let me emphasise again and again, this in no way undermines our 100%, 1000% percent commitment to having a SNT in every ward.

Joanne McCartney (AM): On that question about a SNT in every ward, 630 wards, are you committed to keeping two police officers and three PCSOs --

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Yes.
Joanne McCartney (AM): -- in every single ward?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Well, yes, and indeed in some wards there will of course be more than that.

Joanne McCartney (AM): So the minimum anyone can expect is a team of five made up of two PCs and three PCSOs?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): That is my intention.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Can I ask you then, because I asked you that same question in February last year, almost exactly one year ago. You said, and I am quoting you directly:

“I will leave it to the Commissioner to give an opinion about whether he thinks that particular model should be sacrosanct and engraved in stone.”

You went on to say:

“I think people will recognise that the operational decision about exactly in what proportions and what kind of pyramidal structure to deploy SNTs will be a matter for the Commissioner and borough commanders. I have no intention of imposing a one size fits all. I think that would be a pointless piece of ‘top downery’ of a kind Londoners would not wish to see.”

What has now changed apart from it being an election year?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Well as I said there has been a discussion going on between us and the police service about the shape of the SNTs, and one of things that has been put to us which seems to me to be sensible is that you could look at the geometry of the sergeant’s role and you might be able to vary it and give sergeants more discretion in the management of SNTs.

Joanne McCartney (AM): Can I just come back to this point: is it you that is directing the police as to what they have in each ward or not?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): No. I think I have been pretty clear this morning about the priority I attach to having a SNT in every ward. That is something that you can say is an operational matter. I happen to think that it is a political question of something that people want to see and it is something that I am determined to preserve and protect, so there is a strong political dimension to it. It may be that in discussions with the police you can work out different tunes, you can work out different ways of using the sergeants and that is where we have got in our discussions so far.

Joanne McCartney (AM): So can I ask: do you actually believe this is an operational matter for the police and, no matter what your political view is, you cannot force them?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): What is “this”? What do you mean by “this” in that sentence?

Joanne McCartney (AM): You have just said you believe it is an operational matter, the exact makeup of SNTs.
Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): No, OK, let me try again.

Joanne McCartney (AM): You said that to me a year ago which is why you would not commit yourself to retaining a model that you now, in an election year, say you want to retain.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): No, well actually, I hesitate to say this but I am being completely consistent this February and indeed last February.

Joanne McCartney (AM): No.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): What I am saying is that there may be scope to vary the geometry of the SNTs and that is something that we are willing to discuss with the police and that is why we are looking at the role of the sergeants. It seems to be completely transparent that we are in favour of keeping a SNT in every ward but not being completely dogmatic about insisting that every SNT in every ward should have a sergeant, when some sergeants might be more than capable of administering more than one SNT. I think I have now said that four times.

Joanne McCartney (AM): So what happens if, when the Metropolitan Police Service review comes back they want to make significant changes, other than the model you have outlined to us today?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Well, we have some ham - we would have ham and eggs if we had any eggs - we will cross that bridge when we come to it. Let us see what they propose. I think as it happens, as I said earlier on to, I think, Caroline, highly unlikely that there will be a disagreement about the future shape of SNT policing. I think this is a sensible reform. We are able to deliver more front line officers and we are able to do all this - this is the fantastic thing - we think without any compulsory redundancies of PCSOs, and I think Londoners listening to the figures and seeing what we are achieving and looking at the direction in which crime is moving will actually be very pleased that there is a focus in the Metropolitan Police Service and in the MPA on reducing back office spending and getting officers out there on the frontline.

Joanne McCartney (AM): The reason I ask is because you are asking us to approve a budget today which outlined the shape of Safer Neighbourhood Policing, and your Deputy, Kit Malthouse, two weeks ago on the Politics Show, was asked, “How can you and the Mayor, as you did this week, guarantee that those teams will remain in every ward?” He was further asked, “Isn’t that an operational policing?” Your Deputy replied, “No it’s not operational policing”.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): I have just told you that, I have just said that.

Joanne McCartney (AM): So you do not believe the makeup of SNTs is operational policing? This is an important distinction; it is one that we are going to be returning to tomorrow at the MPA.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Thank you so much Joanne, thank you. Well, can I just repeat then, I think for the fifth time, the point that I have just made, which is that I think there is a political imperative to have a SNT in every ward. It is something I believe in, I think it is something Londoners want. They want to see numbers kept up and they want to see people out there on the streets. Where I think it is sensible to allow reform is in the exact geometry of those SNTs and where it may be that a experienced sergeant can cope, can deal with, can administer more than one SNT then we are content to allow that process to happen.
Joanne McCartney (AM): I note I still do not have an answer to that question. Can I ask, have you actually got a grip on this? Because looking at the reports of what is actually happening across London – I can see just looking at the local newspapers over the last two weeks – in Barnet it has been announced that each of the 21 wards are set to retain their existing teams. In Croydon it is reported that half the teams could be scrapped. In Bromley it is suggested that the Chief Superintendent for the area has submitted a proposal to the Metropolitan Police Service to continue having a sergeant for each of his teams and wants to see no change whatsoever. We see in Merton that it has submitted plans to reduce the number of SNTs from 20 to nine. Would you comment on that?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): All I can say Joanne is what I have said to you. I think I will say it now for the sixth time: it is agreed between us and the Metropolitan Police Service that we need a SNT in every ward. We are going to protect numbers of police constables and PCSOs in the SNTs. We do think it is possible that there could be a variation in the system of administration by the sergeants. If I have to say this a seventh time, Dee, I wonder whether you might see fit to intervene because I really do not see how I can elucidate this more clearly than I already have.

Dee Doocey (Chair): Thank you. Richard Barnbrook.

Richard Barnbrook (AM): This is related to the MPA’s inflation budget of £56.6 million Mayor. With inflation at the moment at 4.5% and projected, by those knowledgeable, of going to 5%, do you think that is a sufficient amount of money given the fact that this inflation budget has run away with itself.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): All I can say, through you, Dee, is that I am confident that in spite of the impact of inflation we will have sufficient funds to meet our obligations more than meet our obligations in the MPS.

Richard Barnbrook (AM): If I can come back now with another question, obviously I have limited time. I am quite happy that you have managed to find £8.4 million for rough sleepers. What actually are your initiatives and how will that money be spent?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): There are a number of initiatives, particularly to deal with entrenched rough sleepers, and we have had a very great deal of success. I think there is probably around about 300 entrenched rough sleepers, or there were when we began. I think about two thirds of them have been helped to find permanent accommodation. There is of course a continual problem of people arriving in the city not having anywhere to sleep and sleeping rough, so we have a No Second Night policy as well and we are working hard with all the delivery agencies concerned to make sure that we end the scourge of rough sleeping. I think we are having very substantial success. I think the Government’s decision to give the GLA £34 million over four years is a reflection of the priority we have attached in this place to ending rough sleeping and the success that Richard Blakeway and others have had in bringing together everybody concerned with the problem in London and coordinating their activities.

Richard Barnbrook (AM): One last comment, very quickly.

Dee Doocey (Chair): You have 15 seconds, so very quickly.

Richard Barnbrook (AM): Page 41 relates to principles and this is the London Fire Brigade. I find it a really poor indictment - and I hope you have actually read through this - it indicates
that unless we have more ethnic people on the London Fire Brigade then the quality of service will be below standard. Is that saying that the Fire Brigade so far has been dismal and has not been able to function simply because it does not have a large enough ethnic minority in that Fire Brigade?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): I hesitate to correct the Member about his quotation of the principles, but what it says is, “To ensure high quality services”, not to allow the services to fall below a standard and I think the policy is extremely good.

Dee Doocey (Chair): Thank you, Mr Mayor. Mike Tuffrey.

Mike Tuffrey (AM): In our budget amendment we did not only say you had the wrong call on things like cutting the Safer Neighbourhood sergeants and the fares package - which is why we will be re-proposing it when we have finished with these questions - we also said that you were not --

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Really?

Mike Tuffrey (AM): -- planning ahead for the opportunities that the Government is bringing in --

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): But you are part of the coalescence!

Mike Tuffrey (AM): -- in terms of decentralised and new powers. Now I am sure you are as frustrated as anybody at the failure of the Government yet to name the funding arrangements for the LDA which clearly constrains some of the actions you can take, but are you satisfied that you have put in place - because I do not see any yet - arrangements to take account of the opportunities of the assets that are coming over. There are going to be new powers for tax incremental financing; we are going to have borrowing powers; the localisation of the business rates is under discussion; there is the Mayoral Development Corporation coming down the track; should you not be now planning to take advantage of those opportunities? You have £10 million sitting in reserves in contingency which you are not spending, so why are you not doing more in this budget to plan for London’s future opportunities?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Two things: obviously there is a certain amount of opacity about future financing beyond 2012-2013 as we have discussed several times already in this Chamber. Secondly, I think a great deal of work has already been done to get City Hall ready for the various amalgamations that are proposed. The absorption of the LDA functions, the Homes and Communities Agency, and I pay tribute by the way to the work of Leo Boland in all this, because I think in organising the delivery he made a great deal of progress in streamlining our work. I am absolutely confident that we will have more than adequate funds and firepower within this body to deal with the extra responsibilities that we are about to require.

I would just remind you Mike, and the two points are integrally linked; we will not acquire the bulk of these powers until 2012/13 --

Mike Tuffrey (AM): Which is why we need to be preparing now.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): -- and I am afraid there is still an absence of clarity about the state of the Government’s finances, let alone ours. If you look at the papers this
morning you will see that the Treasury is in receipt of substantial revenues over and above what they predicted. It may be that the financial envelope is very different in 2013 and 2014.

Mike Tuffrey (AM): If you simply wait until all these things are announced you will not be able to take advantage of the opportunities. I am saying instead of having £10 million sitting in contingency, you should be investing now to take advantage of the opportunities that we know are coming, because you are not doing it.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Of course, we will do that as and when the moment of absorption of those functions comes a little bit nearer.

Steve O’Connell: I am going to comment and ask you a question around rough sleeping, Mr Mayor. Before I do I think it is bound upon me as someone who, unlike some others, legitimately has an interest in Croydon to correct some comments earlier. It is a political ploy to plant stories in papers and then quote them as truths. As far as I am concerned there was never --

Dee Doocey (Chair): Your question, Mr O’Connell.

Steve O’Connell: -- any threat to half the SNTs. Mr Mayor, rough sleeping. May I congratulate you on securing £34 million from Government. Would you not agree with me that in a civilised leading world city of the 21st century there is no place for rough sleeping.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): I agree, Steve, and I would like to thank you and to congratulate Croydon Council by the way on everything they do in Croydon to help people who are sleeping rough.

Steve O’Connell: OK, thank you. I mean on that point Mr Mayor - and I would congratulate Richard Blakeway of course for the work that he has done – I know that you will use this money wisely, but can I urge you that rough sleeping is not just an issue and a matter for central London. Many of our outer London district centres have vulnerable people who are forced onto the streets despite very good councils trying to protect them. What I urge you to ensure is that part of this funding is spent in partnership with outer London boroughs to address the problems in their town centres.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Absolutely.

Steve O’Connell: Thank you Mr Mayor.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Of course we will make sure that the money is distributed fairly throughout London where the problem is most acute.

Steve O’Connell: Indeed, thank you.

Roger Evans (AM): A previous holder of your post is going around London at the moment claiming that he can deliver great things for outer London. Can you tell us how the budget you are proposing will help the ‘doughnut’?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): This is a budget for greatly improving transport services all over London. I would remind you that by protecting investment in transport we are able to continue with a programme of safety on buses that has I think been hugely popular in parts of London that had got used to too many kids being allowed to kick off and I am very pleased that
crime on buses has come down across London, in outer London as well. We will be able to introduce improvements in convenience for people using the buses across London from next year. I might as well announce this now - why not. I always assume that I am able to announce whatever I know, I am going to announce it: from next year on the buses you will not only be able to use your Oyster card, you will be able to use your plastic. So when you swipe on you will be able to swipe on, if you have a charge card, a plastic Visa card, you will be able to use your Visa card instead of your Oyster card. Indeed we have Oysterised the Overground rail service and we are able to keep up investment in such programmes as the Croydon Tramlink and we are going to be making an announcement about that in due course.

There is going to be a great deal in this budget for outer London in the improvement of parks, in the planting of trees and in all sorts of amenities that the outer boroughs need.

Roger Evans (AM): Yes I am pleased to hear that you mentioned transport there because that is a key need certainly for my residents in Havering and Redbridge. I do not know if you have had the opportunity yet to take a look at some of the amendments tabled this morning. For example, this Liberal Democrat coalitionist amendment which in some ways is not as coalitionist as it could be, because they want to delay the rollout of Cycle Superhighways to outer London, including Cycle Superhighway Route 2 --

Brian Coleman (AM): I am not voting for that.

Roger Evans (AM): -- which is intended to go - do not worry, it is not intended to go to Barnet, Brian - it is going to go from Aldgate to Bow. It was originally intended to go further to Ilford and it is being blocked at the moment by Newham Council. Will you reject suggestions that you should delay the rollout of this route and in fact make your best efforts to --

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): I am amazed. Are they really trying to block the Cycle Superhighway?

Roger Evans (AM): -- have it pass through, under or over Newham so my residents in Ilford can benefit from the cycle revolution in London too?

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): I am very disappointed the Liberal Democrats are opposing improvements to cycling in London. In fact I am amazed that they have taken this line. I do not think that is right. I think the Cycle Superhighways actually are a great benefit, rather an unsung benefit by comparison with the Cycle Hire Scheme. Everybody goes on and on about the Cycle Hire Scheme, actually the Cycle Superhighways are doing a great deal also to encourage cycling. On some of the routes you are seeing an increase of 100% in the usage of the routes. In many cases, in think 34% of route users of the Cycle Superhighways are people who have not regularly cycled before in London so it achieving its objective of getting new cyclists onto the roads. So I am very pleased with that and I am determined to continue with the programme.

Roger Evans (AM): Green colleagues today are suggesting a return to the Western Extension Zone. I understand that some --

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Surely they are all suggesting it, are they not?

Roger Evans (AM): Not in their budgets, but I understand that unofficially some of the Labour people have suggested that as well.
Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Oh, I see. Oh they are not in favour of restoring it, or are they?

Roger Evans (AM): Could you just assure us that you will not restore it and what is more, you will not actually see extra congestion charge zones introduced elsewhere in London because that has always been a big concern that people have in my part of town.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Right, well I would of thought that if they are going to attack me for removing it then consistently they should propose to restore it. I am amazed that they are not proposing to restore it.

Darren Johnson (AM): They are. No, we are.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Oh I see. Well as I have said before, this was something that was imposed undemocratically, it was not approved by the people of London. They were consulted upon it, they said no and the thing was then whacked in anyway. I do not think that was the right way round, I think it undermines people’s confidence in government. We consulted, we got a very clear view that the people of London did not want it, we removed it and we will not be restoring it.

Len Duvall (AM): Mr Mayor, on the £34 million that has been given to you on rough sleepers, can you confirm that the Conservative-led Government cut that money before they passed it onto you? Can you also give an assurance that this money is not going to be used in supporting the cuts that are being made at local government level? I think 12 rough sleepers hostels are being closed in Hammersmith and Fulham - Conservative-led - and I think also hostels are being closed in Westminster as well. I heard the Member from outer London talking about the need for rough sleeping to be addressed and I think it was a point well made. This money is likely to replace some of the cuts being made by your Conservative colleagues, both in local government as well as on top of central Government.

Boris Johnson (Mayor of London): Thanks, Len. My understanding is that actually that is not quite right and that this represents an increase in spending on rough sleeping of about £1 million a year. So to that extent I think it is the right way forward and as I said, it is a great vote of confidence in City Hall and the leadership that we have taken on this issue that the Government wants to support our coordination and organisation of initiatives to end rough sleeping. Of course I listened to what you said about what is happening in Hammersmith and Fulham and I am sure that Rick [Blakeway] and others will be taking that up and we will seeing what we can do to help out.

Dee Doocey (Chair): Thank you. That concludes this section of the meeting so thank you very much for your attendance, Mr Mayor.
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Written Answers to questions submitted under the MQT procedure at Mayor’s Question Time on 23 February 2011

Fare Rises
Question No: 418 / 2011
Valerie Shawcross
As your hike in Bus, Train and Tram fares is resulting in many commuters in outer London Boroughs such as Croydon now having to pay hundreds of pounds a year extra to travel to work, do you understand the anger your policies are causing, as many families face wage freezes, potential job losses and the VAT increase.
Written answer from the Mayor
The only alternatives were either to cut services and investment; to increase Council Tax; or reduce concessions for the less well off.

These alternatives were even less palatable.

Pay Increase
Question No: 419 / 2011
Valerie Shawcross
Croydon’s Council leader has awarded himself a 34% pay increase to be taken at some point this year, will you as Mayor join me in urging him to reverse this decision?
Written answer from the Mayor
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 2 March 2011:

Legislation requires that all local authorities set their allowances by reference to a report by an Independent Remuneration Panel. In Croydon the Panel was a London wide panel convened under the auspices of London Councils. LB Croydon's latest members’ allowance scheme was adopted by Croydon's Full Council consisting of all 70 members.

No member of Croydon Council, including the leader Cllr Mike Fisher, has taken any additional remuneration as a result of that decision. The result is that no Croydon member, including the Borough’s Leader, is receiving any greater total allowances this year 2010/11 than they did last year 2009/10. The savings to Croydon taxpayers will be £57,000 per annum.

I note that when you were Leader of the Borough, your Special Responsibility Allowance alone and not including your basic allowance increased by 68 percent while the Leader’s allowance under Labour between 2000 and 2005 increased by a whopping 153 percent.
Travelcard
Question No: 420 / 2011
Valerie Shawcross

Your decision to scrap the ability to travel from Zone 6 to Zone 2 by Travelcard has hit residents in places such as Sutton, Purley and Coulsdon has caused great distress, will you agree to look again at this decision to hit those in outer London the hardest.

Written answer from the Mayor

No. I do not accept any of the points made in the question.

The Travelcard season ticket remains in place.

The limited number of people who used to buy the One Day tickets that have been withdrawn can contain their travel costs by switching to Oyster card PAYG.

I am pleased to note that PAYG top-up facilities are now available at Sutton, Purley and Coulsdon as well as at local newsagents etc.

I am also pleased to note that the Train Companies froze off-peak PAYG fares in outer London in January 2011, to the benefit of very many thousands of outer London users.

Tube complaints
Question No: 421 / 2011
Valerie Shawcross

Please advise how many complaints were received about London Underground services – by line and in total – for all available reporting periods since period 10. (Further to question number 295/2011)

Written answer from the Mayor

The number of complaints received during period 11 (9 January to 5 February 2011) are detailed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Complaints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non line specific</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakerloo Line</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Line</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle Line</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Line</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith &amp; City</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilee Line</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Line</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Line</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccadilly Line</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Line</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo and City</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 2,501

In Period 11, London Underground (LU) carried 83.97 million passengers.
The presentation of the ratio of complaints to journeys has been amended after discussion with London TravelWatch to align with the reporting format used by Train Operating Companies. Therefore, there were around 3 complaints for every 100,000 journeys.

Tube performance
Question No: 422 / 2011
Valerie Shawcross

The agenda papers for the meeting of TfL’s Rail and Underground Panel held on 8th February show that none of London Underground’s line met their targets for ‘percentage of scheduled kilometres operated’ for the last quarter of 2010. Do you find this an acceptable state of affairs? If not, what are you personally, as Mayor and Chair of TfL, doing to resolve the situation?

Written answer from the Mayor

The Rail and Underground Panel paper you refer to clearly points out that a major cause of disruption in the three periods in question was the pointless and completely unnecessary strike action called by the RMT and TSSA, which you have wholeheartedly supported. Without it, the percentage of scheduled kilometres operated would have exceeded the target on several lines. However, as I have made clear in previous answers, I am clear that we will not be swayed from well thought through, pragmatic, sensible and effective plans simply because some union leaders and the political party they fund wish to obstruct them, and seek to disrupt the travel of Londoners in the process.

I have frequent and regular discussions about the performance of the Tube with TfL’s and LU’s senior management, which is working to ensure that it returns to its underlying good performance trend that has seen customer satisfaction rise to record levels, despite the capricious and politically motivated recent industrial action.

Tube refunds
Question No: 423 / 2011
Valerie Shawcross

How much has TfL spent on refunds for tube passengers affected by service disruption for each of the past five years?

Written answer from the Mayor

The amounts paid out in Customer Charter refunds are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>£1,567,512.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>£2,223,596.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>£1,782,139.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>£931,509.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>£986,643.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, there are small amounts paid as ‘goodwill payments’ in cases where there has been exceptional disruption.
63 Bus
Question No: 424 / 2011
Valerie Shawcross
Please provide a full breakdown of TfL’s cost-benefit analysis for extending the 63 bus to Honor Oak Station, in particular how the cost was arrived at.

Written answer from the Mayor
Three additional buses would be necessary for the suggested extension, for which the estimated cost increase was £630,000 per annum. An additional 640 passenger trips per day were estimated, leading to an increase in revenue of approximately £92,000 and in passenger benefit of approximately £410,000. This would give a benefit to net cost ratio of 0.8 to 1. TfL normally require a ratio of 2.0 to 1 or better for bus service improvements and of course the subsidy must be available.

63 Bus 2
Question No: 425 / 2011
Valerie Shawcross
Will you ask TfL to consider extending the 63 bus to Honor Oak Park station during peak hours only?

Written answer from the Mayor
TfL has no plans to operate the 63 to Honor Oak Park station during peak hours only. Operating a peak service is particularly expensive as the ownership costs of the extra vehicles required still have to be borne, but passenger benefits and additional fares revenue is reduced.

P12 Bus
Question No: 426 / 2011
Valerie Shawcross
I have received a fresh barrage of complaints about excessive unreliability on route P12. In your response to question number 4029/2010 you explained that TfL felt roadworks were to blame for poor performance on this route, but that these would be ceasing in December. What is the current problem on this route and what are TfL doing to improve the matter?

Written answer from the Mayor
Route P12 continues to be disrupted by the effects of roadworks, which in some cases have been extended beyond the original forecast date for completion. Victorian Water Main replacement works are ongoing at Ilderton Road and Asylum Road. The London Borough of Southwark has also been undertaking improvement works at Southwark Park Road, which were completed on 10 February.

TfL continues to work closely with the operator of the P12 to determine effective and affordable solutions to the disruption. An emergency schedule has been introduced for the P12 and TfL will closely monitor the service to ensure its performance improves.
343 Bus

Question No: 427 / 2011

Valerie Shawcross

I recently attended a meeting where a large number of residents were complaining about the perennial problem of the 343 bus speeding along Ivydale Road. What are TfL doing to address this and has liaison with LB Southwark taken place to ascertain possible improvement work?

Written answer from the Mayor

Following your meeting with TfL on 7 January, at which residents from Ivydale Road were present, TfL wrote to you to confirm the action underway to address the issue. Abellio, who operate the 343, has put in place a Customer Care and Operations Action Plan to:

- Improve their handling of complaints from passengers ensuring swift action with individual drivers as appropriate,
- Include analysis of trends in customer complaints to allow for targeted resolution of these through staff forums and/or road shows,
- Provide refresher training for drivers at Walworth Garage where route 343 is based,
- Focus on the importance of customer care and on ensuring bus drivers keep to the speed limit at all times,
- Praise staff who receive commendations and publish this in company newsletters to exemplify good behaviour.

TfL attends quarterly Public Transport Liaison meetings with the London Borough of Southwark, and has discussed bus driving standards during these meetings.

Pedestrian Crossings Removal

Question No: 428 / 2011

Valerie Shawcross

Further to your answer to my question number 0410/2011, please list the locations of those crossings which have been removed from the list for possible removal and provide an update on the 132 remaining sites.

Written answer from the Mayor

TfL wrote to provide you with this information on 18 February. This information has also been posted on TfL’s website.

Pedestrian Crossings Removal 2

Question No: 429 / 2011

Valerie Shawcross

As a result of heavy cuts to local authority funding imposed by the coalition government, a number of boroughs find themselves in the distasteful position of having to consider cutting back on school crossing patrols. Will TfL take this into consideration when proposing to remove crossings?

Written answer from the Mayor

TfL discusses each site where there is potential to remove signals with the appropriate local authority to ensure that issues such as this are fully considered before any action is taken. This will continue. The boroughs offer a detailed knowledge of local conditions and developments, which adds value and focus to these ongoing discussions.
Pubs

Question No: 430 / 2011
Valerie Shawcross

The local pub in London, as elsewhere in the country - CAMRA estimate that 29 pubs a month are closing down – is finding itself increasingly in danger of being acquired, closed and redeveloped into residential accommodation by property developers. Will you consider using your planning powers as Mayor to provide protection for these important local social amenities in the London Plan?

Written answer from the Mayor

London’s pubs are still a vital part of many local communities. My draft replacement London Plan sets out a positive approach to planning for necessary local facilities including pubs. The protection of individual pubs however is properly a matter for boroughs. In their local development frameworks boroughs can draw on the strategic support of the London Plan to offer specific protection for local pubs to meet identified needs.

The Localism Bill, currently before Parliament, includes provisions relating to ‘assets of community value’. This might prove useful in protecting public houses.

255 Bus

Question No: 431 / 2011
Valerie Shawcross

Please give an update on proposals to extend this bus route.

Written answer from the Mayor

The extension uses roads in two boroughs, Lambeth and Wandsworth. The major new areas served are in Lambeth but the route needs to use roads in Wandsworth to reach the local town centre, Balham. TfL has been seeking to reach an agreement with Wandsworth Council on traffic management measures to facilitate the extension. Given the time elapsed since the consultation on this proposal, TfL wishes to reach a conclusion with Wandsworth and is discussing this with council officers.

Route Utilisation Strategy

Question No: 432 / 2011
Valerie Shawcross

Will you be submitting a response to Network Rail’s current Route Utilisation Strategy consultation for London and the South East? If so, what are the key points you will be raising for the future of rail travel in this region?

Written answer from the Mayor

Yes, TfL will be submitting a response to the draft London and South East Route Utilisation Strategy. The response will say that overall we welcome the Route Utilisation Strategy as a document and generally support its analysis and findings. The Route Utilisation Strategy starts to set out a compelling case for long term rail investment in London, however it is published for consultation and as such is a work in progress. TfL are working with Network Rail and the rail industry on some of the issues raised in the document and I understand that TfL officers have discussed the document and the intended response with you.
**South London Line Mitigation Plans**  
**Question No: 433 / 2011**  
Valerie Shawcross  

Please give an update on plans to mitigate the loss of the South London Line next year, in particular how the situation for passengers at Clapham High Street and Wandsworth Road will be ameliorated.

**Written answer from the Mayor**  

The findings of TfL and London TravelWatch’s joint study indicate that one package of mitigation options appears the most appropriate (in terms of operability, affordability and value for money). This package includes additional stops in long distance Kent services during peak times to serve Denmark Hill and Peckham Rye, and a Bromley South to Victoria service outside of peak times to serve all stations between Peckham Rye and Wandsworth Road.

We recognise that this is not a perfect solution, as Wandsworth Road and Clapham High Street stations would still not have direct services to London Victoria in the peak periods. However TfL do not believe that this can be resolved without a full timetable recast or platform lengthening at these stations, which would increase the funding requirement even further. I have subsequently sought funding for the study’s recommended package; however in the current economic climate it has just not been possible to find money for additional services.

In the light, of this TfL is currently working with Southeastern, Passenger Focus and London TravelWatch to review the low cost element of the proposal and include additional stops in Kent services at peak times. These discussions are ongoing and no decisions have yet been made.

TfL will also press for the full proposed service package to be specified in the next Southeastern franchise at the appropriate time.

Bus and Tube services are also available in the area.

**Cycle problems at Oval**  
**Question No: 434 / 2011**  
Valerie Shawcross  

I have received a large number of complaints from cyclists using the Cycle Superhighway at Oval that they are in conflict with other traffic at this junction. What is being done to improve the situation?

**Written answer from the Mayor**  

Overall, conditions for cyclists at this junction are a lot safer following the introduction of Barclays Cycle Superhighway Route 7.

TfL has removed a major conflict point by taking out a southbound filter lane for general traffic on the A3 at the junction of Kennington Park Road and Brixton Road. The filter lane meant that cyclists travelling straight on had to move across two lanes of fast-moving traffic. Now that the filter lane has been removed, cyclists only need to cross one lane of general traffic, which has been significantly calmed by the introduction of a signalised left-hand turning.

Other improvements to cyclist safety at Oval include blue surfacing across the junctions and trixi mirrors, both of which help make cyclists more visible to motorists.
Crystal Palace Football Club  
Question No: 435 / 2011  
Valerie Shawcross  
What pre-application discussions have your/GLA officers taken part in regarding the possible move of Crystal Palace FC to Crystal Palace Park? What is your view on this proposal?  
Written answer from the Mayor  
There have been two meetings between CPFC 2010 and my Sports Commissioner, Kate Hoey, and members of the GLA Sports Unit. My view is that it is encouraging to see people coming forward with possible solutions for the future of Crystal Palace and I welcome their interest.  
There was a preliminary meeting between the Crystal Palace Football Club, the Chief Executive of Croydon Council and the Deputy Chief Executive of the LDA in September 2010.

Crystal Palace Station  
Question No: 436 / 2011  
Valerie Shawcross  
Further to my question 0040/2011 to TfL plenary, please provide an update on the funding availability for accessibility works and reinstatement of the former ticket hall at Crystal Palace station.  
Written answer from the Mayor  
Designs are complete and TfL is having ongoing discussions with funding partners. It is likely that in order to complete the full scheme a further application for DfT Access for All funding will be required to help with the costs of making the station fully step free.

Tramlink extensions 1  
Question No: 437 / 2011  
Valerie Shawcross  
Do you plan to reinstate plans to extend Tramlink to Crystal Palace?  
Written answer from the Mayor  
My Transport Strategy supports longer term enhancements to the Croydon Tramlink network including the potential for further extensions. Whilst the current TfL Business plan has no funding available for Tramlink extensions, TfL has undertaken a review of those corridors where there is greatest need and potential for future extensions and these are included in the sub regional transport plan for South London. This review was undertaken with south London boroughs and identifies a number of corridors for further consideration.

Tramlink extensions 2  
Question No: 438 / 2011  
Valerie Shawcross  
How many of your/TfL’s officers are working on delivery of proposal 16 of the Mayor’s Transport Strategy, in terms of developing extensions to the Tramlink network? How much staff time has been deployed on this activity?
Written answer from the Mayor

While the current TfL Business plan has no funding available for Tramlink extensions, TfL has undertaken a review of those corridors where there is greatest need and potential for future extensions and these are included in the sub regional transport plan for South London. This review was undertaken with south London boroughs and it identified a number of corridors worthy of further consideration.

Overall this has involved two or three members of TfL staff at various times over the past 12 months, working on this alongside other duties.

Gants Hill Roundabout

Question No: 439 / 2011

Valerie Shawcross

Why was funding for access improvements to the bus stop by Gants Hill roundabout not included in the major refurbishment works at this location?

Written answer from the Mayor

The Gants Hill project was originally conceived as a carriageway refurbishment scheme. The scope was later widened to include improvements to footways, lighting and landscaping.

TfL has an ongoing programme to improve accessibility at bus stops in London. Works are prioritised where accessibility can be improved at comparatively low cost in order to improve as many stops as possible. At this stop however there are difficult constraints which will require a more complex solution, at a much greater cost.

Kerbs at bus stops should allow for an accessible angle on a bus wheelchair ramp when it is deployed. The footpath at this location is narrow and there is insufficient width available for the kerb to be raised higher as this would create a drainage problem for the adjacent properties. Providing a drain within the footway in order to raise the kerb was considered, but this would have resulted in an angle between the kerb edge and the drain, effectively steepening the angle towards the ramp.

The potential for undertaking access improvement works at this stop will be kept under review. Any workable solution identified will need to be prioritised in relation to the benefits and costs of other improvement works on the Transport for London Road network.

Accessible bus stops funding

Question No: 440 / 2011

Valerie Shawcross

Is it the case that TfL will currently only fund low cost improvements for accessibility works at bus stops?

Written answer from the Mayor

No. However, both TfL and the London boroughs are mindful of the need to ensure value for money in developing and implementing such works. In the current financial year, LIP funding is being utilised by 17 London boroughs to deliver bus stop accessibility works. These range from very simple measures, such as appropriate waiting and loading restrictions through to more significant engineering works, such as kerb height changes. In addition, boroughs are also including such works within larger area-based schemes (e.g. improvements in town centres or at
an interchange) to provide economies of scale and minimise disruption on the network. Furthermore, TfL has a dedicated programme of bus stop accessibility works for the Transport for London Road Network and, like the London boroughs, also addresses such requirements as part of wider programmes of work.

**New Bus for London**

**Question No: 441 / 2011**

Valerie Shawcross

How much space will there be for luggage and other items such as folded up buggies/pushchairs on the New Bus for London? How does the new bus compare with a) standard double and single deck vehicles and b) bendy buses in this regard?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 2 March 2011:

The New Bus for London has over one square metre of space for luggage on top of the front wheel arch. This space will be suitable for small items of luggage, shopping bags and folded strollers, and is accessible close to the front and centre doors.

The NBfL provides more generous luggage space than most double deck vehicles in the fleet, but less than a bendy or large single deck bus. Luggage space on buses tends to be provided in areas which cannot be used for seating or standing, such as over wheel arches, to make best use of space on board and this approach applies equally to single, double and articulated buses. The locations and overall amount of space available will reflect the configuration of individual vehicle types.

**East Dulwich Sainsbury’s**

**Question No: 442 / 2011**

Valerie Shawcross

Several elderly residents in the East Dulwich area have raised again the question of a bus to serve the Sainsbury’s in Dog Kennel Hill (that is a bus that drives into the forecourt of the store, not in the road, which still leaves older people with a considerable walk from the bus stop). They have asked if changes to the P13 or 148 could be made to facilitate this. Please could this be investigated? Are there any other options for meeting this request?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Route P13 already runs into the store. This service provides direct links to Queens Road in Peckham, parts of East Dulwich, West Dulwich and Streatham. Unfortunately the store is built behind a large car park, isolating it from the main road, where a high level of bus service operates. Extending the 148 to the store would significantly increase operating costs and could not be justified.
Tube ticket office closures
Question No: 443 / 2011
Valerie Shawcross
Please give an update on the statement on page 2 of your election manifesto that you will be ‘halting the proposed Tube ticket closures’.

Written answer from the Mayor
I did indeed halt the ticket office closures planned by my predecessor. Under my administration London Underground (LU) has subsequently delivered sensible changes to the opening hours of ticket offices so that all stations with a ticket office have retained that facility, open at times that reflect demand. This has also enabled a more efficient deployment of LU’s workforce. All stations continue to be staffed, with those staff often now freed from their position behind a glass screen to locations such as gate lines and platforms where they can be of most help to passengers.

Blackwall tunnel tidal flow
Question No: 444 / 2011
Valerie Shawcross
Please give an update on the pledge on page 3 of your election manifesto that ‘I will also reinstate tidal flow in the Blackwall Tunnel at the earliest opportunity’.

Written answer from the Mayor
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 3 March 2011:

Since the cessation of the tidal flow, total traffic in the Blackwall Tunnel has increased by around 20 percent. A TfL review found that returning to the tidal flow would not result in improved traffic management. Therefore I have no plans to reinstate the morning tidal flow.

In addition, there are issues around fire risks associated with introducing two way traffic flows in a tunnel with a high proportion of HGVs with no separate means of escape. Also in a tunnel with two way flow there would be no choice but to pass fire smoke and/or toxic fumes over one or other queue of traffic whereas with one way traffic the system ventilates in the direction of traffic flow thus protecting the queue of vehicles behind the fire. You should bear in mind that there was a fire within the tunnel on 29 November 2009.

The principal causes of serious and severe disruption in the Blackwall tunnel are vehicle breakdowns, accidents and HGV’s exceeding the northbound height restrictions. TfL is introducing a number of measures to reduce these unnecessary tunnel closures and more details can be found at:


Later opening on the tube
Question No: 445 / 2011
Valerie Shawcross
Please give an update on the statement on page 5 of your election manifesto ‘I want the tube to open for one hour later on Friday and Saturday nights, so Londoners can get home safely late
at night’.

Written answer from the Mayor

London Underground (LU) has looked at every possibility for implementing a slightly later running of the Tube on Friday and Saturday nights. However, the focus on delivering the massive programme of line upgrades (to provide much-needed additional capacity for London and replace ageing and unreliable assets) means that there is less scope to do this at this point. This is because of the need to maximise access to the railway during engineering hours for upgrade work and also because of the incremental timetable changes needed to both facilitate the upgrades and enhance capacity and reliability wherever possible in advance of the upgrades.

London Underground will continue to keep this under review in the longer term with a view to implementing it if appropriate in the future. Any change to the weekend operating hours would also require an agreement with the trades unions about changes in working hours.

Of course for the Olympic Games LU will temporarily be running an enhanced service, including later running of the Tube in the evenings. Upgrade work is being suspended during this time.

Orbital bus routes

Question No: 446 / 2011

Valerie Shawcross

Please give an update on the statement on page 5 of your election manifesto ‘I will commission a trial of orbital express bus routes for outer London. I believe they should be designed as a distinct mode of transport connecting, for example, key rail terminals initially across South London with coach style vehicles and a limited number of stops. The fares should be no more expensive than current bus fares and should include full Oyster access’. You further state that ‘if successful, we will expand this to other parts of North London’. Has the ‘trial’ thus been deemed unsuccessful?

Written answer from the Mayor

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Suburban Station security

Question No: 447 / 2011

Valerie Shawcross

Page 26 of your election manifesto states that ‘we will release £3.1million that has been earmarked for MPS advertising and spin doctors to put towards funding approximately an extra 50 warranted officers. WE will specify that these new officers must patrol suburban platforms, in particular the stations with the highest levels of crime’. Please list the suburban national rails stations which benefitted from this pledge.

Written answer from the Mayor

The 50 British Transport Police officers provide neighbourhood style policing through seven teams supplementing other neighbourhood policing teams that were already in place.

The seven teams police outer London stations or lines travelling out of these main stations:

Croydon
Bromley South
Stratford
A full list of the stations covered is included in Appendix F.

No strike deal

Question No: 448 / 2011

Valerie Shawcross

Please give an update on progress made on the statement on page 6 of your election manifesto ‘I will look to reduce the disruption caused by strikes on the tube by negotiating a no-strike deal, in good faith, with the unions’.

Written answer from the Mayor

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 3 March 2011:

This remains an objective worth pursuing. Via London Underground’s management, I have offered the Tube trades unions opportunity to enter into negotiations on this point, but they refused. Some recent behaviour has shown they have absolutely no interest in a no strike deal.

Jubilee Line (1)

Question No: 449 / 2011

Valerie Shawcross

On Saturday 2 January my constituent was travelling on the Jubilee Line which was closed at Kilburn (and between, I believe, Wembley Park and Finchley Road, at approximately 6.30pm) because of a signalling failure. The information he received from the station staff was that “a new signalling system has been installed and it does not work”. Could you please investigate this problem, give a fuller explanation and assure me that the new signalling system is working?

Written answer from the Mayor

It is not correct to say that the new signalling system on the Jubilee line does not work and I am sorry that your constituent was given this explanation.

The new signalling system is now operating between Stratford and Dollis Hill, and whilst the system has performed well overall there have been some initial issues have emerged that would only reveal themselves under intense operations. London Underground (LU) apologises to customers who have experienced delays during this period. I can assure you that LU and Tube Lines are focused on urgently resolving any issues that arise, with a team on stand-by at all times to respond quickly to any incidents that could cause delay.

Once completed, the new system will provide significantly faster journeys, increased reliability as well as enabling a third more capacity. Indeed each customer journey is already eight seconds faster on average than under the old system. Recovery time when failures do occur is also quicker.
Jubilee Line (2)  
Question No: 450 / 2011  
Navin Shah  
On 4 January the Jubilee line suffered delays during the morning rush hour as the driver said there was a defective train at Stratford. As Stratford is at the end of the Jubilee line can you please explain to me why, when there are two platforms for the Jubilee line, it caused such a delay to the rest of the line?  

Written answer from the Mayor  
The delay on the Jubilee line on 4 January was caused by a points failure which then led to a train becoming defective on the approach to Stratford station. Unfortunately the position of the defective train meant the lines to all three Jubilee platforms at Stratford were blocked, necessitating a suspension of the line to North Greenwich and resulting in severe delays to the rest of the line.  

Emergency response teams did everything they could to recover the service as quickly as possible.

Khat and the Somali community  
Question No: 451 / 2011  
Navin Shah  
In Brent there is a problem with Khat being spat on the ground, which in turn is spreading TB. What role does the Mayor think he can play in taking Khat off London’s streets? What is the Mayor currently doing to combat the use of Khat among the Somali community? When will the Home Office’s review of Khat be ready and when will the Mayor begin taking action on this issue?  

Written answer from the Mayor  
I am advised by NHS Public Health colleagues that TB cannot be caught from spit on the street – transmission is airborne and close prolonged contact is usually necessary. On the wider issue of Khat, the report of the Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs (ACMD) into individual and societal harms related to khat use is still awaited. Education and medical interventions responding to concerns about substance problems are primarily a matter for local partnerships (Drug Action Teams). The Greater London Alcohol and Drug Alliance (GLADA) works to support these local partnerships and providers across London.  

As a consequence of my Office’s engagement with the Somali community, the issue of Khat has been brought to my attention and my Deputy Mayor Richard Barnes is working with the relevant communities and agencies to address the matter. In addition, my Office has also liaised with the Home Office to obtain information about how it plans to address the issue of Khat.

Planning  
Question No: 452 / 2011  
Navin Shah  
How do you see that the changes to the planning law due to the Localism Act 2011 will affect building in London?
Written answer from the Mayor

Judgement on this should be reserved until the Bill has been enacted, as it may be amended during its passage through parliament. It is likely, however, that neighbourhood forums will be established in many parts of London for the purpose of bringing forward proposals for growth through the medium of neighbourhood plans and development orders; these will have the benefit of local support following referendums and are thus likely to lead to development more readily than under the current planning regime.

Disability Strategy
Question No: 453 / 2011
Navin Shah

I was contacted by a charity chief executive in my constituency who has concerns of your lack of knowledge of disability, your involvement in disability strategy only delays positive changes for disabled people who often have to stay far too long in unsuitable accommodation as it is whilst waiting for things to be built. She says that Health Inequality Strategies tend to ignore the high rate of incorrect or insufficient treatment and care of people with learning disabilities, sometimes known to lead to premature death which is not acknowledged in the health services as a significant problem. It is my view that this would not be seen as acceptable if it was any other group, and will the Mayor be taking a proactive stance on addressing this?

Written answer from the Mayor

As you are aware I do not have any direct responsibility for commissioning, provision or regulation of health and care services. However, the GLA Disability Equality Scheme, which I published last year, sets out in detail what I am doing to promote equality for disabled people, including in relation to health inequalities. In developing this scheme the views and priorities of disabled people were sought, including a number of organisations of people with learning disabilities. My Statutory Deputy Mayor, Richard Barnes, chairs a stakeholder group which provides a forum for ongoing engagement with deaf and disabled people.

Cuts to Transport staff
Question No: 454 / 2011
Navin Shah

Can you guarantee that no station will be left unstaffed for any amount of time because of your transport cuts programme? Can you confirm that London Underground has been warned by the Office of Rail Regulation that unstaffed stations should be isolated incidents, not everyday occurrences?

Written answer from the Mayor

London Underground continues to have staff rostered at all stations during all times that they are open to customers. Where there is a single member of staff on duty at some quiet, surface level stations, they are entitled to a meal break and that situation existed prior to the recent changes. Members of staff generally remain on the station during their meal breaks, so that they are able to respond to any incidents. If they do leave the station, they are required to inform a supervisor, who can ensure an appropriate response. This arrangement will continue to apply.

Whilst LU has had discussions with the Office of Rail Regulation (ORR) about station staffing levels, it is not the case that any warnings have been issued by ORR in respect of station staffing.
**Ticket Office Closures**

*Question No: 455 / 2011*

*Navin Shah*

What do you suggest passengers do when the ticket office is shut and they need to do one of the following: update their oyster card if their bank card is not functioning properly; if their oyster card is damaged and needs to be replaced; touch in with their oyster card and then find out that the train has been cancelled/delayed and need to be refunded the money?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Customers can use cash at ticket machines to update their Oyster card in the absence of a bank card, just as they would if the ticket office was open.

Additional functions on LU’s ‘Advanced Fare Machines’ (AFMs), including the resolution of ‘incomplete journeys’, will be in place by the end of the month (there is at least one AFM available for passengers to use at every station). Between May and August 2011, LU will further increase the functionality of the AFMs to enable the vending of Oyster cards and voiding of an entry or exit. In the meantime, customers can buy their card at any one of several thousand Oyster Ticket Stops across the network.

The Oyster Helpline (the number for which is advertised at all stations) is and will remain the key route through which TfL will continue to assist customers with Oyster queries.

**Interchange Stations**

*Question No: 456 / 2011*

*Navin Shah*

I have been contacted by a constituent who has become aware of a change of behaviour at stations where two lines meet. In the past, when a southbound Metropolitan Line train stopped at Wembley Park the southbound Jubilee Line train would wait for passengers to change on to the other line, and vice versa. The same practice prevailed on the northbound platform to allow a smooth interchange between trains. However, twice during the two weeks beginning 13th December 2010 my constituent was on a southbound Jubilee Line train which ran into Wembley Park next to a Southbound Metropolitan Line train. On both occasions the Metropolitan Line guard closed the doors so Jubilee Line passengers had no opportunity to walk across and get the Met train. Has the practice of waiting for passengers to change trains stopped and could it reinstated if it has as it would alleviate a lot of frustration?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

In fact, there was never such a practice. However, following the introduction of a new timetable in December 2010, fewer trains now have a change of driver at Wembley Park. Previously, it may have appeared that drivers were waiting to enable passengers to change from another train however the slightly longer time spent on the platform was simply a result of one driver leaving the train and another taking over.

The problem with holding trains on a busy and high frequency metro system like London Underground is that whilst for some customers it feels like a better service, it actually causes delays and congestion for many others. It can also reduce the frequency of trains running, so reducing the capacity of the line, critical at a time of record and growing demand levels. As a result, the policy is not to have trains waiting, and instead to focus on providing a better overall service for all customers by improving the regularity and reliability of trains arriving as planned.
Trade Union Relations

Question No: 457 / 2011

Navin Shah

You stated to the trade unions in your joint opinion piece with the Prime Minister in the Sun on the 12th of January “You can choose constructive dialogue or you can choose confrontation.” Would the RMT’s repeated rebuffed and rejected requests to meet with you throughout your Mayoralty suggest this choice exists?

Written answer from the Mayor

The choice exists but it is abundantly clear which of the two the RMT has chosen. Unless of course you are of the view that ‘constructive dialogue’ is equivalent to demanding meetings while simultaneously threatening strike action. That is not my view.

GP Consortia

Question No: 458 / 2011

Navin Shah

What roles does the Mayor believe are appropriate, and inappropriate, for private sector providers in supporting GP consortia?

Written answer from the Mayor

It will be entirely up to individual GP consortia to determine the most appropriate arrangements for discharging their responsibilities.

GPs in London

Question No: 459 / 2011

Navin Shah

Equitable access to healthcare is an important determinant of equality in health outcomes. How many people in London are estimated to be without a GP? In the absence of primary care trusts, what mechanism will ensure GP led care does not lead to increased difficulties in registering with and moving between GPs. What will mitigate the potential resultant effects on health inequalities in the capital?

Written answer from the Mayor

I am unable to give you the estimated number of Londoners not registered with a GP now although my staff are in dialogue with NHS London over how such a number might best be determined.

Under the current system the local PCT has a duty to find a doctor for anyone who is unable to find one themselves. When PCTs are abolished in April 2013, GP consortia will take over responsibility for people who live within a consortium’s area and are not registered with any GP practice. There is no assumption that this transfer of responsibility will have an effect on health inequalities.
**NHS Reforms**

**Question No: 461 / 2011**

Navin Shah

Your answer to question 3852/2010 mentions the establishment of a partnership forum to oversee NHS reforms in the capital, to avoid wasteful duplication. Please provide the Assembly with a full list of a. meetings so far. b. members participating in this forum and c. those informed of and invited to attend the forum.

**Written answer from the Mayor**

MQ3852 / 2010 referred specifically to public health responsibilities and in my response I indicated that it was important that the new public health system was integrated and avoided wasteful duplication (I did not claim and nor is it the case that the partnership forum is responsible for “overseeing NHS Reforms in the Capital”).

The partnership forum is not an entity with defined terms of reference, membership etc. Rather it is a group of London Leaders coming together in different meetings with varying attendees to shape knowledge about what the reforms would mean from different stakeholders’ perspective.

The ultimate output on public health issue is encapsulated in the letter from myself and the Leader of London Councils to the Secretary of State which set out the case for a London Health Improvement Board.

I would be happy to provide a copy of this letter if you so wish.

---

**NHS Reforms 2**

**Question No: 462 / 2011**

Navin Shah

Your answer to question 3852/2010 mentions the establishment of a partnership forum to oversee NHS reforms in the capital, to avoid wasteful duplication. Will the minutes and agenda of these meetings be published?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Please refer to my answer to MQ461 / 2011.

---

**Public Health White Paper**

**Question No: 463 / 2011**

Navin Shah

Your answer to question 3852/2010 states more detail will be in the Government’s public health White Paper, expected in December. What priorities and direction has the GLA taken from ‘Liberating the NHS: Legislative framework and next steps’?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

‘Liberating the NHS: Legislative framework and next steps’ sets out how the Government will legislate for, and implement, the NHS reforms following responses to the earlier NHS white paper and associated consultation documents.

Since then the Government has published the Health and Social Care Bill, which is now in its Committee Stage. We are considering the implications of the Bill alongside ongoing discussions about the proposals contained in the public health white paper.
Health and Wellbeing Board
Question No: 464 / 2011
Navin Shah
Does London need a city-wide statutory health and wellbeing board?

Written answer from the Mayor
Following discussions with a wide range of partners I have concluded that there is a need for a pan-London forum focusing on health improvement. Subject to the approval of the Secretary of State it is hoped that this will be called the London Health Improvement Board.

Cycle Scheme
Question No: 465 / 2011
Navin Shah
Do you have any plans to extend the Cycle Hire Scheme to Brent and beyond?

Written answer from the Mayor
I consider Barclays Cycle Hire to be an expanding programme. Last November TfL announced plans for Phase 2 of the scheme, extending Cycle Hire across Tower Hamlets and a greater area of Hackney in time for the 2012 Olympic Games. However, any additional extensions will depend on funding.

One of the basic premises of the scheme is that a dense network of docking stations needs to be in place, located every 300m or so throughout the cycle hire zone, as users rely on the expectation that there will be a docking station close to both their desired origin and destination. This means that to expand the scheme over even a short distance requires a large number of additional docking stations.

Lights at Kingsbury Station
Question No: 466 / 2011
Navin Shah
Can you tell me why the lights are left on at Kingsbury Station during the day time when there is natural light and when the station is shut? Will you consider turning off lights in stations when there is no need for them to save money and electricity?

Written answer from the Mayor
Due to the original design and specification of the lighting within a number of London Underground (LU) stations, there are no switches at these stations that allow the lights to be easily turned on or off. However, subject to necessary funding being available, LU is looking to install switches at some stations affected by this issue – including Kingsbury.

This is part of a wider strategy to reduce CO2 emissions network-wide, which also includes: ten of LU’s largest stations signing up to the 10:10 pledge last year to cut CO2 emissions by 10%, nearly 200 stations currently having Energy Efficiency Plans (with this number due to be increased over time to cover all stations), the delivery of low energy lighting at Charing Cross and the more efficient management of escalator usage.
Service on the Bakerloo line
Question No: 467 / 2011
Navin Shah
I have received many complaints from constituents who are frustrated with the service provided on the Bakerloo line. The service on the Bakerloo line north of Queens Park is often withdrawn at short notice for seemingly the most trivial of reasons. When will passengers be able to rely on the Bakerloo line northbound of Queens Park?

Written answer from the Mayor
In fact, performance statistics for the current financial year so far show that the Bakerloo line has operated 96% of its scheduled services across the line, and 94.4% from Queen’s Park northwards.

Recent pointless and completely unnecessary strike action has been the cause of some of the disruption – without it customers would have been spared a lot of inconvenience.

To ensure consistent good performance, LU works closely with Network Rail, who own and maintain the track and signalling north of Queen’s Park and have been undertaking a programme of improvement work on the track and other infrastructure. That has meant a series of weekend closures on that section, but it is certainly never the case that the service would be withdrawn for ‘trivial’ reasons. If you can supply any examples of when you think that has been the case, I will most certainly ask LU to investigate.

Bus Access to the Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital
Question No: 468 / 2011
Navin Shah
How does TfL measure the “likely level of additional benefit to passengers” in extending a bus route into the gates of the Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital, Brockley Hill, Stanmore? I continue to receive a great deal of casework requesting bus routes are extended to enter the hospital grounds given the impaired mobility of many of its users. What does TfL quantify the expense of this measure to be, and has this been subjected to a cost/benefit analysis? How have the benefits to the hospitals’ users been quantified?

Written answer from the Mayor
The benefits to passengers are reduced travel time to and from the hospital. This would result in an increase in the number of passenger trips by bus. To assess the potential of a proposal to generate new trips, TfL reviews relevant available data sources. For the Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital this included usage of route 107, which already serves the main gates, the general level of visits to the hospital and experience with bus usage to hospitals elsewhere on the network.

TfL has looked at the possibility of extending route 324 and estimate that it would cost about £215,000 per annum before revenue is taken into account. Estimated usage is around 250 to 400 trips per day. The extension would provide benefits to passengers of around £190,000 per annum and new revenue of around £40,000. The extra subsidy required would be about £175,000 per year and the ratio of benefits to net costs would be around 1.1 to 1. TfL normally require a ratio of 2.0 to 1 or better for bus service improvements and of course the subsidy must be available.
Bus Access to the Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital (2)
Question No: 469 / 2011
Navin Shah

In the absence of action to improve step-free access at Stanmore Station, will the Mayor instruct Transport for London to reconsider their consultation analysis and extend the 324 bus route to the grounds of the Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital from its current terminus at Stanmore station? As the 324 calls at Kingsbury, a genuinely accessible station, extending the 324 would provide step-free access to the RNOH. Alternatively will the Mayor consider the extension of the 615 south to Kingsbury to provide step-free access?

Written answer from the Mayor
Please refer to my answer to MQ468 / 2011.

Route 615 is operated under contract to Hertfordshire County Council rather than TfL. TfL is discussing the position regarding access to the hospital with the County Council and Harrow Council.

CAP09, the Xcite project and Affordable Childcare in Harrow
Question No: 470 / 2011
Navin Shah

Does the Mayor have a message for the seventy workless parents helped into employment by the CAP09 pilot in Harrow, the termination of which was an immediate consequence of the abolition of the LDA? Will the Mayor listen to the case presented to him by Harrow Council and attempt to find funds to continue to support clients in 2011/2?

Written answer from the Mayor
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written answer received on 2 March 2011:

The LDA’s CAP09 programme, which includes Harrow’s Xcite project, was terminated due to continued under-performance at the overall programme and individual borough level rather than due to the abolition of the LDA. There is therefore no LDA funding for CAP09 in 2011/12.

The continuation of the programme would represent poor value for money for Londoners. A review of delivery was undertaken at the end of November 2010, at which point Harrow had reported and shown that 37 people had entered employment. This performance outturn represents 34% achievement against Harrow’s original contracted target, and 77% against its Recovery Plan.

Bakerloo Line Engineering works
Question No: 471 / 2011
Navin Shah

When will the Bakerloo line engineering works be completed? What is the timetable for closures from March 2011?

Written answer from the Mayor
The current engineering work on the Bakerloo line is for essential maintenance that cannot be completed overnight. The majority of the work is in fact being undertaken by Network Rail
which owns the infrastructure between Queen’s Park and Harrow & Wealdstone. In the first quarter of 2011, of the five days of planned works on the line, the four to date have been for Network Rail track maintenance and the remaining one (on Saturday 26 February) is for London Underground to carry out heavy maintenance work.

In the second quarter of this year, there are planned closures on four weekends. These are:

- The Easter weekend (Friday 22 to Monday 25 April) for LU and Network Rail works between Paddington and Harrow & Wealdstone
- The first May Bank Holiday weekend (Saturday 30 April to Monday 2 May) for Network Rail works between Queen’s Park and Harrow & Wealdstone
- Sunday 8 May for Network Rail works between Queen’s Park and Harrow & Wealdstone
- Sunday 29 May for LU and Network Rail works between Paddington and Harrow & Wealdstone.


Travelcard Costs
Question No: 472 / 2011
Navin Shah

Do you believe Metropolitan and Jubilee Line users are getting the service they deserve?

Written answer from the Mayor

I recognise that there has been significant disruption on the Metropolitan and Jubilee lines.

Recent disruption on the Metropolitan line is principally related to the age and condition of the infrastructure on the line (which is some of the oldest on the network). The wintry weather in December also had an effect, compounding some of the asset failures, and the introduction of a new timetable added a further complexity to service recovery during incidents. LU is urgently seeking to rectify these issues and improve day to day performance in advance of the upgrade of the line. A new fleet of trains is currently being introduced and this will be followed by the upgrade of signalling – both of which will boost reliability in the longer term. These improvements will also mean faster and more frequent journeys for customers.

The issues on the Jubilee line have been the result of a number of factors following the introduction of the new signalling between Stratford and Dollis Hill; while the system has performed well overall there has been some initial impact on performance as issues emerge that would only reveal themselves under intense operations. London Underground and Tube Lines are focused on urgently resolving any issues that arise – with a team on standby at all times to respond quickly to any incidents that could cause delay.

Once completed, the new system will provide significantly faster journeys, increased reliability as well as enabling a third more capacity. Indeed each customer journey is already eight seconds faster on average than under the old system. Recovery time when failures do occur is also quicker.
**Safer Neighbourhood Teams**
*Question No: 473 / 2011*

Navin Shah

What consequences do you envisage as Borough Commanders move SNTs from ‘quieter’ areas, where the fear of crime remains high, to busier areas, and what measures do you plan to reassure local constituents?

*Written answer from the Mayor*

SNTs will not be moved from quieter areas.

**Single Room Rate**
*Question No: 475 / 2011*

Nicky Gavron

What impact do you believe the increase in the threshold for the Single Room Rate will have in London?

*Written answer from the Mayor*

The GLA is continuing to work with London Councils and others on the impact of the shared room rate and has asked the Government to exempt vulnerable homeless people from the extension of the Shared Room Rate.

**Investment in HCA**
*Question No: 476 / 2011*

Nicky Gavron

How much money will the Mayor of London be investing through the GLA and HCA in housing over the next financial year?

*Written answer from the Mayor*

Annex 2 of the 2011-15 Affordable Homes Programme Framework sets out the HCA’s national budget for 2011/12. The government has decided that the HCA should not apportion the uncommitted funding between its regions in advance of providers submitting their offers to deliver new supply (section 2.35 of the Framework).

However, the HCA’s London budget for NAHP 2008-11 commitments is known, and in 2011/12 circa £672 million is required to meet these.

**Afford Housing**
*Question No: 477 / 2011*

Nicky Gavron

How much money is already committed for affordable housing through the GLA and HCA?

*Written answer from the Mayor*

Approximately £1.1 billion is already committed in London for 2011-15 through the HCA.
Social Housing Budget
Question No: 478 / 2011
Nicky Gavron
What proportion of the social housing budget for the Spending Review period 2011-2015 has already been allocated to projects that have (a) already started, (b) been completed and (c) will start in the 2011/12 financial year?

Written answer from the Mayor
(a) Please see my response to MQ477 / 2011.

(b) Developments completing prior to April 2011 do not have any further call on the HCA’s budget.

(c) £62.77 million has been allocated for projects starting on site in 2011/12.

Budget for Affordable Housing
Question No: 479 / 2011
Nicky Gavron
What has been the total budget for new affordable housing in London between 2008 and 2011? Please include all funding received for programmes such as KickStart and break down the total funding by programme allocation.

Written answer from the Mayor
The NAHP budget for 2008-11 can be found in Appendix 1 of my London Housing Strategy. Details of the additional funding made available by the previous government’s under its housing stimulus programme can be found at: http://www.homesandcommunities.co.uk/housing_stimulus.

Homes built on LDA Land
Question No: 480 / 2011
Nicky Gavron
How many homes have been built on land owned, or formally owned, by the London Development Agency year on year since 2000? Please break down by year and by tenure.

Written answer from the Mayor
Based on the information available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Homes Built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999/00</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges within the Draft Replacement London Plan

Question No: 481 / 2011

Nicky Gavron

What is the main challenge the Mayor of London anticipates in delivering his Draft Replacement London Plan?

Written answer from the Mayor

Chapter 1 of my Draft Replacement London Plan indicates that there are seven key, interrelated challenges in delivering its proposals: those associated with population and economic growth; persistent poverty and disadvantage; climate change; adequate infrastructure; securing the Olympic legacy; my new focus on Londoners’ quality of life and a changing planning system. In different ways each of these bears on the others – they cannot be considered in isolation.

Planning Applications for Green Belt Developments

Question No: 482 / 2011

Nicky Gavron

Can the Mayor provide a list of all planning applications for developments in the green belt that have been referred to him since he took office and outline what was his recommendation for each?

Written answer from the Mayor

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Kings Cross Redevelopment Area

Question No: 483 / 2011

Nicky Gavron

What steps has the Mayor taken to ensure public access and throughways are delivered in the King’s Cross Redevelopment Area?

Written answer from the Mayor

The planning permission for the King’s Cross railway lands and the related S106 agreement were decided before I took office. Any subsequent enforcement is a matter for the local planning authorities.
Police Officers
Question No: 484 / 2011
Nicky Gavron
Does the Mayor anticipate that the number of police officers will be more, less or the same at
the end of the forthcoming Spending Review period (April 2015) as they are at the beginning
(April 2011)? In your response, please differentiate between full-time police officers, Specials
and Community Support Officers.

Written answer from the Mayor
It is too early to anticipate what police numbers will be in April 2015. I can only reaffirm my
absolute commitment to maintaining levels of frontline policing and Safer Neighbourhood
Teams for as long as I remain Mayor.

Change of Travel
Question No: 485 / 2011
Nicky Gavron
What impact does the Mayor believe increasing travel fares will have on car usage? Has an
assessment been made regarding this by Transport for London? If so, what is the outcome?

Written answer from the Mayor
The impacts of proposed public transport fares changes on public transport demand are always
considered. However, the relationship between public transport fares and car use is complex
and not easy to observe. Other factors, such as the price of petrol, can have a far bigger
influence on actual levels of car use.

TfL’s recent Travel in London 3 report shows that traffic levels have declined by 6 per cent over
the last decade. This reflects a wide range of factors (including increased public transport
provision, shared space and congestion charging) which have collectively influenced the
volumes of road traffic in London.

Increase in PM10 Pollution
Question No: 486 / 2011
Nicky Gavron
Has there been an increase in PM10 pollution in the former Western Extension Zone since its
abolition?

Written answer from the Mayor
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Let us Out!
Question No: 487 / 2011
John Biggs
Constituents and businesses in Dagenham continue to be frustrated by the continuing weekend
closures on the District Line making travel from and to the area almost impossible. What are you
going to do to ensure that works are better co-ordinated to avoid such weekend closures?
Written answer from the Mayor

TfL is always focused on co-ordinating works so that disruption to customers is minimised in every way possible.

Currently a major programme of upgrade works is under way on the East end of the District line, including track replacement between Plaistow and East Ham, drainage work at Barking (to increase signalling reliability) and signalling improvement work between Bromley-by-Bow and Upton Park.

I do appreciate the impact of closures on your constituents and businesses in Dagenham and I am sorry for any inconvenience caused. This work is critical to maintain reliability and prepare the way for the significant boost to capacity and reliability which will be delivered through the upgrade of the line with new trains and signalling. Wherever possible work on the District line is co-ordinated with Crossrail and Network Rail works to maximise the amount of work completed through each closure.

Whilst closures will always be necessary for some renewal and upgrade work, like for example track replacement, now that TfL is free of the constraints of the PPP every opportunity is being taken to avoid closures wherever possible. In line with this, the tendering process for the signalling contract for the Sub-Surface line includes a specification that the work must be carried out without closures.

District Line Closures (1)

Question No: 488 / 2011

John Biggs

Are you happy that TfL have got the advance publicity, and alternative transport services, right? In my view this is often not the case and the approach needs to be regularly reviewed and refreshed for those occasions when closures are necessary.

Written answer from the Mayor

TfL is acutely aware of the impact of closures on its customers, and therefore always ensures that adequate and well-publicised alternative travel arrangements are available.

Before a closure is confirmed, TfL examines the existing alternative transport such as other rail services, local bus routes and other Underground lines. If these are inadequate to cater for those passengers who would have used the closed section of line, then replacement bus services are provided – often designed to link to other Tube or rail lines to make the journey as quick as possible.

Every closure that requires a replacement bus service is uniquely reviewed and closure managers travel around the network on weekends to monitor performance and identify any necessary improvements.

TfL also works with local authorities to check for planned road works, and alters any bus routeings if required.

TfL has developed a suite of free online ‘Travel Tools’ (www.tfl.gov.uk/traveltools) to help customers plan their journeys, with the key advice being to always ‘check before you travel’. Our Travel Tools include a weekly email with details of weekend closures, Journey Planner, mobile travel alerts, live travel news and the six-month look-ahead at www.tfl.gov.uk.
Other ways of promoting information about closures include articles and advertisements in the London media including the Metro newspaper, station-specific posters and leaflets, and at National Rail’s stations in the south east, train and station announcements.

Again, TfL keeps its communication and publicity arrangements under continuous review to ensure they are meeting passengers’ needs.

**District Line Closures (2)**

**Question No: 489 / 2011**

John Biggs

What progress has been made with minimising these closures and looking at alternatives, where these might be possible, as the perception is that TfL is almost careless as to the decision to close lines at weekends these days?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Closures on the eastern end of the District line may be scheduled to allow upgrade or essential maintenance work on the Tube or Network Rail tracks, as well as Crossrail work. As the route is largely shared between the District and Hammersmith & City lines, and Network Rail, TfL works with Network Rail to ensure that when a section of track is closed, the opportunity to undertake work on that section is maximised, and impact on customers is kept to a minimum while allowing the upgrade projects to remain on programme.

TfL strives to deliver its upgrade plans with the least disruption possible. It will always consider all the options for carrying out works, including weekend closures, extended closures and early evening closures. Projects are coordinated as much as possible and often work is being carried out on two or more different projects or work streams during a closure. Nevertheless, with a major programme of upgrade works underway, and a growing number of events taking place in London, it is impossible to plan all closures such that every single event in London is protected.

Freed from the confines of the PPP, TfL is also looking at innovative options, taking advantage of new technology where appropriate, to reduce the impact. A key requirement of the tender specification for the sub-surface signalling upgrade was for potential contractors to demonstrate how they would keep closures to an absolute minimum whilst carrying out the work. On the Northern line, TfL has cancelled the excessive programme of closures originally planned for the upgrade under the PPP, and will complete the work with much less disruption to passengers.

**District Line Closures (3)**

**Question No: 490 / 2011**

John Biggs

Can you list the proposed closures for the next 12 months of the line through, and connecting Central London with, Dagenham Heathway, Dagenham East and Becontree Stations and for each occasion give a brief reason for the planned closure?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Assets along the District line are being replaced or refurbished as part of its upgrade, which is due for completion in 2018. Planned closures for the east end of the District line between February and September 2011 are listed in the spreadsheet attached as Appendix G.
Track closures are typically planned six months in advance of works taking place. Accordingly, the schedule of weekend works beyond September has not yet been finalised.

**Segregated Cycle Tracks**

**Question No: 491 / 2011**

John Biggs

A recent TfL press release (11/1/2011) states “that cycle journeys have shot up to 100% during peak times on the first two Cycle Superhighways”. The A13 route from Barking is mainly segregated, saw an increase in the number of cyclists of over 100% when it became Cycle Superhighway 3, as compared to 50% for CS7 from Merton which is not segregated. Do you agree that these facts demonstrate that segregated cycle tracks are safer and more popular and will you, therefore, be prioritising segregated facilities on future highway routes?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

It is worth noting that needs vary significantly between cyclists. Some will feel safe and be more attracted to cycling through segregated and dedicated routes, whilst others will have their needs met through improvements in conditions on the highway.

We must also be realistic. In many places, the existing layout of roads and buildings means that there is simply not enough space to provide segregated cycle lanes without adversely impacting other users. As a highway authority TfL has to consider the needs of all road users, as well as nearby residents and businesses. Segregated cycle provision is also less flexible to fluctuations in demand for road space from cyclists and other road users.

**Super Sewer**

**Question No: 492 / 2011**

John Biggs

I have recently met constituents, and Thames Water, to discuss the impact of the Super Sewer on King Edward VII’s Memorial Park in Shadwell. While not opposing the sewer will you support the aim of residents and park users to either seek an alternative site and/or otherwise minimise the impact of works on the park?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

This is an important project for London and I am determined to minimise the impact of the Tunnel’s construction on Londoners. I am clear in my response to the first stage consultation on the Thames Tideway Tunnel (see link below) that Thames Water must minimise the impact of its work at all the construction sites and deliver legacy benefits to Londoners. With regards to the King Edward Memorial Park specifically, I believe that it appears to be the best option as it has the fewest negative impacts and will work with Thames Water and the LB Tower Hamlets to minimise the impacts on the residents of Shadwell.

[http://www.london.gov.uk/mayoral-planning-decision/planning-decisions-12-january-2011#1](http://www.london.gov.uk/mayoral-planning-decision/planning-decisions-12-january-2011#1)

**Blackwall Tunnel Response Team 1**

**Question No: 493 / 2011**

John Biggs

I note your introduction of a response team to attempt to tackle breakdowns and overheight
vehicles in the tunnel. Can you describe further the team(s)? How many staff, police or other, will be deployed? And what is the cost and by whom will it be met? Given that this is I understand a three month project, is it essentially an educational project or do you have longer term plans after this period?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The Blackwall Tunnel carries around 100,000 vehicles a day across the river in East London, more than most sections of the M1. In the nine months leading up to the trial there were around 1,200 tunnel closures caused by over-height lorries.

The purpose of the trial is to test whether dedicated policing can improve journey time reliability by reducing the duration and frequency of unplanned incidents that cause significant delays to traffic using the A102/A12 Blackwall Tunnel corridor. A key objective is to change driver behaviour through engagement and enforcement.

The two policing teams each consist of one sergeant and four constables providing coverage between 0630 and 2100, Monday to Friday. They are drawn from the Metropolitan Police Service’s road response teams; a unit of highly trained, specialised officers funded by TfL and dedicated to supporting the smoothing traffic flow agenda. During the trial, the team will also undertake enforcement operations in partnership with VOSA and MPS traffic police.

Staffing costs for the three month trial will come to £156,000. This does not include accommodation, vehicle or equipment costs. The trial uses existing resources from the TfL-funded special services agreement with the MPS. Management, monitoring, evaluation and reporting of the trial will be conducted through the MPS/TfL partnership on smoothing traffic flow. The outcome will feed into discussions on optimising the future deployment of the road response teams.

**Blackwall Tunnel Response Team 2**

**Question No: 494 / 2011**

John Biggs

Implicit in your introduction of the response team, is of course a recognition that the whole of East London is held to ransom, and frequently gridlocked, by problems in the tunnel. Not only is this massively inconvenient but it has massive economic consequences and holds back investment and development decisions. It is widely recognised that this problem will only be addressed by the construction of another road crossing, suitably managed to minimise its potential negative impacts. Do you accept this? If not, why not and if so what urgency are you placing on this, as the impression is created by your actions to date that you are merely kicking the problem into the long grass so that it will not be addressed until another Mayor sits in City Hall. What outputs will exist by May 2012?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 2 March 2011:

As you are aware, I have strengthened the importance placed on traffic reliability in my Transport Strategy, which places a new emphasis on smoothing traffic flow. I agree that a new crossing is required in east London to address the problem, and that this should be close to Blackwall in order that the reliability of the road network in the Blackwall tunnel area is addressed.
My Transport Strategy explicitly supports measures to improve the river crossings, and we will be bringing forward proposals to deliver new crossings, including a new river crossing at Silvertown, a new ferry crossing, and a Cable Car which we hope will be delivered in the short term. In the meantime, the new Blackwall tunnel response team aims to deliver improvements for local people in the short term, and we will continue to investigate medium as well as long term improvements in order to bring relief to residents of east and south east London.

For more details on the work of the Blackwall tunnel response team, please see my answer to MQ493/2011.

**Mayor’s Trees**  
**Question No: 495 / 2011**  
John Biggs  
Of those planted since you launched this programme, how many are still standing?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The vast majority of the 5,012 trees planted in the first two rounds of the programme are still standing and are healthy. It is expected that around 4,500 more will be planted this winter, with many already in the ground.

A survey by the Forestry Commission, who manages the programme on our behalf, concluded that between three and five percent of trees planted in the first two rounds were lost through vandalism, accident (e.g. damage from vehicles) or natural failure (i.e. diseased trees). This is an extremely good success rate for street trees. The normally tolerated failure rate is nearer 10%.

In most cases trees that have been lost have been replaced.

Further monitoring will be undertaken this summer to ensure the street trees planted through my programme are being maintained to a good standard. All recipients of my Street Tree grants are funded to maintain trees for the first year after planting and I expect this maintenance to continue.

**DLR Stratford international**

**Question No: 496 / 2011**  
John Biggs  
Why has this project been delayed? Will the revised end February opening date be met and if not when will it now open?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The Stratford International extension will open in Summer 2011. This delay has been caused by joint venture contractors Skanska and Volker Rail taking longer than expected to progress some technical aspects of the project such as communications system design and installation. Whilst further work on these systems is required, test trains have started running on the line which marks a significant milestone on the project.

Timetables are now being prepared as the testing continues. Trains will run at least every 10 minutes on the new line and this will increase during the 2012 Games and in the future as demand increases.
With the new line opening in Summer, it will be ready well in advance of the 2012 Games and provide a lasting legacy to East London.

**UK technology Hub in the east End**

**Question No: 497 / 2011**

John Biggs

What resource are you applying to the pursuit of this initiative, following is political launch in November 2010? What targets have you set for it?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

No resources have been allocated aside from one existing full time member of staff. Targets have not been specifically set for the ‘initiative’ as the work is part of my ongoing interest in supporting the growth of high tech businesses across London as a whole. The overarching ambition is for London to be the digital capital of Europe.

**Mayors Fund**

**Question No: 498 / 2011**

John Biggs

The fund is of course independent of you but closely associated with you. Are you concerned about its ability to raise funds or its performance and what can you report to us about its success so far? How many fundraising or other events have you held with or to promote the Fund since its inception?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The Mayor’s Fund has improved the lives of over 8,000 children since its inception and over 1,000 of those have been helped through intensive 1:1 work. The funding raised has been enough to do what the Fund has wanted to do. The Fund has ambitious plans for the future and is extending its geographical reach and impact. It needs to raise more funding to do that and these are difficult times for that, of course. Nevertheless the Fund has succeeded so far and is confident of its future. As Patron, I undertake six events a year for the Fund.

**Government Offices**

**Question No: 499 / 2011**

John Biggs

Do you welcome the decision of the Department of Business Innovation and Skills to reintroduce regional offices? Does this demonstrate that if the Government Offices had not existed it would have been necessary to invent them?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

My concern is with how London is run. As far as I am aware there is no final decision on the location of these offices and that is a matter for BIS.

I welcomed the government’s decision to abolish the Government Office for London, given the greater devolution to the Mayor and boroughs. I do not see a need for a BIS local presence in London.
Role Models  
**Question No: 500 / 2011** 
**Jennette Arnold** 
Following on from my previous question 2435/2010, now that the Rt. Hon Francis Maude MP has publicly disowned Ray Lewis (Newsnight, 07/02/2011) will you do likewise?  

**Written answer from the Mayor** 
I will not “disown” Ray Lewis. I note that in the edition of Newsnight broadcast 7 February the Rt Hon Francis Maude MP was neither questioned nor made a comment about Ray Lewis. All the programme reported was that Mr Maude is no longer a trustee of the Eastside Young Leaders’ Academy.

Engagement with London’s diverse communities  
**Question No: 501 / 2011** 
**Jennette Arnold** 
Will you please provide me with a list of activities and events that you are planning for 2011-12 to engage with London’s Diverse Communities?  

**Written answer from the Mayor** 
I plan to continue my current programme of engagement with London’s diverse communities, ranging from the community celebrations in Trafalgar Square to regular meetings with different groups in City Hall, too numerous to list.

Many of the activities are subject to 2011/12 budget approval but it remains my intention to continue to host community receptions in City Hall, Community Conversations, and four more People’s Question Time (PQT) - to make City Hall more accessible and accountable to Londoners. In addition, I will continue with State of London debates, as well as consulting London’s communities on the policies that I will develop.

Elimination of blind spots around lorries  
**Question No: 502 / 2011** 
**Jennette Arnold** 
One of my constituents from Clapton died earlier this month after being hit by a lorry whilst cycling. You wrote to me on the 11 January 2010, and said you had written to Lord Adonis on the issue of legislation regarding the retro fitting of safety equipment, including mirrors, to all HGVs. What talks have you had with the current Secretary of State about this most important issue?  

**Written answer from the Mayor** 
I was very sorry to hear about the death of one of your constituents earlier this month. Cycle safety is very important to me and my number one priority, as identified in the Cycle Safety Action Plan (published in March 2010), is to reduce cycle fatalities which involve lorries.

Since writing to the Secretary of State last year, TfL has been working closely with the Department for Transport who are represented on TfL’s Cycle Safety Working Group. The group oversee delivery of the Cycle Safety Action Plan, which includes identifying improvements to lorry operation and design. In April 2011, TfL understand that the Department will be publishing research on how lorry drivers’ direct and indirect vision from vehicles can be improved (including recommendations for any legislative changes).
Following the completion of this research, TfL will work with freight operators in London to implement the recommendations of this study. TfL and I will also work with the DfT to review whether any legislation needs to be addressed in terms of retrofitting of safety equipment.

Elimination of blind spots around lorries

Question No: 503 / 2011

Jennette Arnold

In your letter to me about the Commercial Vehicle Education Unit of 11 January 2010, you said you were “keen to look at all kinds of innovative solutions that will help improve safety for cyclists.” One of my constituents has suggested the installation of sensors and cameras on lorries as this measure is now more affordable and should be widely applied. Have you discussed the introduction of such equipment with the Secretary of State for Transport?

Written answer from the Mayor

My Cycle Safety Action Plan was launched in March 2010. The Plan can be viewed at http://www.tfl.gov.uk/corporate/projectsandschemes/15480.aspx. One of the actions within the Plan is to identify the most appropriate safety devices for freight operators. TfL has been in communication with the Department for Transport on this matter and understands that Department for Transport will be completing a piece of research in April 2011 which will advise on how lorry drivers’ direct and indirect vision from vehicles may be improved.

In parallel, TfL is running a technology trial for lorries to evaluate the most effective motion sensors and cameras currently on the market for detecting cyclists. Following the trial, TfL and I will consider whether it would be appropriate for further representations to be made to the Secretary of State regarding the introduction of such equipment.

Commercial Vehicle Education Unit

Question No: 504 / 2011

Jennette Arnold

Since it was reopened with full MPS funding in April 2010:

How many roadside checks of freight vehicles has the Commercial Vehicle Education Unit undertaken?

In how many faulty cases have been identified?

Written answer from the Mayor

The Commercial Vehicle Unit (CVU) have completed 2761 roadside checks on freight vehicles; offences (“faulty cases”) were identified on 2200 of these vehicles.
**TfL cuts in PlusBus funding**

**Question No: 505 / 2011**

**Jennette Arnold**

Why is TfL preventing Islington Council from using its Local Improvement Plan (LIP) funding to keep the PlusBus service running?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Whilst TfL acknowledge the Borough’s concerns about the future of the route, the utilisation of LIP financial assistance to subsidise bus services does not represent value for money.

A number of other PlusBus type services have been withdrawn by other London boroughs over the past few years because of the high levels of subsidy required and a lack of available funding. In addition, customer demand can often be met through the main bus network, or through door to door services such as Dial a Ride and Taxicard.

TfL has offered to meet with LB Islington members and officers, together with representatives from Hackney Community Transport to investigate ways of reducing the costs of the service, whilst maintaining its core users. It has also been suggested to them that Freedom Pass income should be available from London Councils.

**Wheelchair access to new bus for London**

**Question No: 506 / 2011**

**Jennette Arnold**

In answer to question 2096/2010, you replied that “TfL’s new bus specification provides a wheelchair space significantly in excess of the minimum legal requirements and should be capable of accepting most of the bigger wheelchairs currently available.” Judging by the many complaints about inaccessibility from wheelchair users who tried out the mock-up model, will you now agree that the prototype of the new bus fails to meet the needs of wheelchair users?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

No. The new bus for London has a longer wheelchair bay than regulations require and its dimensions are comparable with the newest double-deck buses entering the fleet. The design has been improved following extensive consultation with disability groups, re-tested with a number of key stakeholders and the majority are now able to readily access the new layout. TfL intends to continue developing the wheelchair bay and it is expected the final design will incorporate further improvements.

**20mph zone in Kingsland Road**

**Question No: 507 / 2011**

**Jennette Arnold**

Will you support Hackney cyclists who argue that the work to improve Kingsland High Street aimed to encourage the use of walking and cycling offers a great opportunity to introduce a 20mph zone on this red route similar to the trial zone on Camden High Street?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The proposal for Kingsland High Street involves narrowing the carriageway and widening the footway. Reallocating road space is another way of reducing vehicle speed, although at present when this road is busy traffic does not generally travel above 20 mph. TfL has no plans to introduce a 20mph limit at all times.
The outcome of the trial zone on Camden High Street is still being evaluated.

**Cycle parking on Kingsland Road**

*Question No: 508 / 2011*

**Jennette Arnold**

Brand new cycle stands were recently installed on the footways of Kingsland Road even though the old ones were only 1-2 years old. Will you please provide me with the costs involved in replacing the existing bicycle stands?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The new cycle stands were installed as part of a developer funded footway paving scheme, where it was agreed to provide three cycle stands in place of the existing two stands. There was therefore no cost to TfL and the removed cycle stands will be recycled. As part of these works, the bollards were also removed to improve the street scene which is consistent with my Better Streets initiative.

**Impact of cycle parking on Kingsland Road**

*Question No: 509 / 2011*

**Jennette Arnold**

The newly installed cycle stands on Kingsland Road have been placed in clusters on the footway and are now taking up more footway space than before. Was the negative impact on the pedestrian flow along this busy road taken into consideration during the planning process?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

New cycle stands have been provided along Kingsland Road where the removal of bollards has freed up footway space. Unfortunately, the stands were installed incorrectly. The contractor will be making the necessary changes at no cost to TfL by the end of February.

**Highbury Corner post office**

*Question No: 510 / 2011*

**Jennette Arnold**

Will you join me and local Islington MPs in condemning plans by Royal Mail to shut Highbury Corner post office and merge it with the Upper Street Branch?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 2 March 2011:

London’s businesses and residents rely on having an efficient and effective postal system and I support the need to retain local post office services. My understanding of the situation with the Highbury Corner Post Office is that the latest proposal will retain Post Office services in the locality, albeit through co-location, whilst allowing the Borough to deliver an improved pedestrian interchange and public realm. I remain supportive of this approach whilst recognizing the importance of local post office services being easily accessible.
Passenger safety Walthamstow Central tube station
Question No: 511 / 2011

Jennette Arnold

One of my constituents in Waltham Forest was recently pushed through the gates by a freeloader when she swiped in at Walthamstow Central. No staff was available at the gates to stop this from happening. She would like to know:

Why the staff level at this already understaffed station has now been reduced even further?

What measures have been put in place to ensure the safety of paying passengers at Walthamstow Central station?

Written answer from the Mayor

It is simply wrong to suggest that Walthamstow Central Tube station is understaffed. LU continues to have staff rostered throughout the day at the station, covering the ticket hall and gateline area (and the ticket office, which remains open for just under 16 hours each weekday, for 15 hours on Saturdays, and for 10 hours on Sundays).

In line with the reduced demand for tickets, there has been a reduction of one rostered ticket seller during the week and one on the weekend, though the ticket-office service remains through most of the day (as above). There is a reduction of one station assistant (from five to four) rostered in the ticket hall and other areas of the station, reflecting the improvements in technology such as the automatic wide aisle gate.

This is an efficient and effective use of staff resources to provide the high standards of customer service that LU is committed to.

In addition, the station is monitored by 72 cameras which are linked to the Station Supervisor’s office and there are seven customer help points. Local managers regularly meet with the British Transport Police Neighbourhood Policing Team who actively support measures to reduce crime on the station.

Cycling in Walthamstow Central
Question No: 512 / 2011

Jennette Arnold

Thank you for your answer to question 282 / 2011. I was pleased to hear that the work at the Hoe Street/Selborne Road has finally been finished. Following from your answer, my constituent would like to know:

Why it took 18 months for the signs and traffic lights for cyclists to be sorted out at this junction?

Why there was a lack of information to cyclists provided on site or via Waltham Forest Cycling group?

Written answer from the Mayor

Due to a safety problem identified on site when modernising the traffic signals, a partial redesign was required to activate the cycle facilities, which introduced delay into the scheme. This technical issue was not resolved as quickly and proactively as it should have been by all involved, and protracted delays occurred which affected the resolution time.

The circumstances and delays have been part of a ‘lessons learned’ discussion with the London Borough of Waltham Forest in order to improve collective performance.
Although the junction of Hoe Street and Selbourne Road is not part of the Transport for London Road Network, TfL recognises the value of information for all road users. TfL will also discuss with Waltham Forest how the provision of information can be improved in future schemes.

**Dalston Interchange**  
**Question No: 513 / 2011**  
**Jennette Arnold**  
Will you share with me the minutes of your 17th of January meeting with Andrew Boff AM to discuss Dalston Interchange?

**Written answer from the Mayor**  
Attending the meeting of 17 January with Andrew Boff were John McNulty (TfL) and Justin Carr (GLA), along with my Private Secretary and Political Advisor. Andrew Boff repeated his previously and publically stated problems with the Dalston Interchange project. I expressed my disappointment that the project had gone so seriously over budget and reiterated my previous statements that lessons should be learnt for future projects of this sort. Taxpayer value should be of primary concern.

**Olympic Stadium & Leyton Orient**  
**Question No: 514 / 2011**  
**Jennette Arnold**  
In the light of progress with a decision about the use of the Olympic Stadium, what support will you offer Leyton Orient to protect their fan base which fans fear will be challenged by another football team moving very close to them? Leyton Orient have been exemplary in their community work and as you know have been great supporters of the Olympic project. Will you agree to help support and protect this asset to Leyton and beyond to ensure they don’t fall victim to the legacy of the project they supported so wholeheartedly?

**Written answer from the Mayor**  
I agree that Leyton Orient has undertaken exemplary community work, and has shown great support for the Games. I am sure that Leyton Orient’s loyal fans will continue to support the club and that Leyton Orient will continue to recruit new fans in the future.

**Align transport zones**  
**Question No: 515 / 2011**  
**Murad Qureshi**  
Will you ask TfL to align zones across all forms of public transport?

**Written answer from the Mayor**  
The fare zones are already aligned between the Tube, the Overground and National Rail. I have no plans to introduce zoning on buses or the Trams.
**Consistent transport zones**

**Question No: 516 / 2011**

**Murad Qureshi**

Will you order a review of the zones used by TfL to ensure that they are consistent with the new London Plan, for example to ensure that the zoning of particular regeneration areas does not run counter to the Plan’s objectives?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

I am not aware of any instances where the fare zones run counter to the London Plan objectives.

I am happy for TfL to examine any specific concerns.

---

**Re-name London Overground**

**Question No: 517 / 2011**

**Murad Qureshi**

Will you consider renaming the London Overground line? The line runs through the Brunel tunnel between Rotherhithe & Wapping, which was the first tunnel in the world to be built with a tunnelling shield under a navigable river. When it first opened in 1843 it was described as the Eighth Wonder of the World. To complete this line’s integration with the Underground and to pay tribute to the engineers who first tunnelled under the Thames, would it not be fitting to call this the Brunel Line?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The London Overground network is made up of five routes: Dalston Junction to West Croydon/Crystal Palace/New Cross; Stratford to Richmond; Gospel Oak to Barking; Watford to Euston; and Willesden Junction to Clapham Junction. All passenger information follows this line naming approach.

While your suggestion would indeed highlight that the line runs through the Brunel Tunnel, it would not assist passengers when planning their journey. It would also be very expensive to make such a change as a vast amount of passenger facing material, including maps and station signage, would need to be updated. Given these factors it is not that something that I would consider.

---

**Two hub impact on Heathrow**

**Question No: 518 / 2011**

**Murad Qureshi**

How do you respond to the suggestion by Steve Ridgeway, CEO of Virgin Atlantic, that two hubs are not viable and that we also need to look at how such a move will impact on Heathrow’s employees and businesses?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.
Localism Bill clause 30 – EU fines

Question No: 519 / 2011

Murad Qureshi

During a recent parliamentary debate, your deputy and chief of staff, Sir Simon Milton gave evidence about clause 30 of the Localism Bill. As you know, this proposed clause empowers governments to pass on fines imposed by the EU. During his evidence, Sir Simon Milton mentioned a number of steps which he believed the government should take in order to make the case to the EU either to extend the time limit for compliance or to mitigate the susceptibility of the UK and local authorities to these fines.

1. What are the main areas of disagreement between you and the government on how to achieve these goals?

2. Why do you believe the government has not included several of your measures contained within your Air Quality Strategy within its submission to the EU, despite the fact that you claim these measures will bring London’s air quality below the limits set by the EU?

Written answer from the Mayor

The Government’s application to the European Commission for a time extension until 2011 to meet PM10 limit values did not include measures in my Air Quality Strategy because at the time of the submission the final Strategy had not been confirmed. However, the Government’s modelling that supported the application showed that even without the Air Quality Strategy measures, London would be compliant with these limit values in 2011. Our modelling shows that, taking into account the measures in my Strategy, including the targeted measures for priority locations in central London, age based standards for taxis from 2012, and schemes to reduce emissions from freight mean PM10 limit values should be met this year.

Later in 2011, the Government is expected to apply to the Commission for a time extension until 2015 to meet NO2 limit values in London and many other urban areas across the country. My Air Quality Strategy includes a number of measures that will reduce NO2 concentrations significantly in London by 2015, including the introduction of a NOx standard to the Low Emission Zone and retrofitting older buses. We have repeatedly requested money from the Government for this.

However, national measures will also be required if NO2 limit values are to be met in London by 2015, a full list of these are set out in my Air Quality Strategy. They include Government introducing a certification scheme for NOx abatement equipment, tax incentives for cleaner vehicles and vehicle retrofit and scrappage schemes, as well as additional funding for the full implementation of my Strategy. The GLA continues to work with the Government to develop a joint action plan that is adequately resourced that will allow NO2 limit values to be met by 2015 and I recently wrote to the Secretary of State for Transport to stress the need for national measures.

Air Quality submission to the EU

Question No: 520 / 2011

Murad Qureshi

Which of your suggested measures has the government not included in their submission the EU? Why is this?

Written answer from the Mayor

The Government’s application to the European Commission for a time extension until 2011 to meet PM10 limit values, which was submitted in May 2010, did not include measures in my Air Quality Strategy because at that time the final Strategy had not been published. However,
Defra’s modelling supporting the application showed that even without the Air Quality Strategy measures, London would be compliant with these limit values in 2011. Our modelling shows that, taking into account the measures in my Strategy, including the targeted measures for priority locations in central London, age based standards for taxis from 2012, and schemes to reduce emissions from freight provide PM10 limit values should be met this year.

Edgware Road signal box
Question No: 521 / 2011
Murad Qureshi
When will the 1928 signal box at the Edgware Road tube station be replaced?

Written answer from the Mayor
The upgrade of the entire sub-surface railway signalling system (including the signal cabin at Edgware Road) is expected to be complete in 2018. It would not be practicable or effective to attempt to replace the signal cabin in isolation from the wider signalling upgrade. The signalling cabin, whilst old, continues to be maintained and to operate safely.

Earls Court signal box
Question No: 522 / 2011
Murad Qureshi
When will the District Line’s pre 1928 signal box at Earls Court tube station be replaced?

Written answer from the Mayor
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response provided on 2 March 2011:

The upgrade of the entire sub-surface railway signalling system (including the District line) is expected to be complete in 2018. It would not be practicable or effective to attempt to replace individual elements in isolation from the wider signalling upgrade. The signalling system, whilst old, continues to be maintained and to operate safely.

Crossrail 2
Question No: 523 / 2011
Murad Qureshi
What work if any are you doing to progress Crossrail 2 from Chelsea to Hackney?

Written answer from the Mayor
My transport strategy identifies the need for longer term additional rail capacity along the north east to south west corridor passing through central London. The need for this is in part due to London’s population and employment growth and the intensification of development areas around the fringe of central London. There is also a significant increase predicted in the usage of National Rail lines into the major London terminals in response to capacity enhancements and major new infrastructure such as High Speed 2. This growth results in the extra capacity that is currently being provided on the existing underground network (through line upgrades), to be fully utilised by 2030. Additional capacity will be required over and above this.
The route of the Chelsea Hackney Line (Crossrail 2) is safeguarded. TfL is reviewing this alignment to ensure the route meets the future needs for London and fully maximises the benefits. Interim thoughts are presented in the Sub Regional Transport Plans and also in Network Rail’s draft London and South East Route Utilisation Strategy. The first phase of the review will conclude with a report to me later this year containing a series of recommendations on taking the Chelsea Hackney Line scheme forward.

**Police shops and police stations**

**Question No: 524 / 2011**

* Murad Qureshi

What numbers of police shops have been set-up across each of the London boroughs? Would you please put the information in table format? As a result of the move towards police shops, which police stations have been made redundant over the past few years?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The information below is the number of Safer Neighbourhoods bases (police shops) that have been provided on borough by borough basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexley</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrow</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington &amp; Chelsea</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston-Upon-Thames</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond-Upon-Thames</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decisions about opening these bases are made on an operational needs basis by the MPS. No police stations have been made redundant over the last few years as a result of the move towards police shops. In line with my priorities no police stations with front counters are being closed without another front counter service with the same, if not better, facilities replacing it. Where a police station has closed this has been part of MPA estate modernisation.

**Heathrow & City Airport noise**

**Question No: 525 / 2011**

Murad Qureshi

In your response to Question 213/2011, you acknowledge you do not have legal powers to control aircraft noise but say you will continue to press those who have the powers to take more actions. Can you be more specific at least by telling us what your strategy is on this front?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 2 March 2011:

Overall, my strategy is that new capacity, beyond what already has permission at these airports, should be provided where it does not reinforce the problems of the past. I will also press for opportunities to be taken whenever they occur, such as with new airspace technologies, to reduce aircraft noise impacts on Londoners.

**Aviation Report - Two-Hubs**

**Question No: 526 / 2011**

Murad Qureshi

Where do you get this notion that New York has two hubs and is a model for us to follow?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

New York shares many characteristics with London. It is a fellow world city. It has a large financial sector and thriving cultural and creative centre that draws millions of business and leisure visitors each year. In 2009, New York had two of the world’s thirty busiest airports by passenger numbers: JFK and Newark. JFK acts as a hub for Delta Airlines and Newark as a hub for United-Continental. Both airports operate primarily as short-haul to long-haul hubs (rather than short-haul to short-haul), fulfilling a similar role to Heathrow. London has a similar edge of continent location to New York, and a substantial aviation market, which suggests that some of New York’s experience could be applied to London.

**Aviation Report - Threat to Heathrow Airport jobs**

**Question No: 527 / 2011**

Murad Qureshi

Steve Ridgeway, CEO of Virgin Atlantic suggested in an interview that two hubs could be a threat to Heathrow. Have you considered at all the impact on jobs in Heathrow with a second hub in London?
Written answer from the Mayor

I greatly value the contribution Heathrow makes to London’s prosperity. One of our primary considerations in examining the options for London’s long-term aviation strategy is the economic and social benefits that airports generate. Heathrow plays an important role in West London and in the Thames Valley’s economy, directly employing about 80,000 people and supporting many more jobs. However, a new hub airport would be designed to cater for additional demand for air travel rather than taking Heathrow’s existing market.

The Chairman of BAA, and owner of Heathrow, was reported in the Sunday Telegraph last September as saying Heathrow is in danger of becoming a second-tier hub. A second hub airport could help to safeguard Heathrow’s viability rather than letting it decline into a second-tier hub, as well as providing major economic benefits in its own right.

Aviation Report - Air travel demand forecasts

Question No: 528 / 2011

Murad Qureshi

Have your demand forecasts for air travel been verified by an independent third party?

Written answer from the Mayor

The demand forecasts reported in a New Airport for London are the latest forecasts published by the Department for Transport (DfT). These were published in their 2009 document UK Air Passenger Demand and CO2 Forecasts. These figures are consistent with US Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and EUROCONTROL forecasts. The extrapolation of DfT figures to 2050 exhibiting a similar, continued rate of increase is endorsed by the Government’s Committee on Climate Change. This has enabled us to match demand to environmental target timescales.

Aviation Report - Growth vs. environmental regulation measures

Question No: 529 / 2011

Murad Qureshi

In the Environment Committee report, Flights of Fancy, it was clearly shown how an expansion of Heathrow with a third runway could not be accommodated without an adverse environmental impact on London. In light of that report, how can you assert that over half a million more air traffic movements (ATMs) could be accommodated within the environment targets for 2050?

Written answer from the Mayor

Expansion at Heathrow would indeed have significant adverse environmental impacts on London. Local noise, air quality and transport congestion impacts would be unacceptable, which is why I oppose the expansion of Heathrow.

However, in 2009 the Government’s Committee on Climate Change reported that a growth in Air Traffic Movements (ATMs) of 55% upon 2005 levels to 2050 could be compatible with commitments to keep CO2 emissions in 2050 no higher than in 2005 as a result of improvements in aircraft technology. If the proportion of the UK’s ATMs which use London’s primary airports remains the same, then an additional 564,000 ATMs per year could be accommodated at London’s airport within these limits.
Schools Sports Partnerships
Question No: 530 / 2011
Murad Qureshi
You have not answered my question 203/2011. Could you list all 56 Schools Sports Partnerships in London and how many of them still remain in London? Would you also when listing them put the contribution that government has made and is going to continue making to them as well against each one.

Written answer from the Mayor
As I said in my answer to MQ203 / 2011, the Government’s announcement on 20 December last year means that all school sports partnerships in London will continue in their current form until the end of this academic year. Full details of each of the partnerships are available from the Youth Sport Trust website.

We are also involved with the Youth Sport Trust and other stakeholders in discussions as to the future provision of school sport beyond this summer. Further detail on this will emerge in due course.

RE:NEW
Question No: 531 / 2011
Murad Qureshi
In answer to question 4260 / 2010 you stated that
The RE:NEW model has been developed through 2 phases to date:
1. Three technical trials in Croydon, Hillingdon and Southwark between April and July 2009 in which 817 homes have been retrofitted; and
2. Nine demonstration projects between November 2009 and July 2010 in which 8,045 homes were retrofitted. The projects were run in Camden, Croydon, Haringey, Harrow, Havering, Hillingdon, Kingston, Lewisham and Southwark.

Your Climate Change Mitigation and Energy strategy sets a target of treating 200,000 homes by 2012 under the RE:NEW scheme. How many homes have been treated to date over and above the trials and demonstrations, and when in 2012 will you meet your 200,000 target?

Written answer from the Mayor
The RE:NEW programme is currently awaiting confirmation of the LDA settlement from Government. Once exact funding levels are confirmed the programme will proceed as anticipated.

Police RE:FIT
Question No: 532 / 2011
Murad Qureshi
How many police stations have been retrofitted under the RE:FIT programme to date? How many are due to be retrofitted in 2011/12? How much budget has been allocated to retrofitting police stations in 2011/12?

Written answer from the Mayor
As stated in MQ 212, the MPS has already delivered 10 RE:FIT projects of which 7 were undertaken on police stations.
For the financial year 2011/12, retrofit measures are scheduled to be undertaken at 10 police stations, and energy efficiency survey work is still underway to identify potential further locations.

Currently, £2.51m of new investment (Climate Change Action Plan, CCAP fund) is allocated for retrofit measures for 2011/12.

**TfL RE:FIT**
**Question No: 533 / 2011**
Murad Qureshi
How many Tube stations have been retrofitted each year under the RE:FIT scheme? How much has this cost each year?

**Written answer from the Mayor**
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

**Tube RE:FIT 2011/12**
**Question No: 534 / 2011**
Murad Qureshi
How many Tube stations will be retrofitted as part of the RE:FIT programme in 2011/12. How much budget has been allocated to this?

**Written answer from the Mayor**
London Underground is currently working with the GLA to identify suitable properties that could benefit from the RE:FIT programme.

No budget has yet been allocated.

**Poor air quality at Horn Lane, Acton**
**Question No: 535 / 2011**
Murad Qureshi
In answer to my question 214 / 2011 you maintain your disappointing practice of trying to duck responsibility for poor air quality in London, saying it is for others, namely the Environment Agency and the London Borough of Ealing in this instance to deal with, which is no doubt part of the reason that the Government plans to pass EU fines to the GLA. As Mayor of London do you not accept that you are accountable for the poor air quality within the Greater London area? Should the Government carry out their threat to pass EU fines on to the GLA, does this mean you will then in turn seek to pass them on to the boroughs at fault?

**Written answer from the Mayor**
I take my air quality responsibilities very seriously indeed. My Air Quality Strategy outlines in great detail the measures that I am taking across London to improve air quality.

Unfortunately, the regulation of waste sites is the responsibility of the Environment Agency and London boroughs. I am not the regulator for these sites so I have no legal basis to act.
Despite this, I have been working hard to influence the relevant authorities to take actions that improve the air quality at waste sites such as Horn Lane. My Environmental Adviser, Isabel Dedring, recently met officials from the Environment Agency and Defra to discuss ways in which to improve air quality at and around waste sites in London. TfL and GLA officials have also met officials from the Environment Agency and the London Borough of Ealing to discuss ways in which the GLA group can provide practical support at that specific location.

**Environment crime line**
**Question No: 536 / 2011**
Murad Qureshi

Back in 2008 you promised us an environment crime line. Could you please remind us of the telephone number? How many calls has this received?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The number you refer to was part of the Home Office 101 Single Non-Emergency Number (SNEN) project to roll out a non-emergency number from 2008. It has been launched in places such as Wales and Hampshire but was not nationwide due to funding constraints at the time.

The Home Office will look for a cost effective way of establishing the number ‘101’ as a single national police non-emergency number for reporting crime and anti-social behaviour. Over time, this would enable local partners to join up with the police to provide even more streamlined access and efficient services for the public according to local needs and local priorities.

In addition, I will be rolling out an on-line and mobile reporting system for environmental crimes such as fly tipping and graffiti based on Lewisham’s Love Clean Streets programme.

However, until that time incidents can be reported on-line. The ability for citizens to report issues of environmental crime and anti-social behaviour on-line is there for anyone, in any borough through their borough websites or via [http://eforms.yourlondon.gov.uk/reportit](http://eforms.yourlondon.gov.uk/reportit).

**Water fountains**
**Question No: 537 / 2011**
Murad Qureshi

What plans do you have for providing free water fountains across London?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Please refer to MQ2858 / 2010 for details of my plans for providing free access to drinking water across London.

MQ642 / 2011 sets out recent progress against our plans to identify innovative funding models with the private sector.

**Low Carbon Zones**
**Question No: 538 / 2011**
Murad Qureshi

In Answer 219 / 2011 you indicated how much funding had been allocated to the ten low
carbon zones. How much of this has been allocated by financial year, and is the 2011/12 funding confirmed? How much of these funds have been spent to date, for each low carbon zone?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Confirmation of the Low Carbon Zones funding for 2011-12 will be made following the final settlement from government on funding for LDA programmes. Programme expenditure is on track. The funding allocation for the programme is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>£1,260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>£1,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2,910,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below indicates how much funding each borough has received to date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough (LCZ)</th>
<th>Funding received to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham (Barking LCZ)</td>
<td>£160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey (Muswell Hill LCZ)</td>
<td>£140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington (Archway LCZ)</td>
<td>£160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth (Brixton LCZ)</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham (Lewisham LCZ)</td>
<td>£130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton (Wandle Valley LCZ)</td>
<td>£155,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond (Ham &amp; Petersham LCZ)</td>
<td>£205,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark (Peckham LCZ)</td>
<td>£95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton (Hackbridge LCZ)</td>
<td>£135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster (Queens Park LCZ)</td>
<td>£135,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Strike Action**  
**Question No: 539 / 2011**  
Len Duvall  
In answer to Written Question No. 357/2011 you stated that “Londoners can draw their own conclusions by the way debate on the issue in the London Assembly has been prevented by parties which are funded by trades unions”. The Labour Party is not funded by “trades unions” but by individual trade union members, via payments through the affiliated political fund. Since the trade union movement is one element of the broader Labour Movement, it is perfectly understandable that individual trade union members would choose to donate funds to a party that acts in the interests of ‘rank and file’ workers everywhere. With this in mind, why do you think that between September 2007, when you were endorsed as the Conservative party’s mayoral candidate, and March 2008 when the mayoral race kicked off, 77% of the total campaign funds you are allowed by law - £324,000 – came from bankers and other ‘City grandees’?

**Written answer from the Mayor**  
The Labour party is mainly funded by trades unions. On the application form of the 15 trades unions affiliated to the Labour party, only 3 mention that the political levy exists, of which only 2 mention that one can opt out. The poor trades unions’ members’ turnout in the recent Labour party leadership election suggests the level of engagement individual members have with the Labour party. I wonder how many members are aware that they are actually donating to the Labour party. This is in contrast to those donating to other political parties, who are all completely aware of where their money is going.

**Campaign Funding**  
**Question No: 540 / 2011**  
Len Duvall  
On 11 October 2009, The Guardian quoted the former President of Denmark, Poul Nyrop Rasmussen, as saying “hedge funds are buying off the Tories and Boris Johnson, which shows that they want to remain above the law”. Did you ever choose to pursue Mr Rasmussen or contest this serious allegation and if not, why not?

**Written answer from the Mayor**  
Denmark is a constitutional monarchy and Mr Poul Nyrop Rasmussen was its Prime Minister, not President. As President of the European Party of Socialists, Mr Poul Nyrop Rasmussen was making a political point in favour of increased regulation of hedge funds.

While there may well be a case for better regulation, I am not in favour of directives specifically designed to attack the competitiveness of London.

**Tax Increment Financing (TIF)**  
**Question No: 541 / 2011**  
Len Duvall  
You seem to have misunderstood Question No: 361/2011. In your answer, you explained how TIF differs from PFI in a technical sense. I would like to know in what way these two forms of off-balance sheet capital investment mechanism differ philosophically?
Written answer from the Mayor

I’m afraid I cannot answer your question because I do not understand it. It is like asking me the philosophical rather than technical difference between apples and pears. As it happens, TIF would probably be on-balance sheet - but it is too early to be sure as there is not yet a TIF policy in place.

Bus Fares

Question No: 542 / 2011

Len Duvall

In answer to Written Question No. 363/2011, you sated that “without the increases, bus demand is projected by TfL to increase by up to 2% in 2011” and that these increases were “projected to reduce the increase in bus travel in 2011 to around 1.5%”. While bus travel is still increasing (because of population increases), 0.5% of growth has been suppressed by you fare increases. This means that, on 2009/10 figures alone, the number of bus journeys that a proportion of the city’s residents can no longer afford to take is 11,285. Would you agree that your bus fare increases have priced a proportion of the city’s residents off public transport?

Written answer from the Mayor

No.

Since being elected I have made the Freedom Pass available 24/7, introduced new half price concessions for the least well off and implemented free travel for veterans. I have also maintained all concessions for young people.

As a result, bus fares in London are by far the most affordable in the UK.

Articulated Bus Routes

Question No: 543 / 2011

Len Duvall

Did bus companies that owned/leased ‘bendy-buses’ absorb the cost of TfL decommissioning them at your instruction, or has the cost of decommissioning been absorbed by fare increases?

Written answer from the Mayor

The bus operators procure their own buses in relation to the route tenders they win and then release or reallocate them in relation to routes they no longer operate or for which a different type of vehicle is required. The operators are therefore disposing of all the articulated vehicles, the majority of which have, or will be, released at the contract end. TfL has therefore not incurred any costs in respect of the disposal of these vehicles.

TfL is still in negotiation over some of the contracts on which articulated vehicles will need to be replaced before their termination date.

Mobility Vehicles

Question No: 544 / 2011

Len Duvall

Has TfL ever investigated the possibility of allowing disabled passengers with specially adapted cars to use bus lanes and, if so, what are the barriers to this?
Written answer from the Mayor

There are no current plans to permit other types of vehicles to drive in bus lanes.

TfL often receives requests for exemptions to drive in bus lanes and each of these must be considered on its own merits. The benefit for one group must be balanced against other factors, particularly the fact that bus lanes allow large numbers of bus passengers to have a quicker, more reliable journey.

Low Emission Zone

Question No: 545 / 2011

Len Duvall

I was recently contacted by a constituent and small business owner from Plumstead, who was concerned about the cost of upgrading his vehicles ahead of the reintroduction of the Low Emission Zone. Have you put in place any transitional arrangements for small and medium sized enterprises who need to upgrade their fleet of vehicles following the introduction of the Low Emission Zone from 2012?

Written answer from the Mayor

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Tax Policy

Question No: 546 / 2011

Len Duvall

In answer to Written Question 365/2011 you said that “tax policy – particularly its detail – is not a matter for the Mayor of London but for Government”. How does this assertion marry with the hours of interview time and hundreds of column inches you have dedicated to attacking the 50p top rate of income tax?

Written answer from the Mayor

Very easily, although I would dispute your assertion that so much has been devoted to this single statistic. My job is to argue for the overall competitiveness of the city. We know that the top rate of personal tax is internationally uncompetitive and it is my job to state this clearly to the Government.

Tax Policy #2

Question No: 547 / 2011

Len Duvall

In answer to Written Question 365/2011 in which I asked whether you could “provide me with some evidence demonstrating that the introduction of anti-avoidance legislation would not have the effect of increasing tax revenues for investment in public services”, you responded that you “will not be undertaking research myself into this matter given my other priorities”. If the costs to Londoners of tax evasion and corporate tax avoidance are such little interest, why is the subject of lower tax rates such a high priority for you?
Written answer from the Mayor

Rates of tax are a factor that affect our international competitiveness and I take the overall competitiveness of the city seriously. London risks losing business to its rivals if its tax rates are too high.

Council Tax
Question No: 548 / 2011
Len Duvall

In answer to Written Question 369/2011 you said that “all Council Taxpayers will benefit from the freeze, not just the wealthiest households”. Making the generally accurate assumption that the wealthiest people in London live in the largest properties, your precept freeze benefits London’s wealthiest the most, doesn’t it?

Written answer from the Mayor

A Council Tax freeze benefits the poor more than the rich as Council Tax represents a greater proportion of their income and spending. London’s lower income families are hit harder by Council Tax rises than any other part of the country because of nationally set Council Tax benefits thresholds.

Anti-avoidance legislation
Question No: 549 / 2011
Len Duvall

In answer to Written Question 377/2011, in which I asked you whether you would support comprehensive anti-tax avoidance legislation in exchange for a reduction in the 50p top rate of tax, you stated “I would certainly want to think about it”. Have you had a chance to reflect on this question and, if so, what are your feelings on the matter?

Written answer from the Mayor

I have not although, as I understand it, the Government is introducing anti-tax avoidance measures in any case. I have argued for the Government to signal its intention to bring in lower personal top rates of tax in due course, recognising that the current fiscal deficit is the immediate challenge to overcome and lowering the top rate of tax is unlikely to be a first order priority for the Government.

Regulation of Financial Services
Question No: 550 / 2011
Len Duvall

In answer to Written Question 378/2011, you said that “I welcome regulatory measures being in put in place now to ensure that” the ability of the financial services to destabilise the broader economy “is prevented in future”. What regulatory measures have the government and are you absolutely confident that they will prevent another 2008-style systemic failure?

Written answer from the Mayor

The overall requirement for banks to hold more capital as a buffer against short-term demands for liquidity is an important reform. UK authorities are in the lead on a proposal to increase capital requirements temporarily when there is evidence of a credit ‘bubble’. It is obviously
important to have international agreement on capital ratios. This takes time, which is why I said they are “being put in place” and not “have been put in place”.

**Economic Diversification**

**Question No: 551 / 2011**

**Len Duvall**

In answer to Written Question 379/2011 you stated that “London is already a very diversified economy”. However, in your 2009 ‘Rising to the Challenge: Proposals for the Mayor’s Economic Development Strategy for London’ document you openly admit that, while financial services represents “a low and remarkably stable proportion” of London’s working population, you openly acknowledge that it “consumes a large proportion of the output of other important sectors in the London economy - 36% of the creative industries’ business to business sales, 37% of business to business sales from the professional services sector, and 58% of business to business sales from the ICT industry”. You claim London’s economy is diversified, yet your figures show a different picture; which is correct?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 2 March 2011:

Both. The diversified nature of London’s economy is, in part, a product of the economic scale of financial services in London’s economy, which, as you correctly cite, create jobs in various other sectors, from marketing, accounting, and legal services to ICT and others.

**Tax rates and income**

**Question No: 552 / 2011**

**Len Duvall**

In answer to Written Question 380/2011 you state that you are “concerned at the highest personal tax rate of 50p in the pound” and that, as a result, “we may be asking too much, not just of financial services employees but other wealth creators”. However, in answer to Written Question 388/2011 you state that the after-tax monthly income of someone earning just below £150,001 a year (and therefore not paying the 50p rate) is £8123.37. Why do you spend so much time arguing on behalf of people whose take home pay is more than 37% of the average Londoner’s pre-tax annual income (£21,800) and is this vehement defence of the right of London’s top earners to pay less tax a good indication of where your priorities as a Mayor lie?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Top earners pay the most tax. Many also can choose where to live and work - and take their business and philanthropy. The risk is that the high personal tax rate will, at the margin, put off people from coming to or remaining in London to work, reducing net tax receipts overall. As you know, I am very concerned that top earners contribute as much as they can to society, but there is a philosophical difference between establishing a stronger culture of philanthropy, which I am championing, and an excessively taxed society, which I do not.
Corporation Tax
Question No: 553 / 2011

Len Duvall

In answer to Written Question 391/2011 you stated that “Corporation tax accruals as a percentage of gross taxable trading profits is 12.4% for financial companies”. Is this fair and not, does it matter to you?

Written answer from the Mayor

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 2 March 2011:

HMRC introduces the concept of double taxation relief as follows:

“United Kingdom domestic legislation generally provides that

1. All income which arises in the United Kingdom, whether derived by a United Kingdom resident or not, and
2. Income derived from abroad by a United Kingdom resident

is chargeable to United Kingdom tax. ...Many foreign countries have taxation systems based on similar principles so that income which arises in one country and flows to the other country is taxed twice, once in the country of its origin and again in the country in which the recipient resides…. Relieving double taxation is a means of removing barriers to international trade, to the operation of free and open markets and to the free movement of persons and of capital.”

(Extracts from HMRC guidance - international manual.)

This is a highly technical area and for more information, please see the guidance available at http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/manuals/intmanual/index.htm.

Corporation Tax #2
Question No: 554 / 2011

Len Duvall

In “The discrepancy between [the 12.4% Corporation Tax paid by financial companies] and the headline 28% rate is largely explained by double taxation relief”. Please explain to me the concept of ‘double taxation relief’ and how financial services companies are able to benefit from it?

Written answer from the Mayor

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written answer received on 2 March 2011:

Please see my response to MQ553 / 2011.

Paxman Interview
Question No: 555 / 2011

Len Duvall

When asked by Jeremy Paxman in a 2 February interview for Newsnight what “Russian oligarchs, fleeing African despots, Arabian Sheikhs” and other non-domiciles “do for us”, you
said that you wanted to see these people “showing much more commitment” through philanthropy. Why do you believe they shouldn’t just pay their fair share of tax like the rest of us?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

I believe that they should pay their fair share of tax and that, additionally, they should show more commitment to this city through greater philanthropy.

---

**Paxman Interview #2**

**Question No: 556 / 2011**

*Len Duvall*

When interviewed by Jeremy Paxman for Newsnight on 2 February you acknowledged that “there are huge numbers of people in this city who are making an awful lot of money. We want them here. We want them to make money. We want them to generate jobs and growth for the rest of society”. Why is there such a disjuncture between the “huge numbers of people in this city who are making an awful lot of money” and the jobs and growth they generate for the rest of society?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written answer received on 2 March 2011:

London has sadly always been a city of contrasts in this regard and a full analysis cannot be offered in a large book let alone in this short answer. However, one of the key objectives of my Economic Development Strategy is to give all Londoners the opportunity to take part in London’s economic success, to access sustainable employment and progress in their careers.

---

**Inequality in London**

**Question No: 557 / 2011**

*Len Duvall*

In a 7 February article for the Evening Standard about economic inequality, Jenni Russell wrote: “as any Londoner knows, these yawning gulfs are staggering. One afternoon I went from a political meeting about whether the minimum wage should be raised by 20p or 40p an hour, to a dinner in a Chelsea mansion where the owner idly wondered whether he should expand his living space by spending £5million on taking over the neighbour’s house”. How do you think your campaign for lower taxes for the rich will resolve the problem of economic inequality in London and the negative social phenomena that arises from it?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The problem is that there are too many Londoners who are not sharing in the city’s success. Meanwhile, I do not believe that the 50p rate is in the longer term interests of London remaining competitive and will cause the city to lose business.

---

**Inequality in London #2**

**Question No: 558 / 2011**

*Len Duvall*

In a 7 February article for the Evening Standard about economic inequality, Jenni Russell wrote
in relation to the unfettered free market model: “economies as unbalanced as these, where ordinary people are getting a shrinking share of wealth and borrow to compensate, are going to fall into periodic and extremely expensive crises. It is much cheaper for the world, says the IMF, to have fairer taxes and incomes and more redistributive policies in the first place”. Is the model proposed by the IMF a viable one for London?

Written answer from the Mayor

These comments on which you are asking my opinion are highly speculative. As I do not agree with the premise that “economies as unbalanced as these, where ordinary people are getting a shrinking share of wealth and borrow to compensate, are going to fall into periodic and extremely expensive crises,” I will not comment further.

Economic Adviser

Question No: 559 / 2011

Len Duvall

In an article for City A.M on 13 January 2011, your economic adviser Anthony Browne said that “it was the politicians forcing banks to lend to causes that were morally worthy but not creditworthy that led to the sub-prime crisis, and sparked a banking implosion”. Do you agree with Mr Browne’s view?

Written answer from the Mayor

There are a number of causes of the financial crisis, subsequent recession and the necessary fiscal retrenchment which has followed. One of which, as Anthony Browne has said was “politicians forcing banks to lend to causes that were morally worthy but not creditworthy”. There was also an extremely short termist view taken by many in the financial services industry. An industry which was not regulated properly by the previous government after setting up the utterly ineffectual tripartite arrangement. The previous government also, foolishly believing it had abolished “boom and bust” then went on a spending spree that even at the top of the boom, as the Governor of the Bank of England and others have noted, led to a serious structural deficit that was completely unsustainable.

Southeastern Trains

Question No: 560 / 2011

Len Duvall

Does TfL employ any monitoring of the performance of Southeastern Trains and, if so, will you request that they make this data (going back 12 months) available to me.

Written answer from the Mayor

No, TfL has no role in managing the Southeastern franchise, and therefore has no performance data beyond that available in the public domain, such as the National Passenger Survey and the public performance measure in the National Rail Yearbook (http://www.rail-reg.gov.uk/upload/pdf/nrt-yearbook-2009-10.pdf).

Bicycles on DLR

Question No: 561 / 2011

Len Duvall

What are the barriers to bringing bicycles on to the DLR?
Written answer from the Mayor

Many DLR stations are elevated and there are particular safety issues in transporting bikes to and from the platforms as well as to other passengers on stairs and in trains. DLR lifts are small and will not accommodate bikes in a satisfactory manner and cycles are not permitted to be carried on escalators. Also, unlike many other light rail systems, the DLR has tunnel sections where bicycles in evacuation situations are a particular concern. DLR trains are not designed to carry bikes and many DLR platforms have constraints on space and don’t have capacity for both bikes and passengers.

Considerable investment has been made on delivering secure and well lit cycle facilities at stations, and DLR has received awards in recognition of this work to integrate and improve cycling facilities. The majority of stations have received new or improved cycle parking and the remaining stations will be covered shortly (subject to funding still being available).

The DLR system is very busy - currently carrying approximately 70 million passengers per annum (estimated to increase to 100 million by 2013/14). To provide for this capacity, DLR has had to invest heavily in providing trains for passenger use and develop its infrastructure.

Safer Neighbourhood Teams (1)
Question No: 562 / 2011
Joanne McCartney
Do you now agree that the Mayor has some responsibility for Safer Neighbourhood policing in London? To what level does that responsibility extend?

Written answer from the Mayor

I remain committed to delivering effective neighbourhood policing in London and, through my budget, have made clear my plans to protect Safer Neighbourhood Teams in every borough and every ward. The MPS Commissioner remains responsible for the operational side of Safer Neighbourhoods Policing.

Safer Neighbourhood Teams (2)
Question No: 563 / 2011
Joanne McCartney
Do you have any concerns over plans to cut 300 Safer Neighbourhood sergeants over next 2 financial years?

Written answer from the Mayor

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 3 March 2011:

I remain committed to protecting every single Safer Neighbourhood Team for every single ward. It is, however, necessary to streamline the management of some of the capital’s smaller and quieter wards to improve performance. The supervision ratio in Safer Neighbourhood Teams is very high and this is being considered as part of the current Safer Neighbourhood Review. In order to maximise front line capacity, supervision and management costs need to be managed down. Safer Neighbourhoods is and will remain the cornerstone of policing delivery in the MPS.
**ACPO**  
*Question No: 564 / 2011*  
Joanne McCartney  
Do you believe that money given by the MPS to ACPO offers value for money?  

**Written answer from the Mayor**  
Yes, the MPS believe there have been huge benefits for the police (and ultimately the public) in ensuring effective working across the country and talking with a joined up voice.

**Safer schools teams**  
*Question No: 565 / 2011*  
Joanne McCartney  
Given that you now plan to reduce the total number of Safer School officers, contrary to your answer to me in Question number 4087/2010 where you stated, “We have no plans to reduce the number of Safer Schools Officers”, how will you allocate these resources to London’s schools? Will any schools lose their Safer School officer or lose any time spent in their school?  

**Written answer from the Mayor**  
I have already announced 70 extra warranted police officers for schools in my 2011–12 Budget. Further proposals to maintain and improve service to schools will be brought forward following the conclusion of the Safer Neighbourhoods Review in the first half of this year.

**Knife Crime**  
*Question No: 566 / 2011*  
Joanne McCartney  
How much of the £18 million of new government funding to tackle knife, gun and gang crime will be given to London, and over what time period?  

**Written answer from the Mayor**  
London will receive £2.1m of funding for police enforcement and prevention work over two years from 2011/12 to 2012/13. This funding will be overseen by the Greater London Authority. Additional elements of the Government’s £18 million funding may also be allocated to projects in London over the next two financial years.

**Home Secretary**  
*Question No: 567 / 2011*  
Joanne McCartney  
How many official meetings have you had with the Home Secretary, Theresa May, regarding policing issues in London? When did such meetings take place and what was discussed?  

**Written answer from the Mayor**  
I met with the Home Secretary on 22 November 2010 to discuss the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill and MPS/MPA funding. I accompanied the Home Secretary on a visit to West Croydon Bus Station, on 3 August 2010, where we met MPS officers to see a ‘knife arch’ in operation. I have also had phone conversations with the Home Secretary.
Deputy Mayor Kit Malthouse met with the Home Secretary on 25 May and 9 June, and he has met with the Minister for Police Reform, Nick Herbert, on at least a monthly basis.

Childcare

Question No: 568 / 2011
Joanne McCartney

What plans, if any, do you have to support parents and carers with childcare costs and provision?

Written answer from the Mayor

There are no current plans for GLA/LDA initiatives to provide affordable childcare, due to imminent changes in mainstream provision and the national policy agenda. These include the forthcoming changes to the tax and benefits system, and the delivery of financial support to unemployed and economically inactive parents.

The introduction of the new Universal Credit will fundamentally alter the way in which support for childcare costs is provided. The DWP’s Work Programme, which is due to start in July 2011, will also offer new forms of support to parents who are out of work.

The Roger Tym & Partner’s report on London’s Childcare Market, commissioned by the LDA, was published on the 2 February 2011 and the LDA has been working with the DWP to ensure that these lessons are built into the design and implementation of the new Work Programme.

Looking forward, the GLA will be working with the DWP to seek to ensure the new Universal Credit effectively reflects London’s higher costs of living, including childcare.

LDA

Question No: 569 / 2011
Joanne McCartney

Do you have any news on whether the government will return any funding to London that would have previously been passed to the LDA?

Written answer from the Mayor

As LDA functions are to be folded into the GLA, funding for economic development for 2012-13 and beyond, that would have in other circumstances gone to the LDA, will come to the GLA. I am in the process of securing a settlement for LDA functions over the Spending Review period which will allow activities in my priority areas – including youth, promotion and regeneration – to continue to flourish. In other areas, such as business support, the Government policy is that they are more suitably delivered at a national rather than a local level. London’s businesses and Londoners will continue to receive support in these areas, albeit primarily through national schemes.

Barking to Gospel Oak Line (1)

Question No: 570 / 2011
Joanne McCartney

When may we expect the Class 172/0s to be upgraded from 2-car to 3-car operation?
Written answer from the Mayor

TfL is aware of growing passenger numbers in response to the much improved services on the line. The number of trains has been significantly increased in recent years and will rise further to four trains per hour from May 2011, giving extra capacity on this route.

TfL has no plans to extend the brand new 2-car, class 172 trains on the Gospel Oak to Barking line, to 3-car.

Barking to Gospel Oak Line (2)
Question No: 571 / 2011
Joanne McCartney
Are there any unused slots in the goods train provision which might be re-designated for passenger use?

Written answer from the Mayor

There are sometimes unused freight paths but these are not always at regular or suitable times for additional passenger services. Ultimately the re-designation of capacity is a matter for Network Rail and the Office of Rail Regulation.

Barking to Gospel Oak Line (3)
Question No: 572 / 2011
Joanne McCartney
What works would be necessary to increase the overall passenger and goods capacity of the line?

Written answer from the Mayor

Signalling would need to be further upgraded, and improvements made to the track or structures to raise the line speed to increase the overall capacity of the line. For extra passenger services additional units would be required. Finally it is possible, depending on the timetable, that additional platforms at both Barking and Gospel Oak may need to be provided as each terminal station currently has only one platform for Barking-Gospel Oak services.

TfL Customer Charter (1)
Question No: 573 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon
For the past 12 months, per month, please provide how many tube journeys were delayed for more than 15 minutes. Please also provide how many passengers were affected by these journeys.

Written answer from the Mayor

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 2 March 2011:

The details of incidents involving delays of 15 minutes or more are set out below. These exclude delays caused by industrial action.
Number of incidents * Estimated number of customers affected**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
<th>Refund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>111 (91)</td>
<td>1,226,587 (1,109,858)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>132 (103)</td>
<td>1,439,049 (1,083,226)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>138 (113)</td>
<td>648,459 (444,683)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>129 (104)</td>
<td>915,403 (682,110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>144 (119)</td>
<td>923,733 (705,234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>143 (112)</td>
<td>1,244,873 (1,002,839)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>136 (107)</td>
<td>904,484 (676,877)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>157 (132)</td>
<td>1,138,869 (920,337)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>177 (143)</td>
<td>1,326,283 (1,114,995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>165 (131)</td>
<td>1,391,896 (1,074,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>229 (150)</td>
<td>1,611,949 (1,057,698)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>157 (123)</td>
<td>1,501,423 (1,155,033)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1818 (1428)</td>
<td>14,273,008 (11,027,390)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figure of 14.3 m customer journeys affected by such delays over the year compares to a total of 1.1bn journeys made on the Tube network – or 1.3 per cent of the total number of journeys.

* Figures in brackets show number of incidents eligible for Customer Charter refund

** Number of customers affected is estimated from typical passenger flows. Figures in brackets show estimated number of customers affected by incidents eligible for Customer Charter refund.

**TfL Customer Charter (2)
Question No: 574 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon

For the past 12 months, per month, please provide the figures for how many passengers claimed for a refund for the cost of a tube journey because it was delayed for more than 15 minutes.

**Written answer from the Mayor

In the past 12 months LU received the following number of claims. The figures in brackets show the number of claims found to be eligible for a refund under the Customer Charter.

It should be noted the figure of 14.3 m customer journeys affected by such delays over the year compares to a total of 1.1bn journeys made on the Tube network – or one delay for every 77m journeys.

**2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Claims</th>
<th>Refund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>17257</td>
<td>(16151)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>35255</td>
<td>(32731)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>21179</td>
<td>(19507)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>11873</td>
<td>(11264)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>39667</td>
<td>(37065)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>39339</td>
<td>(36513)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>12832</td>
<td>(11707)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>26662</td>
<td>(23153)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stations on match days (1)

Question No: 575 / 2011

Caroline Pidgeon

Will you review having all stations in the Arsenal area open on home match days to help relieve the severe congestion for supporters attending games at the Emirates stadium?

Written answer from the Mayor

London Underground (LU) does everything it can to facilitate customers travelling to and from Emirates Stadium as quickly as possible on match days and this includes running extra trains and having extra staff on hand at key Tube stations serving the Stadium.

Holloway Road is a lift-only station which was not designed for major passenger flows and for safety reasons it must be operated as exit-only at the end of matches - otherwise it simply would not cope with demand. For a similar reason Drayton Park National Rail station (which closes in the evening and on weekends) is not kept open for match-days. Spectators are instead encouraged to use the other nearby stations (Arsenal, Finsbury Park, Highbury & Islington), all of which are within walking distance of the Stadium.

This is safest and most effective way to manage the crowds in the area on match days and travel arrangements are already reviewed regularly with Arsenal FC, the London Borough of Islington and the Metropolitan and British Transport Police to ensure that the most appropriate travel plan continues to be implemented.

Stations on match days (2)

Question No: 576 / 2011

Caroline Pidgeon

What is TfL’s policy for managing large numbers of passengers on match days at rail and Underground stations serving large sporting events?

Written answer from the Mayor

TfL works closely with all of London’s major event organisers, relevant local boroughs and the Metropolitan and British Transport Police to plan the safest and most effective transport services to and from matches of up to 90,000 attendees.

Tried and tested plans are in place for each venue and these are always assessed in advance of particular matches to ensure that the most appropriate plan is in place.

Where necessary, TfL will always roster additional staff at rail and Underground stations to facilitate customer flows and, in addition, temporary changes are made in some cases to existing station signage to further regulate these flows. At all times the focus is to provide the safest,
fastest and most effective journeys for event attendees and other customers using these stations.

Cycling on pavements and cyclists going through red lights
Question No: 577 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon
During 2010 there appeared to be a huge variation in the number of Fixed Penalty Notices awarded to cyclists who ride on the pavement or cycle through red lights. Do you think this evidence reveals that the Metropolitan Police are not consistently enforcing the legislation in this area? Do you think more measures should be taken to protect pedestrians from the small minority of adult cyclists who blatantly break the law?

Written answer from the Mayor
The issue of safety for all road users, including pedestrians and cyclists is an integral part of the objective to reduce the number of people killed or seriously injured (KSI) on London’s roads. The establishment last year of the MPS Cycle Task Force and the commencement of the trial of a cyclist improvement scheme “Capital Cycle Safe”, are delivering a more consistent approach to tackling offences committed by cyclists across London.

Waterloo International Station
Question No: 578 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon
Further to MQ 9/2011, please list all conversations and meetings which the Chair, other Board members and staff at TfL have had with Network Rail about a new flyover at Clapham Junction to enable 16-car trains from the Southampton line to run into Waterloo International platforms?

Written answer from the Mayor
The Chair and Board members have not discussed this. The station is not TfL’s and it and the services are the responsibility of the DfT and Network Rail.

However, the idea to run longer trains to Waterloo International facilitated by a flyover near Clapham Junction has been around for some years. Indeed, TfL’s January 2006 response to Network Rail’s South West Main Line Route Utilisation Strategy (RUS) recommended such a scheme in the medium term.

More recently, the scheme is included as an option in the draft London & South East RUS (Option F3). TfL staff are members of the management group of this RUS, which is a rail industry document compiled by Network Rail. TfL staff have therefore been present at various meetings with Network Rail where the idea has been discussed during the development of the RUS. The London & South East RUS meetings started in October 2009 and TfL has attended various meetings roughly every 1-2 months since this time. Since the draft RUS was published, a South West sub-group has been set up which has discussed this option, amongst others, in more detail. This group first met in January 2011 and will meet every 4-6 weeks over the next few months.

The draft RUS states that this scheme may need to be taken forward in the longer term, but only if no other more affordable options to cater for the forecast future growth in passengers can be developed. No detailed development of this scheme has been carried out to date.
Cycle Hire docking stations not in use

Question No: 579 / 2011

Caroline Pidgeon

Please provide a list of cycle hire docking stations which are currently not in use, along with the reasons.

Written answer from the Mayor

The number of docking stations not in service on a particular day is variable, depending on the activities of highway authorities, utility suppliers and property owners, along with any faults which may occur with the station itself.

As of 15 February 2011, four stations were not in service:

- Cheapside, Bank: This docking station has been suspended, pending relocation to a nearby site at the request of the City of London. The new site is expected to be available by the end of July 2011.
- Pall Mall, St James: This docking station has been temporarily suspended in preparation for two-way traffic on this road. Westminster City Council installed a pedestrian island which has narrowed the carriageway near the docking station. As a result, Transport for London wishes to address safety concerns by redesigning the station. The station is expected to reopen later this year.
- South Kensington Station, Thurloe Street, Kensington: This station is currently suspended to allow scaffolding and building works to take place. This station is expected to return to service by the end of February.
- Old Brompton Road, South Kensington: This station is currently suspended due to gas main replacement work in conjunction with The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea road resurfacing. This station is also due to be reinstated by the end of February.

Mayor’s Year of Walking

Question No: 580 / 2011

Caroline Pidgeon

How do you feel your Year of Walking is going so far?

Written answer from the Mayor

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Footways on Red Routes

Question No: 581 / 2011

Caroline Pidgeon

Will you consider devolving power down to local boroughs by giving them permission to take over the management of footways on Red Routes?

Written answer from the Mayor

TfL is not opposed to delegating appropriate powers to boroughs.

In terms of highway enforcement, a trial delegation of TfL powers to the London Borough of Wandsworth in 2008/9 revealed that all of the enforcement carried out by Wandsworth was based on the issue of fixed penalty notices either pursuant to the London Local Authorities Act
2004 for street trading offences or pursuant to the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003 for displaying adverts (e.g. A boards) in breach of regulations. The specific Powers that TfL delegated to Wandsworth were not used.

In terms of highway maintenance, the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) is maintained in a consistent manner by TfL across London, under long term contractual arrangements which are due to expire in 2013. TfL is working with London boroughs, Capital Ambition and the Office of Government Commerce to look at a new model for the management of London’s roads post 2013. This will include all London’s roads in order to create efficiencies, economies of scale and reduce the total number of contracts operating in London.

In the mean time, although there are no plans to separate out sections of the TLRN (such as the footways) for maintenance, TfL is working with a number of boroughs on collaborative enforcement of street trading and licensing of tables and chairs, for example.

King’s Cross
Question No: 582 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon
Developers Argent are proposing a new pedestrian bridge from York Way into one of their buildings on the opposite side of the King’s Cross railway tracks. Given that Network Rail appear to be reneging on their commitment to provide access to the station from the Islington side, will you use your influence to ensure that this bridge is provided?

Written answer from the Mayor
Updated written answer received on 3 March 2011:
I am only able to influence directly the very limited number of planning applications that are referred to me by the boroughs under the Mayor of London Order 2008 because they are of potential strategic importance. I am not aware of any referable application submitted by Argent that proposes a bridge over the railway tracks. Feasibility studies have been undertaken, the first by Islington Council and the second by Arup, commissioned by Network Rail. The Network Rail study was a requirement of Camden Council and its grant of planning permission for the station redevelopment. These studies concluded the bridge had a very poor business case because of its high cost and limited benefits and would be very unlikely to receive public funding.

381/C10 Bus
Question No: 583 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon
I have heard reports of severe overcrowding in the mornings in the Rotherhithe area with people having to wait over 25 minutes for a 381 and C10 bus. Will you personally look into this with TfL and consider increasing capacity on these routes?

Written answer from the Mayor
TfL will be introducing bigger buses on route C10 from 19 March this year. These will also have two doors (currently one), helping make more effective use of the space inside the bus.

A new schedule was introduced on route 381 on 8 January to assist in dealing with delays caused by roadworks. TfL is continuing to monitor the performance of the service. Indications so far are that the new schedule is having a positive effect on performance.
**Countdown at Wilson Grove**

**Question No: 584 / 2011**

Caroline Pidgeon

Why has the countdown display gone missing from the eastbound ‘Wilson Grove’ bus stop opposite Bermondsey tube station?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The shelter at this stop is to be replaced, and the Countdown sign must be temporarily removed to allow this work to be completed. The sign will be reinstated once the new shelter is in place and the required electricity connection and data cable are available. While such work is complex TfL will work closely with all the relevant contractors to ensure this is completed as quickly as possible.

---

**Accumulative maps on air quality noise (1)**

**Question No: 585 / 2011**

Caroline Pidgeon

Further to my written question submitted in December on accumulative maps of air noise, MQ 3910/2010, which was following up a reply to a previous question I asked, Question Number, 3295/2009, please can you state why a reply to a written question asked in December 2010, and which should have been answered before Christmas, was only finally answered on the 25th January 2011, and then only after extensive chasing for a reply?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 2 March 2011:

Due to the Christmas break and an administrate oversight there was, unfortunately, a delay in furnishing your office with this correspondence.

Please accept my apologies.

---

**Accumulative maps on air quality noise (2)**

**Question No: 586 / 2011**

Caroline Pidgeon

Further to MQ 3910/2010, why did the reply finally provided on the 25th January 2011 fail to enclose a reply to your letter as requested in the question and as promised in your reply Question Number 3910/2010?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 2 March 2011:

The correspondence referred to in response to 3910/2010 was my letter to the Chief Executive of the CAA. My staff have been discussing with the CAA the potential of producing accumulative maps on aviation noise.
Accumulative maps on air quality noise (3)
Question No: 587 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon
Further to MQ 3910/2010, why, despite the answer to MQ 3295/2009 stating: “However, under current arrangements, detailed work would be the responsibility of central government, in conjunction with the airport operators. I will write to the Minister requesting production and publication of such information”, did you instead only write to the Chief Executive of the Civil Aviation Authority, with your letter to Andrew Haines, Chief Executive of the CAA dated the 14th September 2010? Would you confirm that no action was in fact taken by yourself and your office between November 2009 and September 2010?

Written answer from the Mayor
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 2 March 2011:

The technical expertise within central government to undertake the work necessary to fully assess the feasibility of producing maps of this nature lies with the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA). Although I initially stated that I would write to the Minister, I changed my view and believe a more effective approach is to first examine practical options in conjunction with the CAA. My office has been active on this matter. The answer is technically not straightforward, and, given the significant resources potentially required for implementation, it is important that any new mapping has the widest possible applicability, and can contribute to assessment of, and public consultation on, fresh approaches to airspace design which the CAA is developing.

Accumulative maps on air quality noise (4)
Question No: 588 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon
Your letter of 14th September 2010 to the Chief Executive of the CAA failed to specifically request the production and publication of far more detailed accumulative air noise maps for the whole of Greater London, despite this action being stated in your answer to Question Number 3295/2009. Why was this?

Written answer from the Mayor
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 2 March 2011:

The underlying issue here is that growth in aircraft numbers over London has been associated with a lengthening of flightpaths, and more complex sequencing and merging patterns over much of the built-up area. Thus, the sheer quantity of overflights was raised in the letter to which you refer. It would not be practicable or appropriate to try to extend over the whole of London the current contours produced around each airport, showing equivalent continuous (‘averaged’) noise. Other indicators, such as number of noise events above a threshold, may initially appear attractive, but selection of a suitable threshold across urban areas with varying ambient noise levels is far from straightforward. I believe engagement with CAA is more likely to produce a practical outcome for this issue.
Accumulative maps on air quality noise (5)
Question No: 589 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon
Will you take seriously the issue of aircraft noise and take up the issue of accumulative noise maps with the Government?

Written answer from the Mayor
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 2 March 2011:
I confirm that I take aircraft noise very seriously, and will pursue the issue of new forms of noise mapping with the Government.

Bikes on Crossrail trains
Question No: 590 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon
Will bicycles be allowed on the new Crossrail trains?

Written answer from the Mayor
No decision has been taken regarding the carriage of bicycles on Crossrail trains. This will be a decision taken by the future operator of Crossrail services. It is likely there will be restrictions on the carriage of bicycles through Crossrail tunnelled sections, but further consideration will need to be given to the carriage of bicycles on above-ground sections of the route.

20's Plenty Campaign
Question No: 591 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon
Will you be supporting the “20’s Plenty” campaign for London?

Written answer from the Mayor
20mph zones are primarily instigated in residential areas, especially those including schools or children’s play areas and where cycling and walking are actively encouraged. The establishment of 20mph zones is the responsibility of the boroughs. TfL works with the boroughs to ensure any new zones are targeted appropriately so that they will be effective in making the areas safer for vulnerable road users. As such, while TfL’s approach cannot be construed as actively supporting the 20’s Plenty campaign (which is calling for a blanket 20mph zone to be introduced across London), it does indicate support for the implementation of 20mph zones where these are appropriate and have strong local support.

Thames Estuary Airport Costs
Question No: 592 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon
In a recent interview, Daniel Moylan said the proposals for a floating airport in the Thames Estuary could cost up to £70 billion. Please provide a breakdown of these estimate costs.
Written answer from the Mayor

Cllr. Moylan was responding to figures proposed by a journalist. There are no estimates of cost; nor can there be until the site of the new airport is settled since much of the cost will be in infrastructure required to provide appropriate surface access.

Winter wonders across the capital
Question No: 593 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon
Excluding staff, elected members and officials, please state how many people participated in these guided walks in London on both Saturday 29th and Sunday 30th January?

Written answer from the Mayor
I am pleased to say that 2,586 members of the public participated in the Winter Wanders programme of led walks on 29 and 30 January 2011. This number excludes supporting staff and guides and represents a 106% increase on the number of people partaking in last year’s Winter Wanders weekend (1,255 participants in January 2010).

Suburban Rail Services
Question No: 594 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon
Following on from my oral question last month, what progress have you made in considering suburban rail services that could be run as part of the London Overground network?

Written answer from the Mayor
On 21 January 2011, I wrote to the Secretary of State for Transport to set out comments on his conclusions from the DfT’s reforming franchising consultation, which offers an opportunity for change. As part of this, I described useful additional reforms to franchising, particularly giving TfL control of the notional franchising budget for London. The Secretary of State has responded, questioning how arrangements would work for those services that run beyond the GLA boundary but inviting officials to work together. As part of this, TfL has commissioned work to undertake an independent review of the case for devolution of rail services in London. TfL has also started to examine a practical example of what could be different under a devolved system, with reference to the standards applied to the Overground. I am therefore continuing to make the case for greater local control.

S-Stock Trains (1)
Question No: 595 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon
How many incidents of S Stock Traction Shoe loss have there been since the trains have been introduced? How much have these incidents cost, why were the S Stock trains fitted with light weight alloy shoes when the A60 has more substantial traction current shoes and is this a case of cutting corners? What is being done to prevent this from happening again?

Written answer from the Mayor
Traction shoes are designed to come off if they strike anything unexpected, to prevent more significant damage to trains. This is the same for both A and S stock trains.
S stock manufacturer Bombardier has identified that the original shoe design needed some adjustment in this respect, and has modified them accordingly. Since this modification two shoes have been lost, and Bombardier is testing these to double check that they were legitimate losses, and not due to any stress fracture within the shoe itself.

Lost shoes are being replaced at Bombardier's expense, pending formal acceptance of the shoe design being fit for purpose. It should be noted that the shoes fitted to the S Stock (including the original design) were of the normal cast iron material and not of a lightweight alloy type as suggested.

**S-Stock Trains (2)**

**Question No: 596 / 2011**

Caroline Pidgeon

Have there been any serious problems with the S Stocks power systems? If so, what has been the cause and what remedies will be put in place to prevent these from happening again?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

There have been no serious issues with the S Stock power systems, only issues which may be expected when introducing a new type of train to a railway.

All modern traction systems are controlled by computers and tuning of the software and controls to get a smooth tractive effort is a normal part of the process. Most of this work has been carried out at London Underground’s test track at Old Dalby.

There are some conditions which could not be replicated on the test track and therefore we have seen a small number of failures in service. When such failures are identified controls are put in place to mitigate the effect until revised software can be applied.

**S-Stock Trains (3)**

**Question No: 597 / 2011**

Caroline Pidgeon

Has the delivery schedule for the new S Stock trains been changed? If so, please provide details.

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The overall delivery schedule for completing the introduction of all 191 new S Stock trains on the Sub-Surface lines remains the same and the milestones are as confirmed in the funding agreement with Government last year: that new trains will be rolled out on the Metropolitan line by 2013 (although actual delivery is likely to be earlier), 2014 for the Circle and Hammersmith & City lines and 2016 for the District line. The schedule for specific train deliveries is being carefully managed with sufficient flexibility to ensure that reliability and performance is maintained at all times.
**S-Stock Trains (4)**

**Question No: 598 / 2011**

Caroline Pidgeon

Will the Metropolitan Line be receiving its full allocation first, or will trains be diverted to other lines leaving the Metropolitan line running a mix of S Stock and 50 Year old A60s? What impact would this have on maintenance costs, and reliability of both S Stock and A60 trains?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The new trains currently being rolled out on the Metropolitan line will continue to be introduced on the line at a rate which reflects an overriding focus of maintaining reliability and performance. As now, the new trains will be introduced alongside the old trains until the whole fleet is replaced, by the end of 2012. The Circle and Hammersmith & City line trains (which have a different configuration to those on the Metropolitan line) will start to be introduced next year.

Under this schedule there is little impact on maintenance costs.

---

**Rail Summit March 2011 (1)**

**Question No: 599 / 2011**

Caroline Pidgeon

On what date will you be holding your rail summit?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

I will be holding the Train Operating Company Summit on Friday, 11 March.

---

**Rail Summit March 2011 (2)**

**Question No: 600 / 2011**

Caroline Pidgeon

At your rail summit in March, will you be discussing tackling the level of overcharging facing many Oyster users who travel by train due to such factors as the lack of barriers provided at many stations?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The issue of passengers paying maximum fares after failing to swipe out at National Rail stations will be discussed at the Train Operating Company summit.

---

**Rail Summit March 2011 (3)**

**Question No: 601 / 2011**

Caroline Pidgeon

At your Rail Summit in March, will you be addressing the issue of Freedom Pass holders not being able to use rail services 24/7?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

We have a packed agenda for the Train Operating Company (TOC) Summit and while this is not a specific agenda item, if time permits, I may raise it with the TOC representatives. However, any change would be a matter for the TOCs and DfT.
**Rail Summit March 2011 (4)**

**Question No: 602 / 2011**

Caroline Pidgeon

At your rail summit in March, will you tackle with the Train Operating Companies the immense overcrowding during the main Skyride event was held in central London on Sunday 5th September 2010? Will specific steps be taken to ensure that train companies provide either longer carriages and/or more trains when the event occurs in 2011?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

---

**Rail Summit March 2011 (5)**

**Question No: 603 / 2011**

Caroline Pidgeon

At your rail summit in March, will you look with the Train Operating Companies at improving the way London Boroughs and members of the public can easily report graffiti, vandalism and other problems that occur at local train stations, to ensure improvements are made to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour on railway property?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

---

**Rail Summit March 2011 (6)**

**Question No: 604 / 2011**

Caroline Pidgeon

At your rail summit in March, will you ensure improvements are made to assist people who wish to walk to train stations, who at present often find that specific entrances to stations are being closed, such as at Lewisham station. Will you seek to ensure that the aspirations and policy objectives of your Year of Walking are actually taken up by Train Operating Companies across London?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

We have a packed agenda for the Train Operating Company (TOC) Summit and while this is not a specific agenda item, if time permits, I may raise it with the TOC representatives.

---

**Gold Cards and Oyster (1)**

**Question No: 605 / 2011**

Caroline Pidgeon

How many Oystercards across London have a Gold Card programmed onto them so they are eligible for off-peak discounts?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

TfL does not hold this information.

However, last month 60,000 Oyster cards carrying the Railcard discount were used for rail pay as you go.
TfL’s records do not distinguish between the various Railcard categories eligible for the discount.

**Gold Cards and Oyster (2)**

**Question No: 606 / 2011**

**Caroline Pidgeon**

What do TfL do to advertise the fact that if you have a Gold Card you can get a third off off-peak Oyster Pay As You Go fares?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The Gold Card is part of National Rail’s portfolio of Railcards.

The primary responsibility for promoting all these cards and the discounts they confer rests with National Rail.

The TfL website contains factual information on the discounts available.

**Safety issues with the Cable Car scheme**

**Question No: 607 / 2011**

**Caroline Pidgeon**

Given recent reports in the press that the proposed cable car scheme would cross London City Airport’s ‘crash zone,’ what measures are you putting in place to ensure that this is rectified and safety is the number one priority?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The proposed cable car scheme does not cross the current London City Airport Public Safety Zone (PSZ). There is a proposal to extend the PSZ which has been notified by the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) and if this were to be confirmed the cable car will cross the western tip of the PSZ. Newham Planning Committee considered the application for the cable car in light of this proposed extension to extend the PSZ and consulted London City Airport and CAA both of which raised no objection. On this basis Newham approved the application.

As is normal process the application was referred to the Mayor’s Office for consideration and an objector who appeared at the Newham planning committee raised the issue again directly with me. In response to this, TfL asked National Air Traffic Services (NATS) to undertake a safety assessment. The NATS review has found that even with an extended PSZ area, of which the cable car would pass through the western tip, the probability of an aircraft accident affecting the London Cable Car to be less than one incident every 15 million years – an extremely low risk and well within Health and Safety Executive and Department for Transport risk guidelines. This report has been forwarded to the London Borough of Newham for them to consider.

**Cycle Hire**

**Question No: 608 / 2011**

**Caroline Pidgeon**

Why, between and including the 5th February to the 9th February, did the Barclays Cycle Hire website say, “Sorry, the Barclays Cycle Hire website is currently unavailable. Please try again later or call our contact centre on 0845 026 3630 referencing Support ID?”
Written answer from the Mayor

The Barclays Cycle Hire website was working normally on these days, with over 12,000 hits, and more than 800 successful membership applications received between 5 and 9 February.

However, the message was inadvertently displayed due to a temporary glitch with the website. TfL has instructed Serco to ensure this error is not repeated. If a customer has a specific issue then TfL will be glad to assist.

Private Hire strategy proposals

Question No: 609 / 2011

Caroline Pidgeon

Please can you update me on which items have been taken forward and/or adopted from the “Private Hire Strategy Proposals 2009-2014” paper from the Surface Transport Panel, 19th May 2009?

Written answer from the Mayor

Many of the items are being progressed through the recent consultation on private hire licensing – please see my response to Question 612/2011.

Other measures not covered by this consultation include:

- TfL is developing a clear, published set of Business Rules to establish clear, transparent licensing arrangements.
- Although the link between operator, driver and vehicle cannot be supported by existing information systems without excessive cost, this will be addressed within the replacement licensing system to be procured later this year.
- TfL now manages and investigates complaints about private hire services in a similar way to those about taxis.
- The content of the website for private hire customers has been substantially improved. Further improvements to the website to assist licensing applicants will also be achieved through the replacement licensing system.

“Badge and Bill” system (1)

Question No: 610 / 2011

Caroline Pidgeon

Why was the ‘over-the-counter’ system scrapped for taxi drivers to renew their badges? Do you think this has been an improvement in service for taxi-cab drivers?

Written answer from the Mayor

TfL has, for a number of years, offered counter services to taxi and private hire applicants and drivers at Penton Street. However, these services were not offering a high level of customer service and queues often built up which led to a large number of complaints.

As part of a wider TfL accommodation strategy aimed at reducing costs, the London Taxi and Private Hire directorate moved from Penton Street to Palestra in 2010. However, it was acknowledged that the Palestra building does not have the facilities to offer a counter service.

Staff that used to serve at the counters are now working on processing applications and renewals meaning that the length of time to process an application has significantly reduced.
There has also been a significant improvement in the telephone service with the introduction of formal call rotas for staff with phones staffed between 8am to 5pm Monday to Friday. This has resulted in call waiting times reducing from over an hour in January 2010 to less than 3 minutes in January 2011.

“Badge and Bill” system (2)

Question No: 611 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon

Since the ‘over-the-counter’ system has been introduced, how many applications/badges have been misplaced?

Written answer from the Mayor

When counter services were available, the majority of the 85,000 licensed taxi and private hire drivers posted applications and renewals to TfL rather than visit Penton Street in person. Since the closure of the counter, and the subsequent move to Palestra, there has been no noticeable increase in the proportion of complaints received due to application forms being lost or misplaced.

Drivers and applicants still have the option of using a counter facility at 20 different key Post Office locations where their forms will be thoroughly checked by Post Office staff for a small fee, before being submitted to TfL for processing.

Private Hire consultation

Question No: 612 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon

Please can you update me on the Private Hire consultation which closed on January 14th? What are the next steps regarding private hire taxis at TfL?

Written answer from the Mayor

The consultation closed on 14 January, after the period was extended at the request of a number of key stakeholders. 77 responses have been received including five from private hire trade associations, 32 private hire operators and two individual private hire drivers. Also included were a number of taxi trade organisations and drivers and key stakeholders such as London TravelWatch, The Metropolitan Police Cab Enforcement Unit and the City Police.

Analysis of the responses is now underway, and proposals for any changes, taking into account the views and evidence expressed by key stakeholders, will be made to the appropriate TfL decision-making bodies with implementation of agreed proposals to commence in Autumn/Winter of 2011.

Private Hire Vehicles in Taxi Ranks

Question No: 613 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon

What action are you and TfL taking to remove the illegally ranked private hire vehicles on taxi stands and ranks and the illegal ranks formed outside bars and venues?
Written answer from the Mayor

Transport for London is finalising proposals for changes in taxi rank regulations in order to clarify that private hire vehicles are not allowed to wait on taxi ranks.

TfL and the Metropolitan Police Cab Enforcement Unit continue to mount both overt and covert operations to identify, arrest and prosecute touts and drivers who ply for hire illegally, and TfL encourages local authorities to improve the enforcement of parking restrictions at night in sensitive locations.

On-street compliance checks on taxi-cabs
Question No: 614 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon
Why is TfL and the Taxi Private Hire directorate carrying out a greater proportion of on street compliance checks on taxi-cabs when compared to private hire vehicles?

Written answer from the Mayor
Whilst I understand this may have been the case in the past, TfL assures me that they have made a very clear commitment that their strategy is to ensure all on-street vehicle compliance checks are proportionate to both the taxi and private hire trades.

In the recent Safer Travel at Night operations that took place in the lead up to Christmas there were only 843 taxis stopped and checked compared with 2,115 private hire vehicles in the period between 9 January and 5 February 2011. A total of 330 taxis were inspected on high visibility operations compared with 697 private hire vehicles.

Rank Availability
Question No: 615 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon
Why has Rank availability and capacity not increased, especially at night, in line with demand and growth of the taxi fleet?

Written answer from the Mayor
A number of important venues now have taxi ranks where the facility did not exist before. Ongoing constraints on the highway network and on resources affecting both Transport for London and the local authorities have impacted on the ability to further provide taxi ranks throughout the capital.

TfL remains committed to working with the boroughs to identify additional rank space, and to deliver improvements in rank provision where there is a demand.

Plying for hire
Question No: 616 / 2011
Caroline Pidgeon
What action does TfL take to combat non-black cab vehicles plying for hire?

Written answer from the Mayor
The Metropolitan Police Safer Transport Command, funded by TfL, has a dedicated pan-London Cab Enforcement Unit (CEU) responsible for enforcing the law relating to taxis and private hire
vehicles in London. The police use a plethora of tactical options with covert and high visibility activities prioritised across London to detect, disrupt and deter touting. The CEU also work closely with Safer Transport Teams (STTs) and with local borough police on joint operations to tackle the problem.

A number of measures have been implemented over recent years that are helping TfL and the police to deal with touting more effectively:

- The number of dedicated cab enforcement officers was doubled to 68 which maximises the number of resources deployed in the late evenings with greater coverage across London. The CEU has made over 5,500 arrests for touting.
- Tougher penalties have been introduced for licensed private hire drivers convicted of touting. PHV drivers now lose their PHV licence for a minimum of one year following a conviction or caution for touting. Over 525 licences have been revoked since the policy was introduced in 2008.
- STTs have increased the focus on illegal cab issues in areas that have previously received limited attention. Operation Safer Travel at Night which took place over the festive period and involved all STTs resulted in over 177 arrests for touting.
- The Safer Travel at Night campaign continues to raise awareness of the dangers of using illegal cabs and provides enhanced information and access to safer travel alternatives. An element of the campaign targeted touting both to raise the profile of enforcement action against illegal cabs and to deter offenders. This included huge windscreen stickers placed on vehicles where the driver has been arrested for touting.

Sexual Assaults/Rapes in taxis

Question No: 617 / 2011

Caroline Pidgeon

For the last 3 years, per month, please provide figures for how many reported cases there were for sexual assaults in:

a) black cabs
b) licensed private hire taxis
c) unlicensed private hire taxis.

Written answer from the Mayor

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Lack of cash point facilities at Dollis Hill tube station

Question No: 618 / 2011

Caroline Pidgeon

A number of residents in the Dollis Hill area have voiced their continued frustration at not having a free to use cash machine within easy walking distance of Dollis Hill Underground station. Currently, residents are charged to use the machine outside of the station. Will you request that TfL look into providing residents with a much needed cash machine at the station to spare them the expense of paying £1.50 for every withdrawal they make, and to increase revenue for TfL for the hire of this space?

Written answer from the Mayor

Factors that determine whether or not cash machines can be installed at any particular London Underground (LU) station include the availability of suitable space, commercial viability from the supplier’s perspective, and security considerations. There are many stations where LU would
like to install a cash machine but cannot do so because of difficulties in one or more of the above areas. Dollis Hill is one of those stations; one problem is that the ticket hall area and adjoining corridors are very small.

Unfortunately, therefore, LU is not able to install a cash machine at Dollis Hill at present but will continue to look at any viable opportunities to introduce cash machines at this and other stations.

**A316 Chertsey Road/ London Road junction, Twickenham – update**

**Question No: 619 / 2011**
Caroline Pidgeon

In February 2010 you stated that “TfL is currently developing the provision of facilities” to cater for pedestrians or cyclists travelling along Chertsey Road, crossing London Road, “and it is hoped that a proposal will be finalised by December this year” [MQ0596/2010]. Can you update me on the progress of this?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

TfL has developed a proposal to provide non-signalised crossing facilities on the northern and southern arms of this roundabout. TfL is currently responding to comments made on the design by the London Borough of Richmond. Following this, TfL will be consulting on the revised design with elected representatives, residents and other stakeholder groups. It is anticipated this will take place in April 2011.

**CS5 Route in Central Peckham and Central Camberwell**

**Question No: 620 / 2011**
Caroline Pidgeon

I have been informed that two proposed sections of 20mph along the route of CS5 in Southwark, one in central Peckham and the other in central Camberwell east along Camberwell Church St, have now been removed by TfL. This is after a consultant’s report recommended that these two sections were made 20mph. Will you ensure these 20mph sections are reinstated to ensure the safety of cyclists?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

CS5 is currently in the preliminary design stage and TfL hopes to finalise design by summer 2011. Therefore, no firm decisions have been taken.

The report referred to is the Cycle SuperHighways Implementation Plan (CHIP), which is prepared as part of the preliminary design phase for each route. The CHIP recorded that 20mph zones in certain areas were an aspiration for some stakeholders. TfL is considering these suggestions. However, the final decision will need to account for the individual circumstances of the local area, as well as the needs of all road users and local residents and businesses.

**LOCOG Diversity and Inclusion Team**

**Question No: 621 / 2011**
Dee Doocey

Have LOCOG filled the post of External Access and Inclusion Coordinator in their Diversity and Inclusion team, which has been vacant since April 2010?
Written answer from the Mayor

Yes. The post was filled on 8 November 2010. The post holder works 2 day a week at LOCOG and 3 days per week at the GLA as Advisor on the Paralympic Games.

Domestic violence incidents

Question No: 622 / 2011

Dee Doocey

How many incidents of domestic violence have been recorded in each London borough in each year since 2007/8? Please also provide as much data as possible for 2010/11.

Written answer from the Mayor

Please see the spreadsheet attached as Appendix A. The appendix contains both domestic violence incidents and domestic violence offences for each year from 2007/08 to 2010/11 (partial year data to 31 January 2011).

The MPS records domestic violence incidents whether or not a notifiable offence has been committed. It also records the number of notifiable offences contained within those incidents.

LDA – Childcare Affordability Programme

Question No: 623 / 2011

Dee Doocey

The London Development Agency’s Childcare Affordability Programme was designed to assist people back into work by making childcare more affordable for low income families. How much money is in the LDA budget for the Childcare Affordability Programme in 2011/12? Now that you are taking over responsibility for the work of the LDA, what future plans do you have for affordable childcare in London?

Written answer from the Mayor

The LDA has terminated its Childcare Affordability Programme due to continued under-performance at the overall programme and individual borough level. There is therefore no LDA budget in 2011/12 for this programme. The original objectives for this pilot programme were designed to test models for supporting parents on low incomes to sustain employment by improving access to affordable childcare. These objectives have been superseded by fundamental changes in the national policy agenda. For example, forthcoming changes to the tax and benefits system, and the delivery of financial support to unemployed and economically inactive parents.

The new Universal Credit will fundamentally alter the way in which support with childcare costs is provided. The DWP’s Work Programme will also offer new forms of support to parents who are out of work. Due to these imminent changes in mainstream provision there are no current plans for GLA/LDA initiatives to provide affordable childcare. The Roger Tym & Partner’s report on London’s Childcare Market, commissioned by the LDA, is now published and being considered by the GLA to help inform future planning.
Affordable childcare in London

Question No: 624 / 2011

Dee Doocye

What steps have you taken to influence government policy around affordable childcare provision for low income families, in order to assist people into employment?

Written answer from the Mayor

The LDA commissioned an independent research report into London’s Childcare market, which was published on the 2 February 2011. The report found that childcare in London was on average between 25% and 35% more expensive than the UK average and public subsidies in London, such as tax credits, did not take all of this difference into account. The research also suggests that childcare interventions work best as part of a broader set of support for parents to find work.

The LDA has been working with the DWP to ensure that these lessons are built into the design and implementation of their new Work Programme. Looking forward, the GLA will be working with the DWP to ensure the new Universal Credit effectively reflects London’s higher costs of living, including childcare.

Human Trafficking Offences

Question No: 625 / 2011

Dee Doocye

How many people have been a) charged by the MPS for, and b) convicted of, each of the following offences, in each financial year since 2007/8:

1. Trafficking in prostitution
2. Trafficking into the UK for sexual exploitation
3. Trafficking within the UK for sexual exploitation
4. Trafficking people for exploitation

Please also provide as much data as possible for 2010/11.

Written answer from the Mayor

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 3 March 2011:

Data is only currently available by calendar year.

A) Charging data

1. Trafficking in prostitution

Trafficking in prostitution under the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act (2002) was replaced by the Sexual Offences Act (2003) and is no longer a separate offence.

2. Trafficking into the UK for sexual exploitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Trafficking within the UK for sexual exploitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Trafficking people for exploitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B) Convictions data

The MPS does not collate conviction statistics in relation to human trafficking. These figures are available from the UK Human Trafficking Centre or the Home Office.

Advertising the London 2012 Games

Question No: 626 / 2011

Dee Doocey

Are you disappointed that just 17 months before the Olympic and Paralympic Games are held in London there is virtually no signage in major transport hubs announcing the Games? Since you are a member of the Olympic Board, can you explain why every other previous host city has been festooned in banners/advertising and London has virtually nothing?

Written answer from the Mayor

My 2012 Team are working closely with colleagues in LOCOG to plan a unique ‘look and feel’ which Londoners and visitors will begin to see across the city in advance of the Games. The first exciting example of this should be unveiled in a major London transport hub soon.

It is not actually the case that previous host cities have had major displays far out from the Games.

SME’s

Question No: 627 / 2011

Dee Doocey

What percentage of bills from SME’s have been paid by the GLA Family within 10 days? Can you break this down by functional bodies?

Written answer from the Mayor

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Crystal Palace

Question No: 628 / 2011

Dee Doocey

Now that the future of the Olympic Stadium has been decided, are you supportive of the reported plans to develop Crystal Palace National Sports Centre, and are you satisfied that the future of this important athletics facility is secure?
Written answer from the Mayor

I remain supportive of the proposals for the National Sports Centre set out in the LDA’s Crystal Palace Park masterplan, which was granted planning permission by the Secretary of State in December 2010.

Following the outcome of the Olympic Stadium legacy decision, the only expression of interest for Crystal Palace National Sports Centre which remains is from the Crystal Palace Football Club (CPFC). To date the LDA has had one preliminary meeting with CPFC in September 2010 but no formal proposals have yet been put forward to the LDA.

MPS recruitment
Question No: 629 / 2011
Dee Doocey
How many existing applications to become police officers are being “fast-tracked” following the decision to lift the MPS’s recruitment freeze, as announced by you on 10th February?

Written answer from the Mayor

There are 210 PCSOs who had successfully completed police officer selection prior to the halt on recruitment. The additional money for officer recruitment will be used initially to allow these PCSOs to train to become police officers. It is anticipated that further recruitment will take place during 2011/12. After this initial recruitment intake the MPS aims to include Specials and other PCSOs in future processes.

Additional police officers – transport network
Question No: 630 / 2011
Dee Doocey
On 10 February you announced that an additional 413 “fully warranted” police officers would be put onto the transport network. How many of these will be Special Constables?

Written answer from the Mayor

None of the additional 413 police officers for the transport system will be special constables.

Additional police officers – schools
Question No: 632 / 2011
Dee Doocey
On 10 February you announced that there would be increase in the number of police officers working in schools of 70. How many of these will be Special Constables?

Written answer from the Mayor

No decision has been taken to include Special Constables in the partnership proposals.
Additional police officers – crime hotspots
Question No: 633 / 2011

Dee Doocey
On 10 February you announced “a new pool of 120 officers to work in partnership with the boroughs to hit crime hotspots and problem areas”. How many of these will be Special Constables?

Written answer from the Mayor
No decision has been taken to include Special Constables in the partnership proposals.

Arts and the Olympics
Question No: 635 / 2011

Dee Doocey
The Games bid promised an “Olympic Friendship: a full-size, ocean-going clipper, crewed by young people, artists, philosophers and students…..In parallel, a virtual vessel will sail the internet and form the basis of a four-year education programme.” These plans have been dropped, so can you tell me what the reality is going to look like? Can you provide details of how London’s children are going to be involved in the Cultural Olympiad and is any money being provided by the GLA to encourage participation.

Written answer from the Mayor
There will be a number of cultural programmes targeting young people delivered by the GLA, LOCOG and local authorities. The Cultural Olympiad programme includes a number of projects specifically aimed at young people, for example, the BT Portrait Awards which is helping young people explore portraiture at the National Portrait Gallery, the Tate Movie Project which is enabling 5-13 years olds across the UK make an animated film and Youth Music Voices which gives young people the chance to celebrate the games through song.

GLA payments to SMEs
Question No: 636 / 2011

Dee Doocey
What measures are in place to make SME suppliers aware that they need to register as such in order to be paid within 30 days?

Written answer from the Mayor
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

LDA Environmental Projects
Question No: 637 / 2011

Mike Tuffrey
Further to MQ3959/2010 can you confirm what level of funding, from the £15m allocated for Climate Change in the LDA’s budget, each of the environmental projects below will receive in 2011/12?

- Ldn Homes Energy Eff. Prog. (Homes Retrofit)
- Low Carbon Zones
• Buildings Energy Efficiency Programme
• Better Buildings Partnership
• Green Enterprise District
• London Thames Gateway Heat Network
• London Carbon Trust Scheme
• Centre for Low Carbon Energy Technology
• Energy Master Planning & DE
• Mayor’s Trees and Parks Programmes
• London Waste and Recycling Board
• London Green Fund

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The LDA has not yet received its final Comprehensive Spending Review settlement and therefore the specific funding breakdown is not yet available.

**GLA contingency**

**Question No: 638 / 2011**

*Mike Tuffrey*

In your draft consolidated budget for the GLA for 2011/12 you have allocated £10.2m as “Contingency for GLA Group budget”. What will this contingency fund be used for in 2011/12?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Once the LDA Settlement is received and analysed, I will bring forward proposals to use the contingency to support schemes that were previously supported by the LDA and other high priorities. This may include prudential borrowing to support capital projects.

**London Housing board**

**Question No: 639 / 2011**

*Mike Tuffrey*

How will you ensure that the make-up of the new London Housing Board is both politically and geographically representative? How and when will decisions be made about appointments to the Board?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

This Board will comprise in equal measure section 67(1) Mayoral Appointees and other suitably qualified person(s) chosen by me, and Borough elected members nominated by the London boroughs. I will select my representatives, other than my Appointees, through an appropriate recruitment and selection process, and London boroughs will be responsible for selecting their nominees. The appointment of Board members will commence once the Localism Bill has received Royal Assent.
London Housing Company
Question No: 640 / 2011
Mike Tuffrey
Further to expressions of interest in the London Housing Company after the two notices were placed in the OJEU last year, when will the LHC be up and running and start delivering affordable homes for Londoners?

Written answer from the Mayor
As you may recall, following the Comprehensive Spending Review in October 2010, I requested that the Housing Investment Taskforce review the preferred London Housing and Property Company (HPC) model together with any other suggestions that may arise from the Taskforce on how best to work with the private sector. Given the financial constraints we face it is imperative that whatever solution emerges, that it responds to the current economic climate. I am yet to see the report of this independent Taskforce, but I have been informed and am pleased to report that the Taskforce is making good progress and will shortly be releasing its findings.

Assuming that a recommendation is to proceed with the LHPC, it may be possible to have the LHPC set up by March 2012. The LDA is also currently working up development details and an outline planning application for a scheme that, if given the green light, could be used as a test scheme for the LHPC.

Enhanced Decent Homes standard
Question No: 641 / 2011
Mike Tuffrey
Further to the publication of the study into costing an enhanced decent homes standard, what are the next steps in your ambition to make London’s social homes “more than decent”?

Written answer from the Mayor
I will continue to encourage public sector landlords to look for opportunities to improve their homes beyond the existing Decent Homes standard. However, I am realistic about what boroughs can achieve given the pressure on their resources.

Fountains
Question No: 642 / 2011
Mike Tuffrey
Further to MQ3956/2010 has the invitation for proposals on fountains been issued? If it has, how many proposals have been received? If it has not, what are the revised timescales for this project?

Written answer from the Mayor
Following the review group meeting to consider a draft specification for the proposal, stakeholders have contributed to the outline invitation for proposals. This sets out all the criteria that external partners would have to satisfy in order to demonstrate that they can improve access to drinking water.

This is being updated to reflect all their input. Once this work has been completed the draft specification will be circulated to the boroughs and stakeholders. The finalised tender will then
be sent out with the selection process being carried out in spring. The timeline for pilots will then depend on the quality and nature of each of the proposals.

**Renewable Energy**

**Question No: 643 / 2011**

Mike Tuffrey

In May 2010 you said that “London Underground (LU) is currently investigating opportunities for renewable energy technologies at stations and via its energy procurement. LU is also involved in the LDA’s heat mapping exercise to identify combined heat and power opportunities” [MQ1615/2010]. What renewable energy technologies are London Underground planning on installing in 2011/12?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

At the end of 2011 London Underground initiated a procurement process for the installation of solar panels on a number of its properties. The Government’s Feed-in Tariffs will enable LU to benefit from renewable energy at no capital cost to LU. The procurement process will be completed by June 2011 with the installation programme finishing by the end of March 2012.

LU is also actively pursuing opportunities to deliver low carbon energy directly to its network. Initial investigations suggest that these could provide up to 20% of LU’s current peak demand. This project is currently at the technical feasibility stage.

In addition, LU continues to work with the LDA to identify opportunities arising from the heat mapping work. The initial high level business case work is expected to conclude in 2011/12.

**Community right to buy**

**Question No: 644 / 2011**

Mike Tuffrey

Given the government proposal to introduce a “Community Right to Buy”, are the GLA and functional bodies compiling Lists of Assets of Community Value? When and how will these Lists be published?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The GLA is not defined as a local authority for the purpose of Clause 71 of the Localism Bill which places an obligation on local authorities to maintain a list of buildings and land of community value.

**Streatham Hub Planning Application**

**Question No: 645 / 2011**

Mike Tuffrey

Further to your objection to the relocation of Streatham Ice Rink to a temporary site, what steps are you considering to ensure the “continuity of ice rink provision of a comparable standard”?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The S106 agreement signed by Tesco and Lambeth Council requires Tesco to provide a new regional ice rink on the Streatham site before the existing regional facility is demolished. The proposal to vary this agreement would allow Tesco to provide a temporary facility in Brixton. I
objected to this, as it would be inadequate for ice hockey and Olympic standard ice-skating training. I have written to the Secretary of State asking him to call in the Brixton proposal. Had I had the powers to do so, I would have directed refusal of the Brixton proposal and prevented the variation of the S106. Tesco and Lambeth should stand by the guarantee of continuity of regional ice rink provision.

Planning powers
Question No: 646 / 2011
Mike Tuffrey
Your objection to the variation of the s106 agreement for Streatham Ice Rink highlighted a “grey area” in the current planning system when it emerged that the Local Authorities do not have to formally consult the Mayor on variations to s106 agreements. Given that s106 often safeguard the provision of key local infrastructure and affordable housing, are you seeking to ensure there is a formal mechanism for the GLA to be consulted on variations to key s106 agreements?

Written answer from the Mayor
Consultation is not enough. S106 agreements are often the determining factor in whether strategic planning applications that are referable to me are acceptable or not. I am therefore seeking powers over S106 agreement variations equivalent to my existing powers over the applications themselves.

London’s Waterways
Question No: 647 / 2011
Mike Tuffrey
What further consideration have you given to the idea of being responsible for London’s waterways? In your opinion what are the key strategic improvements which could be made to London’s waterways?

Written answer from the Mayor
I am continuing to develop my ideas about taking on additional responsibilities for London’s waterways. As I have said in the past, I can see significant strategic benefits from this in terms of ensuring our waterways maximise their transport, environmental and leisure potential while also extending democratic accountability for the management of this resource for London.

In the meantime I will continue to engage with key stakeholders including the Port of London Authority, British Waterways and Defra/DfT to find ways of achieving these strategic objectives in the short and medium term, pending more fundamental structural reform.

Regional Growth Fund
Question No: 648 / 2011
Mike Tuffrey
Further to MQ176/2011 in which you revealed that the GLA has not submitted, nor worked in partnership to submit bid to the Regional Growth Fund, how will you ensure that London gets its fair share of funding from the Regional Growth Fund?

Written answer from the Mayor
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.
Written answer received on 2 March 2011:

When the Government first announced the Regional Growth Fund I made representations that London should receive its fair share.

Government has been clear that the main purpose of the Regional Growth Fund is to support areas making transition from a public sector dominated to a private sector economy.

I would support high quality proposals from London, involving or led by the private sector. However I do not want to raise expectations or waste resources bidding for, or encouraging others to bid for, funding that London based projects are unlikely to secure.

GLA/LDA Events

Question No: 649 / 2011

Mike Tuffrey

What Events for London will the GLA and LDA be supporting in 2011/12?

Written answer from the Mayor

I have agreed that the following events will be funded from the GLA Events for London budget in 2011/12

Event
Liberty Festival
London Mela
Notting Hill Carnival
Diwali
Vaisakhi
Eid
Armed Forces Day
Jewish Events
African / Black History
Pride
St Patrick’s Day
Chinese New Year
St George’s Day
New Year’s Eve
Mayor’s Thames Festival
Cultural Campaigns
Carnaval Del Pueblo
Major civic events
Small festivals

Community Conversations

Question No: 650 / 2011

Mike Tuffrey

How many attendees were there at each of your Community Conversations events in Croydon (14 Dec 2010) and Waltham Forest (24 Jan 2011), and how much did each event cost to put on?
SME Suppliers
Question No: 651 / 2011
Mike Tuffrey
How many suppliers are registered with the GLA group as SMEs?

Written answer from the Mayor
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Payments to SME Suppliers
Question No: 652 / 2011
Mike Tuffrey
In the first, second and third quarters of the financial year 2010/11, how many SMEs registered with the GLA group received payment within 10 days?

Written answer from the Mayor
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Payments to Suppliers
Question No: 653 / 2011
Mike Tuffrey
In the first, second and third quarters of the financial year 2010/11, what percentage of suppliers to the GLA group were paid within 10 days and what percentage of suppliers were paid within 30 days?

Written answer from the Mayor
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

LEZ phase 3 – vehicle abatement (1)
Question No: 654 / 2011
Mike Tuffrey
TfL have recently advised my office that there are currently nine official companies permitted by TfL to sell abatement fittings to Londoner’s who need to modify their vehicle in advance of phase 3 of the LEZ in 2012. Do you believe, like TfL, that nine official companies will create competitive prices for the consumer?

Written answer from the Mayor
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.
LEZ phase 3 – vehicle abatement (2)

Question No: 655 / 2011

Mike Tuffrey

Only four accredited companies are able to provide filter modifications to larger vans, minibuses and specialist diesel vehicles, in advance of phase 3 of the LEZ. Given the volume of vehicles that will be required to make modifications, do you believe this number is adequate?

Written answer from the Mayor

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Revising your Air Quality Strategy

Question No: 656 / 2011

Mike Tuffrey

What legal advice have you received on the need to revise (or not) your Air Quality Strategy following the failure of the UK’s reapplication for a time extension until 2011 to comply with the limit value for dangerous airborne particles (PM10) in London and will you publish it?

Written answer from the Mayor

The European Commission has not yet announced whether it has approved the UK Government’s application for a time extension until 2011 to comply with the PM10 daily limit value in London.

Next steps on air quality

Question No: 657 / 2011

Mike Tuffrey

What new steps will you take following the failure of the UK’s reapplication for a time extension until 2011 to comply with the daily limit value for dangerous airborne particles (PM10) in London?

Written answer from the Mayor

The European Commission has not yet announced whether it has approved the UK Government’s application for a time extension until 2011 to comply with the PM10 daily limit value in London.

CCLA Public Sector Deposit Fund

Question No: 658 / 2011

Mike Tuffrey

Will you agree to consider depositing some of the GLA’s surplus funds with the new AAA-rated Public Sector Deposit Fund, launched by CCLA, a London-based investment management firm owned entirely by its local authority, charity and faith clients, and so join the City Corporation and other local authorities in this joint endeavour?

Written answer from the Mayor

This has certainly been considered and remains under review. Officers corresponded with CCLA earlier in the year regarding the fund in question and noted the proposed investment process was compatible with the GLA’s investment strategy. Whilst, at present, officers believe direct management of investments within the GLA’s risk parameters is likely to deliver yield superior to
that expected from this fund, investment opportunities are regularly reviewed and CCLA will be included in such reviews.

**Disability hate crime**
**Question No: 659 / 2011**

Dee Doocye

How many incidents of disability hate crime have been recorded in each London borough in each year since 2007/8? Please provide a breakdown by borough and please also provide all available data for 2010/11?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

In 2007/2008 a total of 6 disability hate incidents were recorded. There were 5 offences recorded within those incidents.

In 2008/2009 there were 42 incidents and 39 offences recorded.

In 2009/2010 there were 145 incidents and 111 offences recorded.

In Financial Year to date 31st January 2011 there were 157 incidents and 111 offences recorded.

Information by borough is shown in the spreadsheet attached as Appendix B.

**River Transportation**
**Question No: 661 / 2011**

Richard Barnbrook

If river based operators are reluctant to use ultra-low sulphur diesel, would you apply punitive measures to force them to comply as you are doing with road-based taxis?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

**Penalty for idling**
**Question No: 662 / 2011**

Richard Barnbrook

The Mayor states in his strategy that the penalty for idling should be brought into line with parking offences with fines around £120. Is there any timescale for the introduction of the charge?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The level of the fixed penalty for stationary idling (£20) is set by the Traffic (Vehicle Emissions) (Fixed Penalty) (England) Regulations 2002. It can therefore only be amended by the Government. I recently wrote to the Secretary of State for Transport suggesting that the fixed penalty for idling offences should be brought into line with that for parking offences (£120) to provide a stronger deterrent to drivers and to encourage enforcement by local authorities. I will continue to press the Government for this change.
Mayor’s Annual Equality Report
Question No: 663 / 2011
Richard Barnbrook
The Mayor’s Foreword states “London’s Diversity is one of its major strengths and it brings enormous economic and social benefits”! Is the Mayor of the opinion that the recent recession would have been a great deal deeper and harsher if London was a homogenous place?

Written answer from the Mayor
No.

Tenancy succession rights in social housing
Question No: 664 / 2011
Jenny Jones
Will you join me in lobbying the Government to amend the Localism Bill such that succession rights for children are retained, and in fact extended to provide a secondary succession right as recommended by the Law Commission in 2006? Currently Londoners who care for an elderly parent find themselves without any rights to remain in their parent’s home on the death of the parent.

Written answer from the Mayor
The implementation of succession rights will be a matter for local authorities and providers on a case by case basis and therefore the Localism Bill already contains sufficient flexibility for succession rights to be applied where it is appropriate.

Self-help housing projects
Question No: 665 / 2011
Jenny Jones
How are you heeding the Housing Minister’s call on the 6th February to give more support to self-help housing projects?

Written answer from the Mayor
The Minister encourages anyone who is interested in setting up a self-help housing project to contact www.self-help-housing.org, who are the experts at promoting and supporting self-help housing initiatives. I support this advice and my Housing Advisor recently visited a self-help housing provider in North London to discuss how the GLA can assist providers further.

Land value uplift
Question No: 666 / 2011
Jenny Jones
Do you monitor the effect of major infrastructure projects such as the East London Line and Crossrail on land values and rents?

Written answer from the Mayor
The value of undertaking monitoring of this type was demonstrated in research on the impact of the Jubilee Line Extension, although disaggregating the effect of the infrastructure project from general trends in the property market will always be a challenge. Monitoring of the ELL impact
on house prices has started. With regard to Crossrail the GLA and TfL have produced a methodology for monitoring its impact on land values and rents for internal discussion.

### Surplus public land

**Question No: 667 / 2011**

**Jenny Jones**

Can you list the potentially surplus land owned by the GLA group and HCA London, providing for each the address, postal code, borough, the size in hectares and any information (no matter how preliminary) as to the preferred options for each site? According to a previous answer, the list of sites was completed by September last year.

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Please see the documents attached as Appendix C for the HCA, Appendix D for the LDA and Appendix E for TfL.

LFEPA currently has 3 surplus sites:

- **0.55 hectares at Bunns Lane, Mill Hill, in London Borough of Barnet, NW7 2DR.** Contracts have been exchanged on its disposal and completion of the sale is due on 3rd May 2011.

- **0.06 hectares at the former Bounds Green Fire Station, 69 Bounds Green Road, Bounds Green, London N22 8DF in London Borough of Barnet**. The Authority is in the process of completing a lease to the London Ambulance Service.

- **0.014 hectares within a premises owned by the Ministry of Defence at 206 Brompton Road London SW3 2BQ in the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea.** Discussions are ongoing with the Ministry on a possible disposal.

Please note that the MPA is not able to share this type of data for security and confidentiality reasons.

### Carbon reductions in social housing

**Question No: 668 / 2011**

**Jenny Jones**

What assumptions have you made about the reduction in carbon dioxide emissions from social housing by 2012, 2015, 2020 and 2025 in your draft Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Annex A of the public consultation draft of the Climate Change Mitigation and Energy strategy sets out the assumptions behind the CO2 emissions reductions can be achieved from across the whole homes sector. The model has broken down housing by type rather than tenure.
Plans for safer, less polluting road freight (1)
Question No: 669 / 2011
Jenny Jones
Can you update me on the plans for new freight consolidation centres and/or break-bulk facilities in London? These are crucial to reducing the length of lorry trips in London.

Written answer from the Mayor
TfL is currently working with a small consortium of freight industry specialists, distribution companies and operators to investigate the feasibility of setting up a London-wide network of consolidation centres and associated distribution services.

Initial meetings have commenced and working arrangements are being finalised. TfL, in conjunction with the University of Westminster, has begun a demand analysis and modelling study that will be completed within the next two months. This study will determine the feasibility and operational requirements for potential freight consolidation services in London.

Plans for safer, less polluting road freight (2)
Question No: 670 / 2011
Jenny Jones
What progress have you made in adopting planning conditions that specify Delivery Service Plans for road freight driving to and from major developments? These are due to be adopted by this spring.

Written answer from the Mayor
TfL guidance for borough development control officers ‘Travel Planning for New Development in London, incorporating Delivery & Servicing Plans’ was published on the TfL website during the week commencing 21 February 2011.

Since April 2009, TfL has made recommendations to borough planning authorities to include planning conditions that require Delivery and Servicing Plans for all referred applications, those affecting the Transport for London Road Network and other significant or large developments. Formal records of these requests have been maintained since May 2010.

Plans for safer, less polluting road freight (3)
Question No: 671 / 2011
Jenny Jones
What progress have you made with your aim that fifty per cent of HGVs and vans serving London should be members of the Freight Operator Recognition Scheme by 2016?

Written answer from the Mayor
Launched in April 2008, the total number of companies registered with FORS is now over 550, with over 70,800 vehicles in 1,590 depots. This represents over 21% of the commercial vans and lorries thought to be serving London. This is in-line with the target to achieve the 50% target by 2016.
Funding the Biking Boroughs
Question No: 672 / 2011

Jenny Jones
Having given Biking Boroughs £25k to draw up extra plans, will you look again at giving them an additional multi-million pound ringfenced budget so they can take those ideas forward and contribute to your strategic targets?

Written answer from the Mayor
I am delighted to be able to advise that despite the financial pressures within TfL, it has been possible to identify a dedicated budget of £4m over the next three years to accelerate delivery of the Biking Boroughs programmes. This investment, alongside the London Implementation Plans support and relevant boroughs’ own policies and projects, will support a step-change in provision for cycling in line with my objectives for a cycling revolution. TfL has now issued the bidding guidance to the Biking Boroughs and expects to formally confirm the allocations on 1 May 2011. Further details can be found in TfL’s Press Release of 17 February 2011.

Cycle parking at Crossrail stations
Question No: 673 / 2011

Jenny Jones
Can you provide a full update on the increases in cycle parking expected as a result of Crossrail’s redesign of stations and associated facilities?

Written answer from the Mayor
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 2 March 2011:

Crossrail will look at the detailed design of secure cycle parking and will work closely with TfL to investigate the provision of secure cycle parking at stations. The consideration of existing available space for secure cycle parking, such as empty railway arches and underground spaces, will, where appropriate, form part of the overall detailed design process for Crossrail stations.

Free public toilets on Remembrance Sunday
Question No: 674 / 2011

Darren Johnson
Will you work with local authorities and others to ensure that public toilets in central London are free of charge on Remembrance Sunday each year?

Written answer from the Mayor
The National Service of Remembrance takes place in the City of Westminster and all of the Westminster-owned toilets are free of charge to the public throughout the year. The toilets nearest the Cenotaph in Whitehall are leased out to a private contractor, but specifically for Remembrance Sunday, Westminster provide them with additional funding to ensure they too are free of charge, on this very important day.

I wholeheartedly commend Westminster’s approach to public toilet provision.
**Insulation for leaseholders (1)**

Question No: 675 / 2011  
Darren Johnson

Do you agree that leaseholders ought to be able to automatically vary their leases in order to install adequate energy and water efficiency measures, and will you lobby the Government to legislate for this? Many Londoners struggle to insulate their homes because of this barrier.

**Written answer from the Mayor**

As we continue to develop our approach to delivering retrofitting activity across London’s housing stock, through RE:NEW, we are looking at a number of challenges represented by its unique mix of housing types and tenure, leaseholds included. I am already actively lobbying Government on the Green Deal and their energy efficiency policy to address a range of existing barriers to large-scale energy efficiency take up in London. I will include this issue in our ongoing Green Deal lobbying activity and will look at how RE:NEW can contribute.

**Insulation for leaseholders (2)**

Question No: 676 / 2011  
Darren Johnson

How are you seeking to help leaseholders in London improve the energy and water efficiency of their flats, especially when they face a complicated mix of freehold, leasehold and sub-let arrangements in their building?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Please see my answer to MQ675 / 2011.

**Thameslink services**

Question No: 677 / 2011  
Darren Johnson

I have been asked by residents in the New Cross/Brockley area whether it is possible for Thameslink services to begin stopping at New Cross Gate. Can you explore this with the relevant bodies?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Although the service is the responsibility of the DfT and not TfL, TfL has asked the operator First Capital Connect, whose response is:

“*The Bedford to Brighton Thameslink route is a long distance inter-urban service with insufficient capacity in its timetable for a stop at New Cross Gate. If a stop was introduced, the southbound trains would miss their slots at East Croydon and the northbound trains would miss their slots at London Bridge. An additional stop would also cause overcrowding on several of the trains.*”

**Disposal of TfL land**

Question No: 678 / 2011  
Darren Johnson

Constituents have contacted me expressing concern that the Transport for London Bill 2010
enables the Board of TfL to dispose of operational land without needing the consent of the Secretary of State for Transport, thereby bypassing proper scrutiny and debate as set out in the Office of Rail Regulation’s guidance on the disposal of land. How will you ensure that proper consultation is undertaken before any such disposal?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The Transport for London Bill 2010 seeks to remove the requirement that the Secretary of State consent to the disposal of surplus land which was used for operational purposes in the previous five year period. Other provisions of the GLA Act 1999 which regulate TfL’s disposal of land will remain unchanged. The Mayor will still be required to give his opinion as to whether the land is surplus before TfL may dispose of it.

**Signs at Greater London boundaries**

**Question No: 679 / 2011**

Darren Johnson

A constituent asks, will you explore placing signs welcoming people to London on major roads coming into Greater London?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

I think there are already too many superfluous signs on our streets and I would need a great deal of convincing that this would not just add to street clutter. I am aware however that TfL is exploring the possibility of local sign sponsorship with London Boroughs, at appropriate locations.

**Fairtrade at the London 2012 Games**

**Question No: 680 / 2011**

Darren Johnson

Will you seek assurances from LOCOG that they are taking the necessary steps to meet their Fairtrade commitment, by specifying that catering contracts require all tea, coffee, sugar, bananas and chocolate served at official Olympic venues come from Fairtrade sources. Will you also go further and encourage them to source Fairtrade wherever a suitable product is available?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

LOCOG’s Food Vision for the Games, ‘For Starters’, sets out benchmark standards that must be achieved for all food provided during Games time. These standards include a stipulation for Fairtrade bananas, tea, coffee and sugar. Chocolate products must be Fairtrade or ethically sourced. LOCOG has also set aspirational standards that it expects suppliers to achieve when viable, including the use of food products that are ethically traded and sourced.
Threat to King George Hospital A&E  
**Question No: 681 / 2011**  
Darren Johnson

Will you oppose the proposal to close the Accident and Emergency unit at King George Hospital in Redbridge? Will you agree to make a representation to Government for maintaining this unit?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

During my term of office there have been a number of questions raised concerning my views on proposed service changes at specific trusts. My position on these matters remains unchanged. 

As you know I am not accountable for such reconfiguration decisions, however through my Health Inequality Strategy I have highlighted the importance of all Londoners having access to a good quality health system (covering primary, community and secondary and tertiary care). 

On a pan London basis, the existing provision of all these services is not delivering the quality outcomes or reducing health inequalities at the pace which I would wish. I am glad that going forward, such strategic decisions will be clinically led. During this transition, I would want to support the emerging GP leadership as they develop ways of determining which of the available options will produce the best health outcomes for the Capital. At this point, I don’t believe that the intervention which you are proposing would be appropriate.

I do believe that previous NHS reviews have been significantly undermined by an understandable lack of trust on the part of the public in the decisions being taken, caused by the absence of routinely available quality and performance information. To address this I am working with NHS colleagues to utilise the London Data Store and am seeking to promote other ways of getting meaningful data into the public domain. In so doing, I hope that this will also support patient choice.

---

Threat to Chase Farm Hospital A&E  
**Question No: 682 / 2011**  
Darren Johnson

Will you oppose the proposal to close the Accident and Emergency unit at Chase Farm Hospital in Enfield? Will you agree to make a representation to Government for maintaining this unit?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Please see my response to MQ681 / 2011.

---

Axing A&E services and population growth  
**Question No: 683 / 2011**  
Darren Johnson

At a time when London’s population is increasing and there is an increase demand on frontline services such as A&E units, will you agree to make representation to government to refrain from cutting A&E units?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Please see my response to MQ681 / 2011.
No idling areas for taxis
Question No: 684 / 2011
Darren Johnson
What progress have you made with identifying resources for the enforcement of no idling areas for black cabs?

Written answer from the Mayor
There are no proposals for dedicated enforcement of no idling areas for taxis. TfL is developing proposals to implement the measures put forward in my Air Quality Strategy, including reviewing the operation of taxi ranks at interchanges and other priority locations, in order to minimise the need for taxis to idle or drive in a stop-start fashion at these sites.

Biggin Hill airport expansion
Question No: 685 / 2011
Darren Johnson
Residents of Bromley and the surrounding areas are seriously concerned because Biggin Hill Airport Limited has applied to the London Borough of Bromley to extend flight operations by 26 hours weekly for 10 weeks in 2012. Furthermore, BHAL has asked to fly individual fare-paying passengers. This would – if permitted – break the Airport Lease which prevents fare-paying passengers. The Lease was designed to give protection to the local environment, to the safety and amenity values of many thousands of residents, to a dozen major schools and two large Hospitals. Would you therefore oppose such a move and confirm that an increase in operating hours at Biggin Hill Airport is not a necessary pre-requisite for the 2012 Olympics flights to use Biggin Hill Airport during its present operating hours?

Written answer from the Mayor
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 2 March 2011:
Responsibility for this decision lies with the London Borough of Bromley. They are best placed to assess the potential benefits and negative impacts of this proposal.

Thames Chase community forest
Question No: 686 / 2011
Darren Johnson
Given that tree planting has been a key stated objective of your mayoralty will you look at whether assistance can be given to the Thames Chase community forest project in the light of Havering Council’s decision to withdraw funding, following a recent review?

Written answer from the Mayor
London’s Trees and Woodland Framework recognises the ongoing work of the Forestry Commission, the 2 local authorities in East London and 3 local authorities in South-west Essex to establish the Thames Chase Community Forest, given it is one of the best opportunities to establish a large area of new community woodland in the Capital.

I understand due to constraints on local authority and statutory agency budgets the current governance of Thames Chase is being reviewed with the intention to establish a Thames Chase Trust in line with the new localism agenda. The Forestry Commission will continue to provide operational management as an interim measure.
When the new governance structure is finalised I will explore what support I can provide through the RE: LEAF initiative.

The 27 fire appliances
Question No: 687 / 2011
Darren Johnson
A constituent has asked that I put the following question to you: when are the 27 fire engines that were taken away by management during the London Fire Brigade dispute going to be returned? Stations are still without their machines, despite the Mayor’s promise of no reduction in appliances. The Brigade’s Facebook page states “the 27 fire engines cannot be returned to service as the FBU can still take strike action with 7 days’ notice.”. The Fire Brigades Union can call for strike action at any point at any time providing they give the correct notice, so does this mean that the 27 machines, recently taken from their stations, will not actually ever be returned?

Written answer from the Mayor
The 27 fire engines withdrawn as part the Brigade’s arrangements to maintain service delivery during periods of strike action by the Fire Brigades Union (FBU) were returned to their respective fire stations on Monday 14 February 2011.

High pay in the GLA group
Question No: 688 / 2011
Darren Johnson
If you compete with the private sector in industries that suffer from grossly inflated pay differences between the highest and lowest paid, resulting in senior Crossrail and TfL staff earning twenty or thirty times as much as their lowest paid colleagues, how will you apply the proposed “fair pay ratios” which you profess to support?

Written answer from the Mayor
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Environmental data
Question No: 689 / 2011
Darren Johnson
Can you update me on your progress in placing the London Development Database and details of all low carbon energy generators installed on GLA group properties in the London Datastore, as requested in May and September last year respectively? Do you plan to release any other environmental data into the Datastore in the near future?

Written answer from the Mayor
Details of LFEPA’s low carbon energy generators were made available on the London Datastore in November 2010. I plan to publish the details of TfL’s and City Hall’s low energy generators by the end of March 2011.

The London Energy and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory (LEGGI) 2008 database is also currently available on the London Datastore, and will publish future LEGGI databases on the London Datastore going forward.
There are also a range of other sites with environmental information online which are publicly available such as Capital Waste Facts (www.capitalwastefacts.com) and the London Air Quality network (www.londonair.org.uk).

**Green Grid (1)**

**Question No: 690 / 2011**

Darren Johnson

Can you tell me the number of staff currently working on the Green Grid, and the staff costs, for (a) the GLA, (b) the LDA and (c) Transport for London?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Members of the London Plan and Urban Greening teams at the GLA work on a range of green infrastructure projects, and by definition this work contributes to the development of the ALGG. It can be related for example to specific projects such as the Wandle Valley Regional Park or to policy development for the draft Replacement London Plan. Therefore as it is integral to a range of projects it is not realistic to isolate a cost element solely for the ALGG.

Representatives of the GLA and TfL:

- Ensure a supportive policy framework through the London Plan and other strategic documents and work on policy implementation
- Attend area framework development sessions
- Review draft frameworks
- Provide a representative on the ALGG project board

The core team at the LDA has 3.6 FTE posts dedicated to the ALGG. Some of these posts are externally funded but the total salary costs (this does not include staff on-costs) in the last year amounted to £145,000. A range of staff at Design for London at the LDA also work on green infrastructure projects from time to time and these costs are not included in this total.

Transport for London is working to support the LDA on the ALGG through a variety of activities. These include delivery of walking and cycling and public realm schemes on TfL’s domain and through funding of Boroughs work via LIPs. An example being delivery of the Olympic Cycling & Walking route through the Lea Valley Regional Park.

The variety of activity and their cross cutting nature inevitably mean that many TfL staff are involved on a part time basis rather than as a dedicated resource. In the current year this is estimated as a proportion of the work for twelve staff, approximating as 1FTE at an estimated cost of £60,000.

**Green Grid (2)**

**Question No: 691 / 2011**

Darren Johnson

The LDA Investment committee was asked at the November 2010 meeting to approve funding of £375k, split into £250k in 10/11 and £125k in 11/12 for ELGG & ALGG projects. With only £70k spent in 10/11 and no budget allocated for 11/12, what projects have been dropped during this two year period, as a result of this £305k shortfall?
**Written answer from the Mayor**

The LDA is still awaiting its settlement form the CSR for 2011/2012. Once the funding agreement is received, we will be in a position to finalise budgets for next year.

---

**Green Grid (3)**  
**Question No: 692 / 2011**  
Darren Johnson

To date, how many of the 300 East London Green Grid projects have been completed? How many are still outstanding?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

An exercise is underway to review the existing area frameworks that form the backbone of the East London Green Grid (ELGG) programme. As part of this, the LDA is currently reviewing the status of projects that were included in original area framework project lists, including those that may have been delivered without direct ELGG financial support.

These figures are scheduled to be finalised by this spring and will complement existing data we already have on direct ELGG funded projects. LDA activities associated with the 50 projects that have received LDA funding and/or support will all be completed by 31 March 2011.

---

**Green Grid (4)**  
**Question No: 693 / 2011**  
Darren Johnson

What is the estimated cost of completing the East London Green Grid? Can you differentiate between design of schemes/preparing bids and the capital costs of physical works? Can you also indicate the estimated LDA or GLA contributions and external contributions as part of this?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Delivering the East London Green Grid (ELGG) is a significant and long term endeavour and it has always been intended as a strategic exercise to highlight opportunities in London.

The LDA has recorded project cost estimates provided by project partners which indicate estimates of £221 million for projects that were collated as part of the production of the original area frameworks. This is likely to be a conservative figure as it only reflects those that the LDA holds information for and have been identified.

The first tranche of projects that were explicitly supported by the ELGG estimated a figure of £75 million to complete them.

These costs have not been split into the various cost elements of delivering identified projects however one could estimate that approximately 15% of this figure could be allocated to design/bid preparation etc.

Based on experience to date the majority of funding for delivery has come from funding outside the GLA family and this is likely to continue given the current economic environment. Nevertheless, following LDA investments of circa £1.8M over four years a programme valued at £88M has been enabled and accelerated towards delivery.
With the Governance Framework that you are devising to allow the LDA/GLA to exit from its leadership role in east London Green Grid, who will take over the main co-ordinating and delivery role?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Future governance of the East London Green Grid (ELGG) is currently being reviewed; taking into account key stakeholder views, and is at an early stage.

Proposals will consider the leadership, co-ordination and delivery roles including resource implications.

The LDA will maintain a leadership role in close collaboration with the GLA in preparation for transition.

What is the surface area of the East London Green Grid projects that have been completed (in hectares)?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The CLG Thames Gateway Parklands projects, which form part of the East London Green Grid (ELGG) programme, will be completed by 31 March 2011 and will deliver a surface area of 826.8 ha.

A number of other projects will be reaching their delivery stage in the next financial year and it is the intention to continue to track projects which have been supported by the earlier ELGG feasibility grant funding to record future outputs.

What is the estimated surface area of the East London Green Grid that has not yet been completed (in hectares)?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 3 March 2011:

We are currently reviewing the East London Grid. Once we have the final data available we will be able to share this with you.
Green Grid (8)
Question No: 697 / 2011

Darren Johnson

Once the governance frameworks and ALGG Supplementary Planning Guidance to the London Plan is completed, what is the planned role of the Green Grid team, if any?

Written answer from the Mayor

The resource for completion of the ALGG area frameworks and SPG to the London Plan is an issue that will be finalised following the decisions on the LDA and the funding settlement. A dedicated resource will need to be ensured to support continuation of this work and implementation of the ALGG.

RE:LEAF London
Question No: 698 / 2011

Darren Johnson

What funds have you contributed to the RE:LEAF London campaign to plant more trees in the Capital? Is this in addition to your budget for 10,000 street trees?

Written answer from the Mayor

In the first month of the programme I invested a total of £31,341.60 into community tree planting projects, which is in addition to the budget for street trees. This geared in an additional £50,000 from partners including 7 boroughs and Trees for Cities. These community-led projects led to the planting of 20,000 trees across the Capital. The Programme will continue to work with partners to secure additional resources.

The one hundred million pound question
Question No: 699 / 2011

Darren Johnson

Given that you have promised to spend £100m for direct climate change programmes on a number of occasions dating back at least to November 2008, and that it was printed in your public draft Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy in October 2010, you must know what you meant to spend it on. Can you give me the details you had in mind when publishing the figure in your draft strategy as requested in question 3602/2010, the final LDA settlement notwithstanding?

Written answer from the Mayor

Please see my answer to MQ3602 / 2010.

Once I the final settlement from government is confirmed I will provide you with the breakdown of the programmes and projects this is supporting.

Low Emission Taxi Fund
Question No: 700 / 2011

Darren Johnson

Will the million pound budget for the Low Emission Taxi Fund be spent in 2011/12? Is this the same million pound budget announced in your October 3rd 2009 press release on the draft Air
Quality Strategy?

Written answer from the Mayor

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Reduction in taxi emissions (1)

Question No: 701 / 2011

Darren Johnson

In the policies modelled for your Air Quality Strategy, what was the estimated reduction in PM10 taxi emissions for 2011 and 2015 resulting from a No Idling zone? When did your modelling assume that the No Idling approach would begin?

Written answer from the Mayor

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Reduction in taxi emissions (2)

Question No: 702 / 2011

Darren Johnson

In the policies modelled for your Air Quality Strategy, what was the estimated reduction in PM10 taxi emissions for 2011 and 2015 resulting from taxi age limits being brought in for 2012?

Written answer from the Mayor

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Monitoring air pollution levels at Vauxhall

Question No: 703 / 2011

Darren Johnson

Will you explain to the people queuing at the Vauxhall Interchange bus station why the data from the Air Quality Monitoring station they can see next to them is not passed onto the European Commission by the UK Government?

Written answer from the Mayor

Defra reports to the European Commission on air quality compliance every year using information from its Automatic Urban and Rural Network (AURN) monitoring sites. These sites are compliant with the requirements of the EU Air Quality Directive. Other monitoring sites in London that are managed by boroughs as part of their Local Air Quality Management duties, such as the site near Vauxhall Interchange bus station, may not meet the requirements as set out in Annex C of the Directive. As such this question is best directed to Defra.

Monitoring air pollution levels at Cromwell Road

Question No: 704 / 2011

Darren Johnson

Given that you are “working closely with the boroughs and Defra to maintain and develop London’s air quality monitoring capability” will you ask your officers to meet Defra to press the
case for keeping the monitoring station at Cromwell Road?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

As you’re aware, I have repeatedly pointed out the need for an overhaul of an incomplete and creaking monitoring network. This is one of the measures we are looking to Government to deliver and unfortunately we have not had a positive response from them.

My officers continually raise the issues around the monitoring network with Defra.

**Monitoring PM10 pollution levels in London**

**Question No: 705 / 2011**

Darren Johnson

Do you agree with the UK Government that London complied with the EU annual limit value for PM10 in 2009?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The Government is formally responsible for assessing compliance with EU limit values and reporting this to the European Commission. This information is included in Defra’s report “Air Pollution in the UK in 2009” ([http://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/library/annualreport/air_pollution_uk_2009b.pdf](http://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/library/annualreport/air_pollution_uk_2009b.pdf)). I am confident that the data contained in that report is correct.

**Air pollution monitoring sites (1)**

**Question No: 706 / 2011**

Darren Johnson

Will you make a formal assessment of which monitoring sites in the London Air Quality Network meet the micro-scale siting and data quality requirements contained in the EU Air Quality Directive 2008/50/EC?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

This is ultimately the responsibility of Government. Defra reports to the European Commission on air quality compliance every year using information from its Automatic Urban and Rural Network (AURN) monitoring sites. This is supplemented by other local monitoring sites in the London Air Quality Network (LAQN) that are administered by boroughs as part of their statutory local air quality management duties.

**Air pollution monitoring sites (2)**

**Question No: 707 / 2011**

Darren Johnson

Is there any legal barrier to the Greater London Authority taking over and running an air pollution monitoring site which Defra or a local authority wishes to close?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Defra reports to the European Commission on air quality compliance every year using information from its Automatic Urban and Rural Network (AURN) monitoring sites. At present there are 14 of these sites in London which are a subset of the London Air Quality Network (LAQN). Over and above this there are 100+ further London Air Quality Network monitoring
sites in and around London that are managed by boroughs as part of their Local Air Quality Management duties.

Transport for London own one monitoring site and have equipment at four other shared sites. Whilst these sites do report into the LAQN their primary purpose is in connection with the Low Emission Zone.

I am not seeking to fund parts of the LAQN. Boroughs and the Government need to continue to monitor air quality to comply with their duties set out above. I will continue to point out to Defra the need for an overhaul of an incomplete and creaking monitoring network. However this is a measure I expect Government to deliver.

**Action on nitrogen dioxide pollution**

**Question No: 708 / 2011**

**Darren Johnson**

Given that London is already in breach of European limit values for nitrogen dioxide air pollution, what is your current timetable for meetings with Ministers to discuss additional funding for the Government-led policies outlined in your Air Quality Strategy? Can you provide me with a policy by policy list of funding & action requested, along with an assessment of the minimum time it would take to implement each of them?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

My Air Quality Strategy sets out in detail the measures that the Government needs to take if NO2 limit values are to be achieved in London by 2015 and the additional funding that is required for full implementation of the Strategy. My officials regularly meet Defra officials to discuss development of a joint action plan for NO2 and my Environment Adviser, Isabel Dedring, has raised this matter with senior officials at both Defra and the DfT. In addition, I wrote recently to the Secretary of State for Transport to stress the need for national measures if NO2 limit values are to be achieved in London. I fully anticipate continued regular discussions with Ministers on this.

**Air pollution and the Localism Bill**

**Question No: 709 / 2011**

**Darren Johnson**

What success have you had with your attempts to secure amendments to the clauses in the Localism Bill relating to European financial sanctions?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

During the Bill Committee’s evidence session on 25 January, my Chief of Staff, Sir Simon Milton, said that “we object in principle to the concept of delegating fines without also delegating the funds, resources and powers to take the steps necessary to avoid the fines.” In subsequent meetings with advisors and GLA officers, Ministers have maintained that the principle behind their proposals for passing on EU fines is the right one. They have, however, acknowledged that the debate on how this principle is applied is a reasonable one and have committed to building safeguards into this process.

As the Bill continues its passage through Parliament, I will ensure that pressure is maintained at all levels of government and that Ministers and civil servants continue to be aware of our concerns.
**Olympic Aquatics Centre**  
**Question No: 710 / 2011**  
Andrew Boff  
How much public funding will be available to subsidise the running of the aquatics centre after 2012, and will it be the Mayor or local government that has to provide this subsidy?  

**Written answer from the Mayor**  
The Olympic Park Legacy Company will be responsible for the operational management of the permanent venues in the Olympic Park. It is currently seeking expressions of interest to appoint an operator by January 2012 on a long term commercial basis. Any subsidy required following this process will need to be accommodated within the OPLC’s financial and business plans.

**OPLC Legacy Vision**  
**Question No: 711 / 2011**  
Andrew Boff  
Is the OPLC / Mayoral Development Corporation intending to retain the freehold for the 2,800 affordable homes that will be built on the Olympic Park after the Games? Does the OPLC intend to contract out the management of the affordable homes, or to perform this role itself?  

**Written answer from the Mayor**  
A key rationale for the proposal to establish a Mayoral Development Corporation (MDC) covering the Olympic Park and surrounding area is to consolidate public sector regeneration responsibilities and assets in the area to deliver better value for money. Accordingly, I am proposing to include the Olympic Village and associated development sites owned by the Olympic Delivery Authority and London & Continental Railways Ltd. within the MDC boundary.

I have proposed that the OPLC will be reformed as the MDC. If, and when, a decision is made to establish the MDC, Ministers, the relevant organisations and I will decide which assets should be taken into the MDC, and consider whether it is sensible for these assets to be transferred to OPLC before the MDC is established. The OPLC is currently reviewing management of homes across the Park as part of its whole estate management approach.

**OPLC Legacy Vision (2)**  
**Question No: 712 / 2011**  
Andrew Boff  
What would be the advantages and disadvantages to the OPLC of retaining the freehold on the affordable homes on the Olympic Park?  

**Written answer from the Mayor**  
The OPLC’s current intention is to retain the freehold of all the housing land it disposes of, whether for private or affordable homes, as part of its strategy to create a whole estate management approach. It is currently reviewing the options for the delivery of affordable homes on the Park including a rented housing model, community owned assets and partnerships with registered social landlords.

Advantages for retaining the freehold include consistency of management across the Park, flexibility of tenure to address changing local and strategic housing needs and the retention of assets in the public sector to generate better value for money for the tax payer. As freeholder, the Company will be in a strong position to attract investment and negotiate community
benefits. Disadvantages could potentially be in the form of a management burden and associated cost.

**OPLC Legacy Vision (3)**

*Question No: 713 / 2011*

Andrew Boff

Is the OPLC seeking greater control over the future of the Olympic Village?

*Written answer from the Mayor*

A key rationale for the proposal to establish a Mayoral Development Corporation (MDC) covering the Olympic Park and surrounding area is to consolidate public sector regeneration responsibilities and assets in the area to deliver better value for money. Accordingly, I am proposing to include the Olympic Village and associated development sites owned by the Olympic Delivery Authority and London & Continental Railways Ltd. within the MDC boundary.

I have proposed that the OPLC will be reformed as the MDC. If, and when, a decision is made to establish the MDC, Ministers, the relevant organisations and I will decide which assets should be taken into the MDC, and consider whether it is sensible for these assets to be transferred to OPLC before the MDC is established.

**New Year’s Eve Fireworks (1)**

*Question No: 714 / 2011*

Andrew Boff

With the principal funder of the New Year’s Eve Fireworks – the LDA - soon to be abolished, what is the future of this event?

*Written answer from the Mayor*

I have secured the budget to enable the New Year’s Eve fireworks to be staged as a part of the GLA Events for London programme budget.

**Events Programme**

*Question No: 715 / 2011*

Andrew Boff

What is the future of the GLA’s events programme? What events will take place in 2011/12, and how much GLA funding with each of these events receive?

*Written answer from the Mayor*

The GLA’s events programme is secure. I have agreed that the following events will be funded from the GLA Events for London budget in 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Budget 2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Festival</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Mela</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notting Hill Carnival</td>
<td>190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diwali</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaisakhi</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eid 25,000
Armed Forces Day 5,000
Jewish Events 25,000
African / Black History 25,000
Pride 100,000
St Patrick's Day 100,000
Chinese New Year 100,000
St George's Day Funded from 2010/11
New Year's Eve 1,900,000
Mayor’s Thames Festival 60,000
Cultural Campaigns 100,000
Carnaval Del Pueblo 60,000
Major civic events 250,000
Small festivals 25,000

Design for London (1)
Question No: 717 / 2011
Andrew Boff
What was the annual budget spent on Design for London in each of the past five years? (Please provide a the budget for each year individually)

Written answer from the Mayor
The annual net spend for the Design for London project at the LDA over recent years was as follows:

2006/7 £70,050 (income exceeded expenditure)
2007/8 £1,104,007
2008/9 £1,164,984
2009/10 £1,406,154
2010/11 £501,500 (forecast)

Design for London (2)
Question No: 718 / 2011
Andrew Boff
How many people were employed (part-time, full-time, or consulting) by Design for London in each of the past five years?

Written answer from the Mayor
The Design for London team has been particularly successful at securing external funding to build upon their core work programme. As such, at any given time, the team includes people working in established (core team) and non established posts. Design for London was set up in 2007 and LDA records show the following total numbers employed by Design for London since then:

April 2008 – 34
April 2009 – 14
April 2010 – 18
February 2011 - 21
Between April 2008 and April 2009, a number of employees transferred to TfL and Urban Design London was separated from Design for London, explaining the significant difference in the number of employees. Furthermore, as these numbers are taken from a point in time, figures will vary within any given year.

**Xcite**

**Question No: 719 / 2011**

Victoria Borwick

Would the Mayor please provide figures for the cost and success rate of this LDA programme, including total figures from across London and figures for each of the boroughs where it has been piloted? What reasons for the abolition of this programme have been identified in the LDA’s evaluation?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 2 March 2011:

The LDA’s Childcare Affordability Programme (CAP09) was designed to test an alternative model of supporting economically inactive parents into long term work. Overall, this pilot programme generated limited demand from parents, and with the difficult job market, the programme has consistently not met its targets. By the end of November 2010, the programme had delivered less than 20% of its original target for job entries and delivered only 63% against Recovery Plans. Whilst there are variations in performance across the boroughs, no borough has delivered more than 35% of original job entry targets. This represents poor value for money for Londoners and as a consequence CAP09 has been terminated.

Final outcomes across the boroughs will be confirmed following a verification exercise to be completed by end of February 2011. Meetings with boroughs are also underway to agree a final financial settlement, therefore total costs are still in negotiation. The LDA’s evaluation report which will seek to fully identify the contributing factors to the programme’s under performance is due by 31 March 2011.

**RE:LEAF London**

**Question No: 720 / 2011**

James Cleverly

Following the successful launch of this project in January, what plans are there to introduce this across London? Which areas are expected to benefit and when, and how many new trees is each area expected to receive?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

RE:LEAF is a pan London initiative - developed with a range of civil society partners - which aims to increase tree canopy cover in the capital by 5 per cent by 2025. The launch involved the planting of 20,000 trees in the boroughs of Redbridge, Barking & Dagenham, Croydon, Hammersmith & Fulham, Sutton, Newham and Brent involving community groups, local businesses and residents.

We expect every borough to benefit from RE:LEAF. We have identified a series of projects, events and activities that will provide opportunities for individuals, community groups,
businesses, civil society groups and local authorities to do their bit. These will be set out in a RE:LEAF prospectus which will be published at the end of March.

168 bus
Question No: 721 / 2011
Brian Coleman
Presently the 168 bus route stops in the centre of South End Green, Hampstead. There can be up to 3 double decker buses standing at this point during the day. This state of affairs is a problem in terms of quality of life and health and safety for the locality. Will the Mayor instruct TfL to examine the possibility of moving the 168 to the bus stand at Morrison’s supermarket at Chalk Farm, where there are two appropriate bus stands that could accommodate the route?

Written answer from the Mayor
TfL has examined this possibility. There is not sufficient stand space at Morrison’s to terminate the 168 there. This stand is currently being expanded so that route 393 can be extended there. When this is complete the stand will be large enough to accommodate routes 27 and 393 but will have no spare capacity. In addition this suggestion would have a significant negative passenger effect, as over 6,400 passengers a day who travel across Chalk Farm would have to change buses to complete their journey.

Cable theft – London Underground
Question No: 722 / 2011
Roger Evans
Given the recent spate of cable thefts from the London Underground, including at Fairlop in my constituency, what consideration has been given to using forensic coding to reduce the likelihood of theft?

Written answer from the Mayor
LU is working with the British Transport Police and Network Rail to implement preventative measures that will minimise cable and metal theft across the network.

The ‘coding’ of cable involves the manufacture of an embedded thread within the copper itself, enabling Police to establish ownership even after the cable is stripped of its outer sheath. This is one element of a package of measures LU is currently exploring which also includes use of cable alarms, police and industry visits to scrap metal merchants, security fencing enhancements in hotspot areas, warning signage, hotspot analysis and an internal communications campaign to increase awareness and reporting.

Additionally there are extensive overt British Transport Police patrols being conducted in areas where we have previously suffered instances of cable theft and vandalism. These patrols complement existing track maintenance patrols and also involve contact with residents that border the railway.

Alcohol Pricing
Question No: 723 / 2011
Steve O’Connell
London was recently found to be the “worst place in England for alcohol-related crime”. What are your views on the government setting minimum prices for alcohol at a level that health
campaigners say will make ‘little difference’?

Written answer from the Mayor

I have worked to tackle the problems alcohol can cause, for example by banning alcohol on the underground and by supporting the work of the Joint Action Group on Alcohol. Education, enforcement, working with the industry and treatment all have a role to play in reducing these problems. The plans to prevent the sale of alcohol below the rate of duty plus VAT is a first step and I look forward to working with the Government and other partners to reduce the problems alcohol can cause.

PPP Contracts

Question No: 724 / 2011

Richard Tracey

What estimate has TfL made of how much money would have been saved if PPP contracts had not been imposed on Londoners by the previous Government?

Written answer from the Mayor

Whilst it is very difficult to make an accurate assessment, it is clear that, following the collapse of Metronet in 2007 and its subsequent transfer to TfL in 2008, LU generated savings and avoided projected costs of £3.6bn. The National Audit Office report on the issue, published in June 2009, estimated that the direct loss to the taxpayer of Metronet’s failure was between £170m and £410m. However, this represented only part of the total costs as it did not take account of work left undone by Metronet which needs to be completed by LU in the future.

Following the acquisition of Tube Lines by TfL in June 2010, much work has been done to re-engineer and re-phase the upgrade programmes which were in the original PPP contracts, in the most efficient way and taking advantage of synergies across the various line upgrades. This work is not yet fully complete but TfL believes the savings will run to hundreds of millions of pounds. However, what we do already know is that approximately £500m has been saved annually through LU not having to pay equity returns to shareholders and the looming funding gap for Tube upgrade works (of around £600m) was immediately wiped out with the acquisition, meaning substantial immediate savings were realised.

There are wider benefits and savings for London resulting from the acquisition of Tube Lines and the integration of Metronet that are more difficult to quantify but no less significant – TfL now has much greater flexibility to deliver upgrade and maintenance work in a way that better suits Londoners, rather than being driven by the need to maximise shareholder return.

Merton CIL Charge

Question No: 725 / 2011

Richard Tracey

Why is Merton in the second charging band for the proposed Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy, despite being shown to be the borough fifth least likely to benefit from Crossrail?

Written answer from the Mayor

The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations are very clear on this issue. They require any charging authority (in this case the Mayor) to consider financial viability, and only viability in relation to any differential charge. The proposed charges do not reflect ‘benefits’ because they are not allowed to. The proposed charges reflect the work of independent property consultants looking at the residential property market across London, the largest development sector across
London as a whole. This first round of consultation closes on 1 March and I encourage people to submit a response.

**Youth violence**

**Question No: 726 / 2011**

Richard Tracey

People in my constituency of Wandsworth have been very shocked by recent gang violence. The Government’s knife-crime advisor said on 2 February 2011 that young criminals view prisons as a “holiday camp”. Would you agree that there appears to be some serious issues with regards to how young people view the law as a deterrent to violence? Would you agree that these need to be urgently addressed?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

It is vitally important that young people see the law as a deterrent to offending and violence. It is also important that prisons and young offender institutions are effective in rehabilitating young offenders and diverting them away from further offending. Project Daedalus, part of my Time for Action programme, addresses this issue and is already showing promising reductions in re-offending rates for young people leaving custody.

**Oystercard/Paper Ticket Revenue**

**Question No: 727 / 2011**

Richard Tracey

What has been the total annual revenue from a) paper tickets and b) Oyster cards on the London rail network, broken down by Underground, DLR and National Rail in London, between 2000 and 2010? Can this be broken to individual ticket offices or boroughs? If it has not done so already, and on current projections, when will revenue from Oyster cards overtake that of paper tickets?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

TfL does not hold the information sought at the London rail network-level. The Train Operating Companies are not obliged to provide this kind of information to TfL.

On the Underground and DLR, Oyster card revenue has already overtaken that from paper tickets. Currently just over 75 per cent of journeys are made using Oyster. This compares with around 73 per cent two years ago.

**Investment in the Underground**

**Question No: 728 / 2011**

Richard Tracey

What has been the annual net public investment (in £s) in upgrading the Underground network for each year since 2000? Has the schedule of works and planned closures for the upgrade of the northern line been finalised? How many days of closures were planned on the northern line under the PPP contract and how many days of closures are now planned under the current arrangement?
Written answer from the Mayor

The capital investment in the London Underground (LU) network for each year since 2000/01 was as follows:

2000/01 £293m
2001/02 £418m
2002/03 £402m
2003/04 £668m
2004/05 £950m
2005/06 £1268m
2006/07 £1506m
2007/08 £1567m
2008/09 £1604m
2009/10 £1495m

LU and Tube Lines are close to concluding contractual discussions with the supplier of the new Northern line signalling system and will confirm a new programme of works shortly. This will entail very significantly fewer closures than the previously planned programme under the PPP, which LU cancelled following the acquisition of Tube Lines by TfL and which would have involved 65 weekend closures and 16 months of early evening closures.

Capacity and Reliability of Underground, DLR and London Rail Network

Question No: 729 / 2011
Richard Tracey

What has been the capacity and reliability of a) Underground b) DLR and c) National Rail network in London, for each year since 2000. On current projections, in what year will a) the number of journeys per year on the Underground break through 1,500million barrier and b) the number of journeys on the Underground network overtake the number of journeys on the whole of the national rail network?

Written answer from the Mayor

TfL does not have information on the capacity of the National Rail network in London. Reliability of National Rail services in London and the South East (L&SE) is measured in terms of trains arriving within five minutes of timetabled arrival time. The public performance measure (PPM) for L&SE operators were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ORR National Rail Trends
The number of London Underground journeys exceeds the number on the L&SE rail network. There were 1064.7 million journeys on the London Underground network in 2009/10, compared with 841 million passenger journeys on the L&SE National Rail network.

Different trains have different lengths and therefore capacity; it is therefore difficult to provide comparable capacity figures for the London Underground and DLR networks. The number of train kilometres is the most appropriate measure, indicating the total capacity of the network by demonstrating the total number of kilometres travelled by the trains.

The annual reliability and capacity figures for London Underground were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reliability percentage</th>
<th>Number of train kilometres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010/11 (up to end of period 10)</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>52,971,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>69,367,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>70,623,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>70,496,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>69,765,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>68,820,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>69,432,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>67,655,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>65,437,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>65,373,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>63,808,163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current forecasts run up to 2028/29 when the passenger journeys are forecast to be 1.446 billion. Demand on the Tube is predicted to exceed 1.5bn journeys some time after 2030.

There were 69.4 million journeys on the DLR network in 2009/10. The annual reliability figures and capacity for the DLR were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reliability %</th>
<th>Number of train kilometres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010/11 (up to end of Period 11)</td>
<td>97.36</td>
<td>4,032,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>94.84</td>
<td>4,575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/9</td>
<td>94.70</td>
<td>3,851,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/8</td>
<td>97.19</td>
<td>4,443,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/7</td>
<td>97.81</td>
<td>4,382,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/6</td>
<td>97.24</td>
<td>3,628,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/5</td>
<td>97.12</td>
<td>3,282,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/4</td>
<td>96.62</td>
<td>3,386,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/3</td>
<td>96.38</td>
<td>3,232,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/2</td>
<td>96.60</td>
<td>2,917,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/1</td>
<td>96.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Essential Engineering**

**Question No: 730 / 2011**

Richard Tracey

For each year since 2000, how many hours of essential engineering works have taken place on the Underground network? By year, what percentage of this essential engineering work has taken place during the night?
Written answer from the Mayor

The majority of Tube essential engineering work is carried out during the four hours at night when the Tube is not operating; with an average of around 1,000 separate teams (or 7,000 people) currently booked each night to carry out this work. This means on average around 28,000 person hours of work per night and around 10.2 million person hours per year for the whole network. However, given the scale of this work no one single record exists detailing the exact number of hours of essential engineering work that have taken place for each year since 2000.

Due to the wide range of different work that is carried out during weekend and blockade closures (and the different numbers of staff involved depending on the type of maintenance/upgrade work), it is not possible to quantify the number of hours in a way which compares directly to those carried out during engineering hours. However, the simple numbers of line closures during weekends have been as follows:

2005* - 142
2006 - 186
2007 - 160
2008 - 166
2009 - 239
2010 - 227

In addition, three significant blockades have taken place since 2005:

2005/2006 - 518 days (Heathrow Terminal 4)
2006 - 164 days on the Waterloo & City line
2010 - 23 days on the Hammersmith branch

*Figures dating back beyond 2005 are not available.

CCTV Camaras

Question No: 731 / 2011
Richard Tracey

Broken down annually since 2000, what percentage of London’s rail stations (including Underground, national rail and DLR) are covered by CCTV cameras?

Written answer from the Mayor

All but three London Underground stations (St Pauls, Chancery Lane and Redbridge) had cameras since 2000 up until 2008 (98.82 per cent), after which every station was equipped with cameras (100 per cent), albeit some with limited coverage.

TfL is not responsible for the management of facilities (including CCTV) at National Rail stations in London, other than those managed by London Overground. However, we understand that 100 per cent of National Rail stations are covered by CCTV cameras. We are not aware of the level of coverage in previous years.

Since the DLR started in 1987, 100 per cent of DLR stations have been covered by CCTV cameras.

London Overground did not take over its current stations until November 2007 so it is not possible to provide an answer to the question for the years 2000-2006. For 2007 to 2010, the
percentage of London Overground stations covered by CCTV cameras is 100 per cent for each year.

Traffic Lights
Question No: 732 / 2011
Richard Tracey
Broken down by year, since 2000, how many sets of traffic lights have there been on London’s TLRN? Where traffic lights have been removed since 2008, what impact has their removal had on congestion in those areas?

Written answer from the Mayor
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

British Library Business and IP Centre
Question No: 733 / 2011
Tony Arbour
How much funding for this programme is provided by the LDA, how much from the British Library and how much from other sources?

Written answer from the Mayor
The LDA has invested a total of £3.36m to date (co-invested alongside the British Library) to establish the Business and IP Centre (BIPC) which opened in March 2006. This consisted of two phases. Phase 1 in 2005 saw the LDA invest just over £1m to help build the Business Centre and provide some staffing resource. Under Phase 2 in 2007 a further £2.36m was granted over 4 years to fund the provision of access and business support services to entrepreneurs and businesses focusing on Intellectual Property matters.

The British Library contribution comes from the Department for Culture Media and Sport grant funding and has totalled £2.34m for Phase 1 and £8.8m for Phase 2. The project has also raised a significant amount of in kind contributions from Partners.

British Library Business and IP Centre (2)
Question No: 734 / 2011
Tony Arbour
How many small businesses and inventors have been supported by the British Library Business and IP Centre since its opening? What is the average cost per unit?

Written answer from the Mayor
Since its launch in March 2006, over 200,000 entrepreneurs from across the UK have used the Centre. On the specific LDA project the impact evaluation for 2007-2009 highlights the following achievements:

- 6,000 entrepreneurs supported through workshops, events and one to one advice.
- 830 users cited the Centre as helping them create their own business.
- 790 additional jobs reported by growing small businesses.
- £32m turnover generated by businesses supported, with 89% crediting the BIPC as critical to achieving business success.
- Every £1 of LDA investment delivered a £22 increase in turnover (excellent ROI).
• £4.1m in-kind support leveraged from supporters and partners.

Based on the LDA investment methodology the average unit cost per business supported since the beginning of Phase 2 has been calculated at £494.

**British Library Business and IP Centre (3)**  
**Question No: 735 / 2011**  
Tony Arbour  
What is the future of the Business and IP Centre when the LDA funding comes to an end in March 2011? Does the Mayor and the LDA have the option to renew the funding for this programme?  

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The British Library (BL) is actively exploring other funding options from both public and private sources to ensure the Centre remains operational when the LDA funding comes to an end in March 2011. The BL submitted an application to the Mayoral ERDF bid in October 2010 and are waiting to find out if they have been successful in their application.

The LDA is still awaiting formal confirmation from BIS of its Comprehensive Spending Review settlement. As such, it is not possible to guarantee any future funding for this project at this stage.

**CompeteFor**  
**Question No: 736 / 2011**  
Tony Arbour  
In response to question 2394/2010, you stated that the LDA was in discussion with government regarding a single portal for public sector contract opportunities. What has been the outcome of these discussions? Will CompeteFor or an equivalent portal be available after 2012?  

**Written answer from the Mayor**

The LDA, the RDA Network together with the Mayor’s Office and the London Business Network (London First, CBI (London), London Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Federation of Small Businesses) have lobbied central government to use CompeteFor as the single portal for public sector contract opportunities. However, a new portal – Contracts Finder (managed by HMRC) has been launched this month to promote public sector contracts to SMEs. Despite our discussions with central government, there are no plans for Contracts Finder and CompeteFor to merge.

The LDA is still awaiting its Comprehensive Spending Review settlement. Subject to the LDA settlement, CompeteFor will continue to publish contract opportunities related to the London 2012 and wider (including Crossrail) until 2012. The LDA is examining potential options (with the service providers) to continue CompeteFor beyond this time and without public funding. This is still work in progress.
LDA International Offices in China  
**Question No: 737 / 2011**  
**Tony Arbour**

Does the Mayor intend to close the LDA’s two international offices in China? How much money would it save each year if these offices were closed?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 2 March 2011:

The LDA currently operates 2 overseas offices in Beijing and Shanghai and employs 3 members of staff in these cities. Following a review of priorities and operational requirements, the LDA has commenced close-down of its operations in Shanghai. The LDA’s Chief Representative in Beijing is currently engaged in a number of key regeneration-related projects, for example there is a potential significant investment project in Royal Docks. This contract will therefore be renewed to continue this activity. The lease for the LDA’s Beijing office will be transferred to London & Partners, the new single promotional agency for London, which will maintain an overseas presence in order to build London’s inward investment pipeline.

The total budget for the LDA’s overseas offices in 2010/11 is £250,000. In 2011/12 the planning budget is £100,000.

Royal Parks  
**Question No: 738 / 2011**  
**Tony Arbour**

In response to question 3829/2010, you stated that you wanted the GLA to be involved in decisions made on the management of the Royal Parks prior to the formal transfer. How soon will you be involved in these decisions, and exactly what will be your role pre-transfer?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Thames Tideway Tunnel  
**Question No: 739 / 2011**  
**Tony Arbour**

In light of discussions I have had with Thames Water regarding the removal of spoil by river from the construction of the Thames Tideway Tunnel, will you provide any reasonable assistance to make this possible?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

In my response to the first stage consultation on the Thames Tideway Tunnel, I am clear that the removal of tunnel spoil by river is critical to limiting the impact of the construction of the tunnel on London. I view the river as the first option for the transportation of spoil and construction materials and will expect Thames Water to demonstrate in its second stage consultation this summer how it intends to optimise this. I will work with Thames Water through the formal consultation processes and in bilateral meetings to secure significant use of the river for the construction of the Thames Tideway Tunnel.
Deals Gateway, Deptford Bridge  
Question No: 740 / 2011  
Darren Johnson  
Can you respond to concerns raised by Greenwich and Lewisham cyclists by asking TFL to review the Deals Gateway junction which is causing real problems for the safety of cyclists? TFL redesigned the junction and took away the 3 stage signals so Deals Gateway and the road opposite are both green together. Any cyclist/vehicle going north from Deals Gateway is ignored by traffic turning into Deptford Bridge because either they thought that it was only green for them or that they got there first. The stop line for traffic is a long way away from the junction, meaning turning vehicles get there first.

Written answer from the Mayor  
TfL plan to relocate the advanced stop line on Deal’s Gateway by approximately 14 metres towards the junction mouth. Given no unexpected delays, the implementation works are programmed for the end of summer 2011. TfL expect that this will provide cyclists greater visibility when moving through the junction and greatly reduce the potential for conflict with other vehicles.

It is not possible to revert back to the previous signal arrangement as it would have a significant negative impact on traffic capacity, resulting in unacceptable levels of congestion and delay in the area.

National Express East Anglia  
Question No: 741 / 2011  
Victoria Borwick  
Further to reports that National Express East Anglia are looking to cut the number of rush hour trains through Enfield from 16 trains per hour to just 12, is this not further evidence that the Mayor should be given greater powers over national rail services in London to safeguard the priorities of Londoners? What progress is being made to this effect?

Written answer from the Mayor  
Yes. Part of the National Express proposal would reduce the frequency of the less commercially attractive service at eight London stations in favour of longer-distance trains on this heavily used route. I continue to make the case for greater local control through the role of the Mayor – see answer to MQ594 / 2011.

324 Bus  
Question No: 742 / 2011  
Victoria Borwick  
Following the concerns expressed by residents in Harrow, will the Mayor give full consideration to proposals to extend the 324 bus route from Stanmore Station to the Royal Orthopaedic Hospital in Stanmore? If not, what alternatives are being considered to improve access to this hospital, and what are their indicative costs compared with the cost of this proposed extension? Does the Mayor believe that the hospital is currently well served by public transport?

Written answer from the Mayor  
Two bus services stop outside the main entrance of the hospital. Route 107 is a TfL service which runs seven days a week, every 15 minutes at most times. Route 615 is a weekdays-only, hourly service run under contract to Hertfordshire County Council.
TfL has given a great deal of consideration to an extension of the 324 and has concluded that it cannot be justified. Please refer to my answer to 468/2011.

TfL is discussing the position with Harrow Council and Hertfordshire County Council to determine if there are any other options available, for example in respect of the service contracted by the County Council.

**320 bus**

*Question No: 743 / 2011*

James Cleverly

Since the 320 bus was extended to Catford six months ago, the reliability of the service has been plummeted with up to four buses arriving almost simultaneously, followed by gaps of 40 minutes. Passengers can no longer rely on this service. Will you insist that TfL restores the previous level of reliability on the 320 service within one month, or if this proves to be unachievable then the extension to Catford will be abolished?

*Written answer from the Mayor*

TfL and I share your concern that route 320 should perform to the standard passengers expect. The service changes last summer were part of a wider package which included a 25% increase in frequency on the Biggin Hill to Bromley link.

TfL is working with the operator to overcome the reliability problems that have been experienced since the new structure was introduced so that the benefit of the frequency increase can be properly realised. This has resulted in improvements in the reliability of the service at Biggin Hill, and you have seen recent papers which show this is being achieved. TfL is monitoring to ensure that this can be sustained.

**320 bus (2)**

*Question No: 744 / 2011*

James Cleverly

How much has it cost to extend the 320 bus service to Catford, and how many complaints has TfL received regarding this service since the extension was implemented on 28 August 2010?

*Written answer from the Mayor*

Overall, the scheme to extend route 320 and restructure route 208 has saved TfL approximately £180,000 per year in operating costs compared to the cost of the previous network structure.

TfL has received 172 complaints between 28 August 2010 and 15 February 2011 about the reliability of route 320.

**Crossrail (1)**

*Question No: 745 / 2011*

James Cleverly

Will there be toilets on board Crossrail trains, and if so how many?

*Written answer from the Mayor*

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.
Written response provided on 2 March 2011:

Crossrail will be a high-frequency metro-style service for London and the south east. It is not intended that toilets will be provided on board Crossrail trains.

**Crossrail (2)**

*Question No: 746 / 2011*

*James Cleverly*

Will there be new toilets installed at Crossrail stations, and if so at which stations?

*Written answer from the Mayor*

Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 2 March 2011:

Currently there are no plans to provide public toilets at new central section Crossrail stations. Crossrail plans to upgrade public toilet facilities at National Rail stations along the route where they exist, or to reintroduce public toilet facilities for stations where they have formerly existed where this can be achieved at reasonable cost. Where a National Rail station is to be significantly rebuilt, toilet facilities will be provided.

**PPP(2)**

*Question No: 747 / 2011*

*Richard Tracey*

What estimate has TfL made of how much faster upgrade work would have proceeded if PPP contracts had not been imposed on Londoners by the previous Government?

*Written answer from the Mayor*

It is very difficult to provide a meaningful estimate of the speed of upgrade works had the PPP contracts not been imposed on London. It is very likely that, in such a scenario, the prioritisation of investment in capital projects may have been different. To make such an estimate would also require a great deal of conjecture about what alternative structure or structures might have been in place and about the past performance of LU and private companies in delivering maintenance and investment under those structures.

Under the PPP, Londoners received a ‘double whammy’ – the upgrade works were delayed and incomplete, and Tube users suffered a punishing regime of excessive closures. The acquisition of Tube Lines and the integration of Metronet allows much greater flexibility to carry out the upgrade and maintenance work in a way that better suits Londoners, with less disruption and with projects delivered rather than delayed. The progress made with the Jubilee line upgrade since Tube Lines became part of TfL is a clear indication of this; in June last year the project was well behind schedule with no clear plan for when or how it would be finished but is now well on course for completion this spring.
Olympic Route Network (1)
Question No: 748 / 2011
Richard Tracey
What effect will the Olympic Route Network have on small businesses and shops on or near to the route? And if they are adverse, what measures are proposed to ameliorate them?

Written answer from the Mayor
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.

Written response received on 2 March 2011:
As part of the transfer of work from the ODA, TfL is looking at this and the work is ongoing.
TfL is also engaging with the business community to help them address the transport challenges the Games will present and aims to help them organise their staff, customer and visitor travel in the lead up to and during the Games.

The Travel Advice to Business programme offers a toolkit of measures and self-help initiatives on the London 2012 website, giving practical examples of how the business can manage its staff travel, customer and delivery needs during the Games.

Olympic Route Network (2)
Question No: 749 / 2011
Richard Tracey
Is there any realistic way to avoid a situation where millions of Londoners do not know about the Olympic Route Network?

Written answer from the Mayor
Yes. TfL will extensively engage with residents and local businesses situated along the Olympic Route Network to ensure awareness, and to allow time enough for any questions or concerns to be addressed. There will be a widespread communications programme in early 2012 to ensure Londoners and visitors to the Capital are aware of the Olympic Route Network, and what changes it will make to their daily lives. It has already been widely publicised in the media.

Cycle Superhighways
Question No: 750 / 2011
Richard Tracey
When the initial 12 cycle superhighways are complete, has any thought been given to extending them further or introducing more routes?

Written answer from the Mayor
There are currently no plans to introduce any new routes other than the 12 already announced. Funding would be needed for any further routes.

That said, TfL remains keen to work with the London Borough of Newham to explore possibilities for extending Route 2 to Ilford after the 2012 Olympic Games. Other than this, there are currently no plans and no funding allocated for any extensions to the 12 planned routes.
Crossrail (1)
Question No: 751 / 2011
Richard Tracey
What is the total length of Crossrail, and how many miles of the line extend beyond London’s boundary?

Written answer from the Mayor
Crossrail is 118 km in length (or 73.3 miles). Of this, 23.5 km (or 14.6 miles) extends beyond the Greater London boundary.

Crossrail (2)
Question No: 752 / 2011
Richard Tracey
If Crossrail were extended to Reading, how many additional extra-London miles would there be?

Written answer from the Mayor
In May 2009, the Department for Transport issued Safeguarding Directions to protect a future possible extension of Crossrail services from Maidenhead to Reading. There are no plans to extend Crossrail services beyond Maidenhead at this time. An extension from Maidenhead to Reading would result in an addition of 18.9 km (or 11.7 miles) to the Crossrail route network.

Cycle Superhighways (2)
Question No: 753 / 2011
Richard Tracey
Please provide a chart/map of the two Cycle Superhighways delivered, which shows the increase since opening of cycling along each section.

Written answer from the Mayor
Please find a chart attached as Appendix H showing average 12 hour, two-directional flows in August and October 2009 (blue bars) against August and October 2010 (red bars).

The latest figures show an overall increase of 70 per cent in cycle journeys across the two pilot routes, with increases of 100 per cent or more seen on some sections during peak hours.

Apprenticeships
Question No: 754 / 2011
Tony Arbour
How many apprenticeships have been created since 2000 across the GLA Group and organisations delivering the 2012 Games by year? How many apprenticeship starts have there been since 2000 by year? How many of these apprenticeships and apprenticeships starts were there in each borough? What proportion of these were (A) men and (B) women? How many of them were there in each sector?

Written answer from the Mayor
Officers are drafting a response which will be sent shortly.
Written answer received on 2 March 2011:

The GLA Group’s apprenticeship programme started in 09/10 and is in the second year of operation. Only Transport for London holds data on apprenticeships prior to this date. I set a target for the GLA Group of 1,000 apprentices for the first year of the mayoral scheme. The GLA Group achieved 884 starts in 09/10. The GLA does not hold information on the residence of GLA Group apprentices or their workplace. GLA Group Apprentices follow a range of frameworks including customer service, business administration, Team leading, construction and civil engineering. We do not hold complete information for the gender breakdown. However, on the information we do hold centrally there are slightly more men than women apprentices in the GLA Group.

The London 2012 Apprenticeship Programme began in May 2009. As of the end of December 2010, the London 2012 Apprenticeship Programme had 408 apprentices who have experienced work on the Olympic Build Programme. This exceeds the target of 350 during the build programme. Six per cent of the apprentices are women, which is above the industry norm for manual trades in construction. The apprentices have been employed in 25 construction trades across the Programme. 65% of the apprentices are resident in London. The ODA does not publish individual borough level data.

**Sentencing Results**

**Question No: 755 / 2011**

Tony Arbour

I understand that Lincolnshire and West Yorkshire Police is considering putting sentencing results on their new crime map websites. To ensure real transparency, would you agree that the MPS should consider doing the same for London?

**Written answer from the Mayor**

This work is being undertaken nationally through the Strategic Crime Mapping Group, responsible for the recent launch of the Home Office Crime Mapping Website. There are a number of ‘trailblazer’ activities to test both the usefulness and the public reaction to more expansive information. These ‘trailblazer’ Forces will report back to the Strategic Mapping group in two months and a decision will be taken.

The MPS would not consider adopting this approach until the trial is complete and the results can be considered in the MPS context.

**Mayor’s Annual Equality Report**

**Question No: 756 / 2011**

Richard Barnbrook

Given the demographics of London, the graph shows fairly robust rates of employment for BAME groups and it would appear that employment is equally distributive across London. Whilst the rate for Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups is lower than the rest this may in large part be due to specific cultural issues. Nevertheless, with this positive graph showing good rates of employment across all people of London would now be the time to assess ditching these expensive equality initiatives and just concentrate on the well being of all Londoners equally and fairly?
Written answer from the Mayor
There is still disparity in employment rates for different ethnic groups. I believe it is important to ensure there is equality of opportunity, not only for the sake of fairness, but also so that London’s economy can benefit from the skills of all Londoners.

Anti-social behaviour
Question No: 757 / 2011
Victoria Borwick
For several years there have been calls for police to tackle the high crime on an estate in Southgate Green Ward. This request was largely ignored until recently when, thanks to the work of Sgt Meeke’s and her emphasis on local policing, crime has now disappeared in the area.

“What more can be done to ensure police take local concerns about anti-social behaviour (ASB) seriously? Do we need to send out stronger messages, to both residents and the police, that ASB will not be tolerated and can be prevented?”

Written answer from the Mayor
I am heartened by the initiative and drive you describe by Sgt. Meeke, and I am assured by the MPS that partnership working with borough councils continues across London to work with local communities to demonstrate that ASB will not be tolerated.

Construction Impact Managers
Question No: 758 / 2011
Richard Barnbrook
Your Clearing the Air Strategy stated that Islington Council has created 2 Construction Impact Manager roles. Do they have any statutory powers that assist their management of large construction sites?

Written answer from the Mayor
Construction sites are subject to regulations relating to their management, including health and safety regulations. In addition, planning conditions can be imposed on developers, some of which may relate to the construction phase.

In 2006, the GLA and London Councils published Best Practice Guidance for construction and demolition sites in London. Implementation of the Guidance has resulted in improved air quality at and around construction sites in the capital. During 2011, the GLA will work with London Councils to review and update the Guidance and will then consult on the revised document as Supplementary Planning Guidance to the London Plan.

Mentoring Policy
Question No: 759 / 2011
Richard Barnbrook
Please give the reasons why your mentoring policy is specifically targeted at black boys?

Written answer from the Mayor
In the London context, black boys are disproportionately affected by Serious Youth Violence (SYV), both as victims and perpetrators. The primary aim of my Mayor’s Mentoring Programme
is to reduce SYV through the provision of trained mentors to black boys aged 10–16 who may be at risk.
### Appendix A – MQ622/2011 – Domestic Violence Incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic Incidents/Offences</th>
<th>FY 07/08 Incidents</th>
<th>FY 07/08 Offences</th>
<th>FY 08/09 Incidents</th>
<th>FY 08/09 Offences</th>
<th>FY 09/10 Incidents</th>
<th>FY 09/10 Offences</th>
<th>FYTD 31/01/11 Incidents</th>
<th>FYTD 31/01/11 Offences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking &amp; Dagenham</td>
<td>3891</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>4335</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>4506</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3783</td>
<td>1558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>2481</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>3137</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>3589</td>
<td>1403</td>
<td>2984</td>
<td>1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexley</td>
<td>2367</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>2742</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>3011</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>2374</td>
<td>1004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>2818</td>
<td>1460</td>
<td>3703</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>4031</td>
<td>2087</td>
<td>3438</td>
<td>1703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>3092</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>3608</td>
<td>2096</td>
<td>3705</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>3194</td>
<td>1442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>2597</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>2732</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>2802</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>2655</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>4859</td>
<td>2332</td>
<td>5454</td>
<td>2665</td>
<td>5787</td>
<td>2561</td>
<td>5194</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>3774</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>4201</td>
<td>2193</td>
<td>4748</td>
<td>2199</td>
<td>4265</td>
<td>1798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>2635</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>3419</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td>4446</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>3725</td>
<td>1296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>5036</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>4872</td>
<td>2352</td>
<td>4851</td>
<td>2105</td>
<td>4119</td>
<td>1707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>4566</td>
<td>2163</td>
<td>4443</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>4665</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>3921</td>
<td>1356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith &amp; Fulham</td>
<td>2228</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>2709</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>2632</td>
<td>1011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>3016</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>3821</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>3984</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>3556</td>
<td>1299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrow</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>2234</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>2363</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>2086</td>
<td>1056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>2230</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>2371</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>2821</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>2365</td>
<td>1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow Airport</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>3121</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>3432</td>
<td>1808</td>
<td>3845</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>2882</td>
<td>1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>3619</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>3982</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>4056</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>3738</td>
<td>1669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>3275</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td>3635</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td>3805</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>3325</td>
<td>1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington &amp; Chelsea</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston upon Thames</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>1443</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>1678</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>4461</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>4984</td>
<td>2074</td>
<td>5158</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>4083</td>
<td>1552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>5643</td>
<td>2947</td>
<td>6004</td>
<td>2936</td>
<td>5785</td>
<td>2342</td>
<td>4915</td>
<td>1765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton</td>
<td>2340</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>2513</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>2485</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>2098</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>5293</td>
<td>2628</td>
<td>5251</td>
<td>2327</td>
<td>5149</td>
<td>2304</td>
<td>4364</td>
<td>1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>2527</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>3249</td>
<td>1401</td>
<td>3429</td>
<td>1285</td>
<td>2901</td>
<td>1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond upon Thames</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>1474</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>4926</td>
<td>2455</td>
<td>5646</td>
<td>2706</td>
<td>5541</td>
<td>2566</td>
<td>4892</td>
<td>2138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>2352</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>2620</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>2222</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>3611</td>
<td>2181</td>
<td>3271</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>3898</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>3805</td>
<td>1490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>4009</td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>4251</td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>4241</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>3538</td>
<td>1571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth</td>
<td>3250</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>3805</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>3957</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>3306</td>
<td>1255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>2105</td>
<td>1283</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>2782</td>
<td>1339</td>
<td>2402</td>
<td>1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPS</td>
<td>101634</td>
<td>50847</td>
<td>112896</td>
<td>52912</td>
<td>119794</td>
<td>51679</td>
<td>103069</td>
<td>41539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B – MQ659/2011 – Disability Hate Crime

### Disability Hate Incidents/Offences Extrated from METMIS 16/02/11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>FY 07/08 Incidents</th>
<th>FY 07/08 Offences</th>
<th>FY 08/09 Incidents</th>
<th>FY 08/09 Offences</th>
<th>FY 09/10 Incidents</th>
<th>FY 09/10 Offences</th>
<th>FYTD 31/01/11 Incidents</th>
<th>FYTD 31/01/11 Offences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking &amp; Dagenham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith &amp; Fulham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow Airport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington &amp; Chelsea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston upon Thames</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond upon Thames</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C – MQ667/2011 – Public Surplus Land HCA

#### HCA London Land and Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Asset Description</th>
<th>Anticipated Date of Disposal</th>
<th>Size in hectares (ha)</th>
<th>Planning Status</th>
<th>Borough Investment Plan Status</th>
<th>Plans for Disposal in progress</th>
<th>Asset detail/comment</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castor Lane</td>
<td>Castor Lane -LB Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0.3883</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No value-unadoptable road - potential access to DLR depot &amp; LBTH unwilling to adopt</td>
<td>Enabling access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafalgar Way</td>
<td>Trafalgar Way-LB Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2.2158</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Internal only</td>
<td>No value-restrictions under Master Building Agreement</td>
<td>Canary Wharf access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Elizabeth Hospital</td>
<td>Hackney Road London E2 8PS-LB Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>Former NHS hospital</td>
<td>Mar 12</td>
<td>0.6213</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Internal only</td>
<td>A strategic site as identified as part of a portfolio of key sites identified for PRSI programme and the family sized intermediate home demonstration project</td>
<td>Currently identified as key site to form part of the London Private Rented Sector Initiative and family sized intermediate home demonstration project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Matthias School</td>
<td>St Matthias Bullivant Street London E14 0ER LB Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>Ex Primary School</td>
<td>Mar 12</td>
<td>0.4066</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Strategic site as forms part of the Blackwall Reach Regeneration Project; part of a JV arrangement that will become unviable if unpicked</td>
<td>Site currently part of Competitive Dialogue process for Blackwall Reach Regeneration Partnership. Submissions have been received from prospective development partners and a selection of the preferred developer is expected shortly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Clements Hospital</td>
<td>Mile End road London E3 - LB Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>Ex NHS Hospital</td>
<td>Mar 12</td>
<td>1.8494</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Internal only</td>
<td>A strategic site as identified as part of a portfolio of key sites identified for PRSI programme and the family sized intermediate home</td>
<td>Currently identified as key site to form part of the London Private Rented Sector Initiative and family sized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Disposal</td>
<td>Final Stage</td>
<td>Development Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunnel Avenue Trading Estate &amp; Axa site</td>
<td>Tunnel Avenue Greenwich SE10 0PT - LB Greenwich Clear site with all buildings demolished</td>
<td>1.5429</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Part of Quintain Development plan Forms part of the Greenwich Peninsula deal with MDL Will be less when ex Univar site is leased long term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Woolworth's Store</td>
<td>25 East Str Barking IG11 8ES - LB Barking &amp; Dagenham Retail Shop</td>
<td>0.1611</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes Final stage of sale to retailer Disposal underway. Remainder of site required for LBBD project Property disposal underway: to be sold to Sports Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304-314,318-320 Poplar High St</td>
<td>Naval Row E14 - LB Tower Hamlets Small trading estate with tenants Phased disposal from 2012/16</td>
<td>0.5573</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>internal only A strategic site as identified as part of a portfolio of key sites identified for PRSI programme and the family sized intermediate home demonstration project Site currently part of Competitive Dialogue process for Blackwall Reach Regeneration Partnership. Submissions have been received from prospective development partners and a selection of the preferred developer is expected shortly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land North of Evelyn Road</td>
<td>Evelyn Road Silvertown E16 - LB Newham Small plot of land Phased disposal from 2012/16</td>
<td>0.0038</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>yes Little if any value Identified for disposal by auction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane Hill Hospital</td>
<td>Coulsdon CR5 - LB Croydon</td>
<td>Former NHS hospital</td>
<td>Mar 12</td>
<td>82.5152</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Master planners appointed</td>
<td>Key local site with a number of complex ownership issues and ongoing security and maintenance liabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2 Well Cottages &amp; Sover Hse-Cane Hill</td>
<td>Lion Green Road Coulsdon CR5 2NL - LB Croydon</td>
<td>Cane Hill estate cottages</td>
<td>Jun 12</td>
<td>0.3125</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Forms part of the Cane Hill site. See comments above</td>
<td>Part of Cane Hill. Cottage No 2 uninhabitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Land At Dock Road</td>
<td>(Q571) Dock Road E16 - LB Newham</td>
<td>Small area of cleared land</td>
<td>Mar 13</td>
<td>0.0681</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Olympic Legacy discussions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Little or no value</td>
<td>Holding costs from central AMES budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Land At Dock Road</td>
<td>(Q580) Dock Road E16 - LB Newham</td>
<td>Small area of cleared land</td>
<td>Mar 13</td>
<td>0.0961</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Olympic Legacy discussions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Little or no value</td>
<td>Holding costs from central AMES budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Description</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>Sold</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites 6 &amp; 8 East India Dock</td>
<td>6 &amp; 8 East India Sorrel Lane E14 - LB Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>2 small plots of land divided by a road</td>
<td>Dec 11</td>
<td>2.1579</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Internal only</td>
<td>A strategic site as identified as part of a portfolio of key sites identified for PRSI programme</td>
<td>Currently identified as key site to form part of the London Private Rented Sector Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land At Ditchburn Street</td>
<td>Ditchburn Street E14- LB Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>Cleared land leased as car park</td>
<td>Dec 13</td>
<td>0.3549</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Strategic site as forms part of the Blackwall Reach Regeneration Project; part of a JV arrangement that will become unviable if unpicked</td>
<td>Site currently part of Competitive Dialogue process for Blackwall Reach Regeneration Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land At Branch Road</td>
<td>London Docklands E14 - LB Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>A small area of grassland</td>
<td>Dec 11</td>
<td>0.2110</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Property already identified for disposal in 2010/11 as part of the revised LWI strategy.</td>
<td>Ex-London Wide Initiative site planned for disposal as part of the LWI strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Completion Date</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking Riverside Joint venture</td>
<td>Renwick Rd, Barking</td>
<td>Strategic Housing site with Outline consent for 10,800 homes</td>
<td>175 ha</td>
<td>Outline planning permission for 10,800 homes and detailed for 4000 homes</td>
<td>5 years plus</td>
<td>Major strategic site in East London and Thames Gateway. Makes significant contribution to Mayor's targets on housing. JV needs to be reviewed and project relies on significant TfL funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Wharf 118/120 Queensborough - Completed</td>
<td>Bethnal Green LB Hackney</td>
<td>Completed scheme - Equity retention</td>
<td>0.4327</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-strategic asset, but does have unsold equity value. Development completed under London Wide Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187/195 London Road - completed</td>
<td>London Road - LB Croydon</td>
<td>Housing development commenced</td>
<td>0.3067</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-strategic asset, but does have unsold equity value. Development completed under London Wide Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Development Completed</td>
<td>Equity Retention</td>
<td>Strategic Asset</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntley Street</td>
<td>1 - 9 Huntley Str LB Camden</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>0.1993</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Non-strategic asset, but does have unsold equity value. Development completed under London Wide Initiative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Holloway Road</td>
<td>Holloway Road - LB Islington</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
<td>0.3826</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Non-strategic asset, but does have unsold equity value. Under construction would only be justifiable to review LWI equity on completion of development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymington Fields</td>
<td>Lymington Road RM8- LB Barking &amp; Dagenham</td>
<td>Under development</td>
<td>12.6842</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Site in production and further phases included in the family sized intermediate home demonstration project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldonwall Industrial Estate</td>
<td>Whalebone Lane South RM8- LB Baking &amp; Dagenham</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
<td>1.2759</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Site in production (part of Lymington). Holding costs included in Lymington Fields budget-purchases to achieve secondary access to Lymington.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
<td>gloves</td>
<td>fence</td>
<td>Key asset?</td>
<td>Key site?</td>
<td>Security liabilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Street</td>
<td>Amelia Street - LB Southwark</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Under development</td>
<td>0.3799</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Non-strategic asset, but does have unsold equity value</td>
<td>Site reached practical completion August 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catford Stadium</td>
<td>Adenmore Road SE6 - LB Lewisham</td>
<td>Ex stadium site now demolished</td>
<td>Jan 12</td>
<td>2.4894</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Key local sites with planning permission but ongoing maintenance and security liabilities.</td>
<td>Currently identified as key site to form part of the London Private Rented Sector Initiative and possible family sized intermediate home demonstration project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Site Information</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
<td>Development Status</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Equitable</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Rail Site</td>
<td>Off Doggett Rd &amp; Catford Hill SE6-LB Lewisham 4 Compounds adjacent to the stadium</td>
<td>1.6479</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Forms part of the Catford Stadium site. See comments above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Currently identified as key site to form part of the London Private Rented Sector Initiative and the family sized intermediate home demonstration project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan High School - From 1 Feb 11 now with Developer</td>
<td>Rowan Road - LB Merton Large secondary school site</td>
<td>1.6102</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Strategic local site identified for larger private and affordable housing about to dispose of site to developer to go into production on site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Currently identified the HCA land for disposal to developer with approvals in place to go into development on site. High on-going holding costs due to derelict state of old school buildings#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth Southside - completed</td>
<td>Off Mapleton Road - LB Wandesworth Completed scheme - Equity retention development completed</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Non-strategic asset, but does have unsold equity value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development completed as part of LWI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-88 Newington Butts</td>
<td>Newington Butts SE1 - LB Southwark</td>
<td>Ex Hotel site now demolished</td>
<td>Mar13</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Key local site but with ongoing maintenance and security liabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary Land At Newington</td>
<td>Off Churchyard Road SE1- LB Southwark</td>
<td>A small section of land</td>
<td>Mar 12</td>
<td>0.0624</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>See Above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenchard House</td>
<td>19-25 Broadwick Street W1 - LB Westminster</td>
<td>7 storey ex Met Police hotel</td>
<td>Mar 12</td>
<td>0.1336</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes Early stage of sale</td>
<td>Identified for a managed disposal as per the LWI strategy already approved by London Board. In keeping with local views and opinions and maximising affordable hsg output on site with Borough keen to retain a high level of key worker provision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identified for a managed disposal as per the LWI strategy already approved by London Board. In keeping with local views and opinions and maximising affordable hsg output on site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Opposition/Authority</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>手头时间</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Sale/Transfer</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brenley Playing Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grassland</td>
<td>Sep 10</td>
<td>2.9053</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Currently under offer for £3m from development partner. Planning submitted but not yet secured - key local site with potential for family housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedars Avenue - LB Merton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site part of the London Wide Initiative and expected to go on site in the current financial year and linked to family sized home demonstration project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Middlesex University Hosp - Hounslow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing development commenced due to complete September 10</td>
<td>Under development</td>
<td>2.0663</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Opportunity to sell equity stake in LWI homes and transfer freehold to management company only at completion not during development as it would affect viability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleworth - LB Hounslow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final phase under construction as part of the London Wide Initiative. Capital receipt of £1.16m due March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>Devolped</td>
<td>Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich District Hospital</td>
<td>Greenwich - Vanbrugh Hill SE10 LB Greenwich</td>
<td>Former HNS hospital</td>
<td>Feb 12</td>
<td>2.8108</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esso Service Station, Orchard Wharf = LB Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>Petrol Station</td>
<td>long term</td>
<td>0.3327</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Limeharbour</td>
<td>7 Limeharbour - LB Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>27,000 sq ft Office block</td>
<td>long term</td>
<td>0.2958</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Limeharbour Court</td>
<td>5 Limeharbour - LB Tower Hamlet</td>
<td>33,000 sq ft Office block</td>
<td>long term</td>
<td>0.1932</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastmaker Court</td>
<td>30/34 Mastmaker Road - LB Tower Hamlet</td>
<td>Office block</td>
<td>long term</td>
<td>0.9499</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich View</td>
<td>Greenwich View LB Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>Office block</td>
<td>long term</td>
<td>2.0978</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LDA Surplus Land for Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Address Postcode</th>
<th>Hectares Available for Development</th>
<th>Preferred option for each site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chequers Corner (Chequers Lane/New Rd)</td>
<td>Chequers Corner</td>
<td>Dagenham</td>
<td>RM9 6LA</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Predominantly residential led development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam Park plot 1</td>
<td>Thames Avenue</td>
<td>Dagenham</td>
<td>RM9 6DE</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>Predominantly residential with ancillary, community and retail uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam Park plot 2</td>
<td>Thames Avenue</td>
<td>Dagenham</td>
<td>RM9 6DE</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>Predominantly residential with ancillary, community and retail uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam Park plot 3</td>
<td>Thames Avenue</td>
<td>Dagenham</td>
<td>RM9 6DE</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>Predominantly residential with ancillary, community and retail uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam Reach 6/Courier Road</td>
<td>Courier Road &amp; Courier Way</td>
<td>Dagenham</td>
<td>RM9 6SA</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>Designated for industrial and potentially waste purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam Reach 5 Plot 6</td>
<td>Consul Avenue</td>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>RM13 8GJ</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>Designated for industrial purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam Reach 5 Plot 8</td>
<td>Consul Avenue</td>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>RM13 8GJ</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>Designated for industrial purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam Reach 5 Plot 12</td>
<td>Consul Avenue</td>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>RM13 8GJ</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>Designated for industrial purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh View Industrial Estate</td>
<td>Ferry Lane</td>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>RM13 9BJ</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>Designated for industrial purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam Reach 8 (Easter Park/Murex) Plot 8c</td>
<td>87-95 Ferry Lane</td>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>RM13 9YE</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Designated for industrial purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam Reach 8 (Easter Park/Murex) Plot 9</td>
<td>95 Ferry Lane</td>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>RM13 9YE</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Designated for industrial purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workspace/29-30 &amp; 51-53 Ferry Lane</td>
<td>Ferry Lane</td>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>RM13 9YH</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>Designated for industrial purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEME Site - Hotel Plot</td>
<td>Marsh Way</td>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>RM13 8EU</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>Planning permission for a 127 room hotel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEME Site - Southern Plot</td>
<td>Marsh Way</td>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>RM13 8EU</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maskills West (Maskell 1)</td>
<td>Hindmans Way</td>
<td>Dagenham</td>
<td>RM9 6LB</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>Designated for industrial and potentially waste purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvertown Way, Canning Town</td>
<td>Silvertown Way, Canning Town</td>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>E16</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>Residential led mixed use scheme being considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelvetrees Crescent</td>
<td>Twelvetrees Crescent, Bromley by Bow</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>Designated as an Industrial Employment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Walden Street</td>
<td>28 Walden Street, Stepney</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>E1 2AN</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Designated the site for affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip of Land at Leyton Business Park</td>
<td>Orient Way, Leyton</td>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>E10 7FE</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>Potential for residential, Waltham Forest consulting on AAP at present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarab Close, Thames Wharf</td>
<td>Dock Road, Canning Town</td>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>E16 1DF</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>Designated industrial or waste use, safeguarded for river crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephenson Street (inc Edwin Shirley)</td>
<td>Stephenson Street, Canning Town</td>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>E16 4SB</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Mixed use development including residential, business and general industrial uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neeld Parade, Wembley</td>
<td>Neeld Parade, Wembley Hill Road</td>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>HA9 6SW</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Area designated for retail, community, commercial and residential uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart Avenue Plot C</td>
<td>White Hart Avenue</td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>SE18 1DH</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>Planning permission for an industrial business park, partly constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart Avenue Plot D</td>
<td>White Hart Avenue</td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>SE18 1DH</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>Planning permission for an industrial business park, partly constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart Avenue Plot E</td>
<td>White Hart Avenue</td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>SE18 1DH</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>Planning permission for an industrial business park, partly constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart Avenue Plot F</td>
<td>White Hart Avenue</td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>SE18 1DH</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>Planning permission for an industrial business park, partly constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham - High Street Site</td>
<td>Lewisham High Street</td>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>SE13 5JH</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>High density mixed use development of retail, office, hotel, residential, education, health and leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham - Quaggy River Site</td>
<td>34-46 Lewisham High Street</td>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>SE13 5JH</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>High density mixed use development of retail, office, hotel, residential, education, health and leisure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royals Business Park</td>
<td>Royal Albert Way, Royal Albert Dock</td>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>E16 2QT</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>Major opportunity zone - science or business park with ancillary retail, leisure, education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Island</td>
<td>Woolwich Manor Way, Royal Docks</td>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>E16</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>Will permit low intensity leisure and tourism related facilities. Partially in the PSZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvertown Dock</td>
<td>Charles Street, Royal Docks</td>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>E16 2BY</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>Comprehensive mixed use development include residential with ancillary schools, shops, play facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Street</td>
<td>Charles Street, Royal Docks</td>
<td>E16 2BY</td>
<td>Comprehensive mixed use development, subject to occupiers on long leases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armada 2</td>
<td>Armada Way, Royal Albert Basin</td>
<td>E16</td>
<td>Vacant industrial site, part safeguarded for Thames Gateway Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallions Park</td>
<td>Armada Way, Royal Albert Basin</td>
<td>E16</td>
<td>Designated for residential and subject to a development agreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armada 3b</td>
<td>Thames Road, Royal Albert Basin</td>
<td>E16</td>
<td>Riverside residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Appendix E – MQ67/2011 – Public Surplus Land TfL

### Public Sector Land Sites Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Category *</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>TENURE Freehold/Leasehold</th>
<th>SOURCE e.g. Brownfield/Operational/Surplus</th>
<th>PLANNING e.g. No planning on site/identified as London Plan Opp Area</th>
<th>SIZE Ha</th>
<th>Adjacency to Operational Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>In hand</td>
<td>A40 Sites, Ealing</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>Freehold</td>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td>No planning on site</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>In hand</td>
<td>Fleet Street Hill (ELL)</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>Freehold</td>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td>No planning on site</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>In hand</td>
<td>Grove Green Road, Leytonstone, E14</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>Freehold</td>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td>No planning on site</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>In hand</td>
<td>Kidbrooke</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>Freehold</td>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td>No planning on site</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>In hand</td>
<td>Lanrick Road, E14</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>Freehold</td>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td>No planning on site</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>In hand</td>
<td>Streatham Hill (Corner of Brixton Hill and Christchurch Road)</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>Freehold</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>No planning on site</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>In hand</td>
<td>Shoreditch (off Pedley Street), E1</td>
<td>LUL</td>
<td>Freehold</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>No planning on site</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>In hand</td>
<td>Hounslow, TW3</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>Freehold</td>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td>No planning on site</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 7.964

---

**Important Notes:**

- **In Hand** - These sites relate to sites/projects under current evaluation where TfL is endeavouring to intensify use around operational infrastructure so areas are to a degree subjective.
- **Long Term Aspiration** - These are sites where the property team can see opportunities for future development around operational infrastructure but development potential is not clear.
- **Source** - Almost all or sites are Brownfield: a small number are 'surplus' the majority of projects are trying to create value around operational infrastructure.
- **Planning** - On almost all sites TfL relies on third parties to take sites through planning the system using private sector resources and expertise.
- **Size** - As almost all sites have an operational interface there is a question about what is operational and what is surplus, and of that whether it only represents air rights.
Appendix F - Q447/2011 - Suburban Station Security

Full list of stations covered

Croydon:
Southern Rail

East Croydon
Selhurst
Thornton Heath
Norbury
Streatham Common
Streatham
Waddon
Wallington
Sutton
Carshalton Beeches

Bromley South:
Southeastern Rail

Bromley South
Shortlands
Bromley North
Ravensbourne
Beckenham Hill
Bellingham
Catford (Ladywell, Catford Bridge)
Hither Green
Crofton Park
Grove Park (Sunbridge Park)
Elmstead Wood
Chislehurst
Bickley
St. Mary Cray
Petts Wood
Orpington

Stratford
National Express

Stratford
Maryland
Forest Gate
Manor Park
Ilford
Seven Kings
Goodmayes
Chadwell Heath
Romford

Acton Mainline
First Great Western

Acton Mainline
Ealing Broadway West Ealing
Hanwell
Southall
Hayes and Harlington
Drayton Green
Castle Bar Park
South Greenford
Greenford (interchange)

Seven Sisters
National Express

Seven Sisters Stamford Hill
Stoke Newington
Rectory Road
Hackney Downs
London Fields
Cambridge Heath
Bethnal Green
Bruce Grove
White Hart Lane
Silver Street
Edmonton Green
Bush Hill Park
Enfield Town

Finsbury Park
First Capital Connect

Finsbury Park
Harringey
Hornsey
Alexandra Palace
New Southgate
Oakleigh Park
New Barnet
Hadley Wood

Wimbledon
South West Trains

Wimbledon
Raynes Park
Berrylands
Surbiton
Motspur Park
Maldon Manor
Tolworth
Chessington North
Chessington South
Worcester Park
### Appendix G - Q490/2011 – District Line Closures 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Service Suspended</th>
<th>Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sat 26-Feb-11</td>
<td>Sun 27-Feb-11</td>
<td>District, Hammersmith &amp; City and Metropolitan</td>
<td>Tower Hill to Bromley-by-Bow (District) Liverpool Street to Barking (H&amp;C) Moorgate to Aldgate (Metropolitan)</td>
<td>Ballast and Track replacement and Drainage at West Ham, Points &amp; Crossing Works at Plaistow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 05-Mar-11</td>
<td>Sat 05-Mar-11</td>
<td>Circle, District, Hammersmith &amp; City and Metropolitan</td>
<td>Bromley-by-Bow to Barking (westbound)/Upney (eastbound) (District) Liverpool Street to Barking (H&amp;C) Moorgate to Aldgate (Metropolitan) between 13:00 and 19:00 Paddington to Hammersmith (Circle)</td>
<td>Ballast and Track replacement at West Ham, Points &amp; Crossing Works at Plaistow, and Drainage at Becontree to Dagenham Heathway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 05-Mar-11</td>
<td>Sun 06-Mar-11</td>
<td>Circle, District, Hammersmith &amp; City and Metropolitan</td>
<td>Bromley-by-Bow to Upminster (District) Liverpool Street to Barking (H&amp;C) Moorgate to Aldgate (Metropolitan) until 13:00 and after 19:00 Saturday and all day Sunday Paddington to Hammersmith (Circle)</td>
<td>Ballast and Track replacement at West Ham, Points &amp; Crossing Works at Plaistow, and Drainage at Becontree to Dagenham Heathway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 19-Mar-11</td>
<td>Sun 20-Mar-11</td>
<td>Circle, District, Hammersmith &amp; City and Metropolitan</td>
<td>Tower Hill to Upminster (District) Liverpool Street to Barking (H&amp;C) Moorgate to Aldgate (Metropolitan) Paddington to Hammersmith (Circle)</td>
<td>Ballast and Track replacement prep. Network Rail resignalling works at West Ham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 26-Mar-11</td>
<td>Sun 27-Mar-11</td>
<td>Circle, District, Hammersmith &amp; City and Metropolitan</td>
<td>Tower Hill to Upminster (District) Liverpool Street to Barking (H&amp;C) Moorgate to Aldgate (Metropolitan) Paddington to Hammersmith (Circle)</td>
<td>Ballast and Track replacement prep. Network Rail resignalling works at West Ham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 09 Apr-11</td>
<td>Sun 10 Apr-11</td>
<td>District, Hammersmith &amp; City and Metropolitan</td>
<td>Tower Hill to Upminster (District) Liverpool Street to Barking (H&amp;C) Moorgate to Aldgate (Metropolitan)</td>
<td>Ballast and Track replacement prep. Network Rail resignalling works at West Ham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 16 Apr-11</td>
<td>Sat 16 Apr-11</td>
<td>District, Hammersmith &amp; City and Metropolitan</td>
<td>Bromley-by-Bow to East Ham (District) Liverpool Street to Barking (H&amp;C) Moorgate to Aldgate (Metropolitan)</td>
<td>Ballast and Track replacement prep. Network Rail resignalling works at West Ham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 30 Apr-11</td>
<td>Mon 02 May-11</td>
<td>Circle, District, Hammersmith &amp; City and Metropolitan</td>
<td>Embankment to West Ham (District) Edgware Road to Barking (H&amp;C) Baker Street to Aldgate (Metropolitan) No Circle</td>
<td>Ballast and Track replacement &amp; Track Drainage. Thameslink Blackfriars, Nosing stones, tactiles and finishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 07 May-11</td>
<td>Sun 08 May-11</td>
<td>Circle, District, Hammersmith &amp; City and Metropolitan</td>
<td>Embankment to East Ham (District) King's Cross to Barking (H&amp;C) Baker Street to Aldgate (Metropolitan) No Circle</td>
<td>Ballast and Track replacement (Bromley By Bow to Mile End), West Ham Signalling project (West Ham to Upton Park), Crossrail enabling works (Liverpool St)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 14 May-11</td>
<td>Sun 15 May-11</td>
<td>District, Hammersmith &amp; City and Metropolitan</td>
<td>Tower Hill to Dagenham East (District) Liverpool Street to Barking (H&amp;C) Moorgate to Aldgate (Metropolitan)</td>
<td>Ballast and Track replacement, Train Buffer Installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 21-May-11</td>
<td>Sun 22-May-11</td>
<td>Circle, District, Hammersmith &amp; City and Metropolitan</td>
<td>Tower Hill to Dagenham East (District) King's Cross St. Pancras to Barking (H&amp;C) Baker Street to Aldgate (Metropolitan) all day Saturday and until 12:00 Sunday.</td>
<td>Ballast and Track replacement, Train Buffer Installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun 22-May-11</td>
<td>Sun 22-May-11</td>
<td>Circle, District, Hammersmith &amp; City and Metropolitan</td>
<td>Tower Hill to Barking/Upney (District) King's Cross St. Pancras to Barking (H&amp;C) Baker Street to Aldgate (Metropolitan) from 12:00 until 20:30 Sunday</td>
<td>Ballast and Track replacement, Train Buffer Installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun 22-May-11</td>
<td>Sun 22-May-11</td>
<td>Circle, District, Hammersmith &amp; City and Metropolitan</td>
<td>Tower Hill to Dagenham East (District) King's Cross St. Pancras to Barking (H&amp;C) Baker Street to Aldgate (Metropolitan) from 20:30 Sunday</td>
<td>Ballast and Track replacement, Train Buffer Installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 11-Jun-11</td>
<td>Sun 12-Jun-11</td>
<td>Circle, District Metropolitan and Hammersmith &amp; City</td>
<td>South Kensington to East Ham (District) Liverpool Street to Barking (H&amp;C) Moorgate to Aldgate (Metropolitan)</td>
<td>Ballast and Track replacement and Track Drainage. Thameslink Blackfriars, Nosing stones, tactiles and finishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 02 Jul-11</td>
<td>Sun 03 Jul-11</td>
<td>Circle, District, Hammersmith &amp; City and Metropolitan</td>
<td>Tower Hill to Upney (District) Liverpool Street to Barking (H&amp;C) Moorgate to Aldgate (Met) Edgware Road to Hammersmith (Circle)</td>
<td>Signalling Upgrades (Aldgate East to Barking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 03-Sep-11</td>
<td>Sun 04-Sep-11</td>
<td>Circle, District and Hammersmith &amp; City</td>
<td>South Kensington to East Ham (District) Liverpool Street to Whitechapel (H&amp;C) No Circle</td>
<td>Ballast and Track replacement and Track Drainage. Thameslink Blackfriars, Nosing stones, tactiles and finishing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H - Q753/2011 - Cycle Superhighway 2

Cycle Superhighway 7:

Cycle Superhighway 3:
1. **Summary**

1.1 This report provides background information in relation to the Mayor’s proposals to create a Mayoral Development Corporation for the Olympic Park and the surrounding area.

2. **Recommendations**

2.1 *That the Assembly puts questions to Sir Simon Milton, Deputy Mayor and Chief of Staff, on the Mayor’s proposals to create a Mayoral Development Corporation for the Olympic Park and surrounding area;*

2.2 *That the Assembly agrees to delegate authority to the Chair, in consultation with the leaders of Assembly party Groups, to respond, on the Assembly’s behalf, to the Mayor’s consultation document: ‘Olympic Park Legacy Corporation: Proposals by the Mayor of London for public consultation’.*

3. **Background**

3.1 The Localism Bill includes provision for the designation of Mayoral development areas, and the creation of Mayoral development corporations (MDCs) to drive regeneration in those areas. The Bill’s provisions include a requirement that the Mayor consult before he designates a Mayoral development area, and the Assembly and each constituency member of the London Assembly whose Assembly constituency contains any part of the Mayoral development area are named in the Bill as persons that must be consulted.

3.2 Accordingly, the Mayor has now issued a consultation document in relation to his proposals to create a new MDC – the Olympic Park Legacy Corporation – centred on the Olympic Park, to take over the assets and responsibilities of the existing Olympic Park Legacy Company (OPLC), and also to take on some programmes and assets of other agencies currently working in the area, becoming the single body with responsibility for driving regeneration in the area.

3.3 The consultation document sets out seven questions which relate to the strategic purpose, proposed boundary and powers of the proposed MDC, and alternative options for meeting the Mayor’s
objectives in relation to the Olympic area. The full consultation document can be found on the following area of the GLA’s website: http://www.london.gov.uk/mdcconsultation. The consultation period ends on 28 April.

4. Issues for Consideration

4.1 Sir Simon Milton, Deputy Mayor and Chief of Staff, has been invited to this meeting to answer Members questions in relation to the Mayor’s proposals to create an MDC for the Olympic area.

4.2 The Chair will put the following initial question to Sir Simon: “Can you explain the Mayor’s proposals to create an MDC for the Olympic Park area?” Assembly Members will then ask oral questions on the Mayor’s proposals.

4.3 The Assembly is recommended to agree to delegate authority to the Chair, in consultation with the leaders of Assembly party Groups, to respond, following the meeting and on the Assembly’s behalf, to the Mayor’s consultation document in relation to these proposals.

4.4 For the reasons set out in the consultation document, the Mayor believes it is essential that the new MDC becomes operational on 1 April 2012. In order to achieve this, the Mayor has decided to carry out this consultation before the Localism Bill receives Royal Assent, noting that the Localism Bill allows him to take into account consultation conducted before the Bill becomes law.

4.5 The consultation document explains that the Mayor has considered a range of options for organisational arrangements to meet his objectives for the Olympic area. It is emphasised that the status quo is not one of them; both the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) and London Thames Gateway Development Corporation (LTGDC), which have made major contributions to the area in recent times, are coming to the end of their lives, and their dissolution will in particular force a change in responsibility for planning decisions in the area, and leave the area without a dedicated regeneration agency.

4.6 In light of these changes, the Mayor has considered three broad options for long-term delivery arrangements:

1. To retain and reform the OPLC and allow development control responsibilities to revert to local authorities;
2. To wind up the OPLC and transfer delivery responsibility to the host boroughs; and
3. To designate a Mayoral development area and establish a Mayoral development corporation.

4.7 The Mayor’s view is that Option 3 is the most effective means of ensuring clear vision and leadership.

MDC boundary

4.8 The Mayor is determined to ensure that regeneration goes beyond the Olympic Park to ensure that there is integration with surrounding areas. To this end, the proposed boundary of the Mayoral development area extends beyond the present OPLC boundary to include land owned by the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, including Eton Manor, the Olympic Village, Stratford City development site including Westfield and a number of fringe areas including Hackney Wick, Fish Island and Bromley-by-Bow North.
MDC Powers

4.9 The Corporation would become the planning authority for the area for the purposes of plan-making and development control and for setting and collecting the Community Infrastructure Levy. The Mayor is keen for the MDC to have proposed power to grant discretionary business rate relief – but has not yet decided whether and how that power could be exercised.

4.10 The Mayor wants the consolidation of assets of all regeneration bodies working in the area; so the assets of the OPLC and of the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation would transfer to the new MDC. Given the good working relations between OPLC and London and Continental Railway and Stratford Village Development Corporation the Mayor is looking for “a unified approach to marketing, development and management of the publicly-owned assets in the area”.

MDC Governance and Funding

4.11 The Mayor is minded to appoint existing board members to the new OPLC Board at the point of transition. The Corporation would have a Planning Committee which will have a level of representation from the host boroughs reflecting the area of each borough contained within the MDC’s area. Key planning policy decisions will be approved by this committee and also by the Mayor.

4.12 The Mayor expects the Corporation to inherit the existing funding settlement for the OPLC. The Mayor also expects that where functions and programmes are transferred they will come with resources originally attached to them. The Mayor argues that over the long term the Corporation will generate returns through the development of its assets. However, in the short term at least, the Corporation will still require public sector grant income in order to meet its core operational overheads. These are to be met through grant from Mayor’s own resources and from Government.

4.13 The Mayor intends for the OPLC to begin operation on 1 April 2012, with planning functions transferring from ODA and LTGDC and local authorities on 1 October 2012.

5. Legal Implications

5.1 The Assembly has the power to do what is recommended in this report.

6. Financial Implications

6.1 There are no direct financial implications in relation to this report.

List of appendices to this report: None.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
List of Background Papers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Officer:</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:richard.derecki@london.gov.uk">richard.derecki@london.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Subject: Petition

Report to: London Assembly (Plenary)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat  
Date: 16 March 2011  

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

1.1 This report sets out details of a petition to be presented at this meeting by Assembly Members.

2. Recommendation

2.1 The Assembly is recommended to note the petition listed at paragraph 4 of the report and to decide whether to refer the petition, and if so where to, and to seek a response to the points raised.

3. Background

3.1 Standing Orders 3.18 to 3.19 make provision for the presentation of petitions by an Assembly Member at an ordinary meeting of the Assembly.

A petition to be presented must –

(a) Be addressed to the Mayor, the Assembly, a Functional Body (as the case may be);

(b) Clearly indicate the name, address and contact telephone number of the person organising the petition, or where the petition was organised on the internet, its data controller;

(c) Be presented in the form of printed sheets, each of which includes the “prayer” of the petition (the “prayer” is the formal request or other subject matter of the petition) or, if the petition was organised on the internet, clearly demonstrate that internet users who subscribed to the petition knew what the prayer was;

(d) Include each petitioner’s legible name and address, as well as their signatures or, where the petition was organised on the internet, their names and email addresses;

(e) Indicate the total number of manual or electronic signatories to the petition; and
(d) Refer to matters within the responsibilities of the Mayor, the London Assembly or the functional bodies, or to matters of importance to Greater London.

3.2 Notice of the intention to present a petition at an Assembly meeting and a copy of the petition must be given to the Executive Director of the Secretariat by no later than 12 noon six clear working days before that meeting.

3.3 Under Standing Orders the Member presenting the petition will read out the prayer of the petition (but not the signatories). The Assembly will not debate the petition. If the Assembly agrees without debate, the petition will be forwarded to the Mayor, Functional Body, relevant committee or other organisation with a request for a response to the points made by the petitioner. The response received will be reported to the Assembly for information and forwarded to the petition’s organiser. The petition and the response received will be published in the appropriate Assembly Minutes.

4. Petition to be presented

4.1 Notice of the following petition has been received:

4.2 A petition, received by John Biggs AM, is to be presented to the London Assembly, in accordance with Standing Orders 3.18 to 3.19, saying:

“We the undersigned call upon the Mayor and the Members of the Greater London Authority to support the people of Tower Hamlets in protecting King Edward VII Memorial Park (Shadwell Park) from the insensitive and destructive proposals of Thames Water. We were dismayed to see that, in his initial response, the Mayor has not requested Thames Water to investigate alternative brownfield sites for the Super Sewer connector planned for the foreshore of the park, but has accepted the proposals at face value.

“The Park is an important part of our heritage. In East London, our history and demographics put open space at a premium. A local petition asks Thames Water ‘to find an alternative site to the Greenfield site in the park, children’s playground, riverside walkway and riverfront at King Edward Park’. It has attracted over 2000 signatures online and hard copy. We ask the Mayor and the Members to champion the local community’s efforts to protect this important amenity.

“Our park regularly wins the Green Flag Award. It is an open space where it is safe for children to play and people to walk, jog and exercise their dogs without fear of traffic. We regularly hear about the legacy of the London Olympics. It is ironic that the largest open space between Tower Hill and the Isle of Dogs is to be turned into an industrial site under these proposals. The petitions asks that you require Thames Water to consider alternative brownfield sites, in addition to those identified in Phase 1 of the consultation, to save the park dedicated in 1922 “to the use and enjoyment of the people of East London, forever”.

The petition has 144 signatures.

The contact person for this petition is: Carl Dunsire, 150 Free Trade Wharf, E14.
5. Legal Implications

5.1 By virtues of sections 59, 34 and 53 of the GLA Act 1999 (as amended), the Assembly has the power to do what is recommended in this report.

6. Financial Implications

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

List of appendices to this report: None.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List of Background Papers: None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Officer:</th>
<th>Rebecca Arnold, Committee Services Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>020 7983 4421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rebecca.arnold@london.gov.uk">rebecca.arnold@london.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Subject: Petitions Update

Report to: London Assembly (Plenary)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat | Date: 16 March 2011

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

1.1 The Assembly is asked to note the responses received to the petitions presented at recent Assembly meetings.

2. Recommendation

2.1 That Assembly notes the responses received to petitions presented at recent Assembly meetings.

3. Background

3.1 In accordance with the procedure set out in the Authority’s Standing Orders, Assembly Members may present petitions to the Assembly concerning any matter within the responsibilities of the Mayor of London, the London Assembly or the Functional Bodies, or otherwise of importance to Londoners.

3.2 Any responses received are reported to the Assembly for information.

3.3 Set out at Appendix 1 are the responses received to petitions presented at recent Assembly meetings.

4. Issues for Consideration

4.1 Appendix 1 lists the date upon which the responses were received and includes a short summary of the responses given. A copy of the full responses is available from Secretariat (contact details at end of report).

5. Legal Implications

5.1 Byvirtue of sections 59, 34 and 53 of the GLA Act 1999 (as amended), the Assembly has the power to do what is recommended in this report.
6. **Financial Implications**

6.1 There are no direct finance implications arising from this report

---
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Appendix 1

Summary of Response Received to a Petition Presented at a Recent Assembly Meeting

Petition submitted on 8 December 2010 (Plenary)

1. **Valerie Shawcross AM** presented a petition with the following prayer:

   “We the undersigned call on the Mayor of London to extend the Barclays’ Cycle Hire Scheme to Stockwell at the earliest possible opportunity.

The Mayor sent a written response on 19 January 2011 saying:

“You will know that in October 2010 it was announced that the Comprehensive Spending Review had protected funding for London’s cycling revolution. This includes the extension of Barclay’s Cycle Hire Scheme ahead of the London 2012 Games. A public announcement was made on 10 November regarding Phase 2 expansion. Phase 2 will see approximately 2,700 docking points created in East London across Tower Hamlets, North Shoreditch, Bethnal Green, Bow, Canary Wharf, Mile End, Poplar and near the Olympic Park to support the forthcoming Olympic and Paralympic Games. Another 1,500 will be added across central London by 2012, to intensify the existing scheme area.

“Stockwell is just outside the current scheme boundary and the plans for Phase 2 do not include extending the scheme to Stockwell. However, if third party funding for new docking stations was secured through support from the local borough, businesses, Section 106 agreements or LIP funding then there would be a good case for future development of Barclays Hire Scheme in these areas.”

Petitions submitted on 19 January 2011 (Plenary)

2. **Caroline Pidgeon AM** presented two petitions with the following prayers:

   1) “I/we the undersigned support the campaign to protect the opening hours of South Woodford ticket office. We call on the Mayor to honour his 2008 manifesto commitment to safeguard London’s ticket offices. We believe that ticket offices play a vital role in giving help to those most vulnerable in society when they are using the Underground. We believe consultation on these proposals has been poor with many Londoners unaware of them. We call on the Mayor to keep London’s ticket offices open and not to reduce their ability to help passengers.”

   2) “I/we the undersigned support the campaign to keep open the ticket offices at South Woodford and Woodford Station. We call on Mayor Boris Johnson to honour his pre-election promise to protect ticket offices”

The Mayor sent a written response on 1 March 2011 saying:
“I can confirm that the position has not changed since I last wrote to you on this matter. As I have already advised, the changes London Underground (LU) are proposing across the network are driven by the following:

- The significant decline in the number of customers using ticket offices, particularly following the success of the Oyster card;
- The tube investment programme and the need to adapt our staffing to reflect the introduction of new technology;
- The need to identify ways to deliver even greater value for tax and fare payers, without compromising the aspects of our service that are essential.

“At the core of LU’s proposals is a commitment to maintaining fully and safely staffed stations at all times of the day and night when our services are running. Recent years have seen a major improvement in safety and security on trains and at stations. In addition to the greater presence of LU staff at gate lines and platforms, the number of Police patrolling the Tube network has risen from 450 to more than 700 today and last year crime fell eight per cent, with just 13 crimes for every million customer journeys. There are now over 12,000 CCTV cameras on the Tube network, with that figure due to rise to more than 14,000 in years to come, as well as more than 1,500 help points.

“LU has also committed to keeping ticket offices open at every one of our stations that currently has a ticket office service (with the exception of Cannon Street which is being redeveloped) – but with revised opening times to reflect the decline in demand for ticket offices. Today, only 1 in 20 journeys on the Tube starts with a visit to the ticket office and some 80% of journeys are made using an Oyster card. There is a growing use of internet sales and automatic top-ups and on stations, there is now much greater provision of self-service ticket machines, and a network of 4,000 ticket stops at shops and retail outlets across the capital.

“Therefore we have an opportunity to deploy staff to areas of the station where they can provide greater assistance – on platforms, ticket halls and gate lines, rather than behind a glass screen in a very lightly used ticket office.

“The number of staff on duty at any particular time of day will depend on the numbers of people using the station and the characteristics and complexity of the station itself. Many stations are also governed by regulations that specify minimum number of staff required for the station to remain open. These will continue to apply and will not change.”

3. **Kit Malthouse AM** presented a petition with the following prayer:

"We the undersigned who live or work in Redcliffe Gardens, Finborough Road and neighbouring streets call on the Council of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and Transport for London to take steps to control the excessive speed of vehicles and motor bicycles in Redcliffe Gardens and Finborough Road which is a danger to pedestrians and cyclists."

The Mayor sent a written response on 1 March 2011 saying:

“As you are aware, Transport for London is responsible for both Redcliffe Gardens and Finborough Road."
“Using data supplied by the Metropolitan Police, TfL monitors the volume of collisions across London which involve personal injury, in order to inform a priority of locations with the most pressing accident problem.

“This approach ensures TfL targets its resources intelligently in order to achieve the greatest impact in terms of reducing casualties. I have asked TfL to look into the collision record for Finborough Road and Redcliffe Gardens when compared with the wider road network and, in particular, the number of speed related collisions.

“Across the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, the average number of collisions for A class roads like Finborough Road and Redcliffe Gardens is 14.74 collisions per kilometer, per year. TfL’s collision data confirms that on Redcliffe Gardens over the last three year period to September 2010 (the latest for when information is available from the Police), there were 10 collisions on the section between Old Brompton Road and Fulham Road; a section of 0.71km in length.

“The data indicates that the speed of the vehicles involved was a factor in only one of these collisions. On Finborough Road over the last three year period to September 2010, there were 13 collisions on the section between Old Brompton Road and Fulham Road; a section of 0.76km in length. The data indicates that the speed of vehicles involved was a factor in two of these collisions.

“When compared against the average number of collisions on A roads across the Royal Boroughs, it appears that there is not a particularly acute accident problem on either Redcliffe Gardens or Finborough Road caused by speeding traffic.

“TfL is considering the feasibility of a scheme to improve the visibility to traffic of existing zebra crossings on Redcliffe Gardens, but in its 2011/2012 programme there are no plans to pursue further schemes along either road.

“However, TfL will continue to monitor collisions across London to ensure that resources are targeted at those locations with the most pressing problem, in order to continue reducing the number of collisions in which victims are killed or seriously injured.”
Subject: Request for use of Section 60 (1) Powers – Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee

Report to: London Assembly

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat Date: 16 March 2011

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

1.1 This report requests that the Assembly uses its powers under s.60 (1) of the GLA Act.

2. Recommendation

2.1 That the Assembly agrees to the request of the Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee to use its powers under Section 60 (1) of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 (as amended) to request that the Mayor responds to the recommendations in the Committee’s report, A Sporting Legacy for London?

3. Background

3.1 The Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee (EDCST) agreed at its meeting on 20 July 2010 to undertake a review into the progress made towards ensuring a successful sporting legacy following the 2012 Games. The terms of reference were:

- To examine what progress has been made in London’s Olympic and Paralympic sporting legacy targets; and
- To review the Mayor’s proposed use of available budget.

3.1 The Committee’s final report, agreed at the EDCST meeting of 15 February 2011, is attached as Appendix 1 (for Members only). It is also available at http://www.london.gov.uk/who-runs-london/the-london-assembly/publications.

3.2 The report sets out the Committee’s assessment of the progress that has been made to date towards a significant and sustained increase in public participation in sporting activities, and makes recommendations for further work to build on what has already been achieved.
3.3 The report makes the following recommendations

**Recommendation 1**
We recommend that the Sports Commissioner and London Community Sports Board develop their partnership approach to incorporate the local health and education sectors. We ask that the Sports Commissioner report back to the Committee by May 2011 on how she plans to ensure the state and independent educations sectors, and local and regional health providers, can contribute to the Mayor’s strategic aims for sports participation; and what the timescale is for this work.

**Recommendation 2**
We recommend that the Sports Commissioner and the London Community Sports Board negotiate with LOCOG to broaden the way the Olympic brand could be used to raise the profile of the work being done to achieve a sports participation legacy. We ask that the Sports Commissioner report back to the Committee on this in May 2011.

**Recommendation 3**
We recommend that after the announcement of the second round of successful bids for the facilities fund in May 2011, the Mayor’s Sports Commissioner report to the Committee on how the Mayor’s funding is adding to the supply of sports facilities in areas where demand exceeds supply.

**Recommendation 4**
We recommend that the Mayor’s Sports Commissioner evaluate the costs and benefits of the different approaches that have been taken to managing and allocating the Mayor’s funds. We ask that she report back to the Committee in May 2011 on the outcome of this review and how they will be taken into account in future funding rounds.

**Recommendation 5**
We recommend that in December 2011 the Mayor’s Sports Commissioner report to the Committee on the outcomes from the grants awarded from the Mayor’s sports funds. This should include details of the numbers of additional people who have started taking part in sport and progress against other social objectives set out for the funds.

We further recommend that in reporting back to the Committee in December 2011, the Mayor’s Sport Commissioner set out how the work of the London Community Sports Board has sought to influence the funding decisions of others and the progress that has been made in filling the strategic gaps identified by the Board’s work.

**Recommendation 6**
We recommend that the Mayor commit to retaining a role for his Sports Commissioner and the London Community Sport Board after 2012. We ask that in a response to this report in May 2011 he set out his plans for delivering a sporting legacy beyond 2012 and the extent to which seed funding might be available to ensure the GLA role is retained.

**Recommendation 7**
We recommend that by May 2011 the Mayor set out to the Committee: whether he remains committed to a 90 per cent target for community use of Olympic Park facilities; and how he proposes to meet any target, with key milestones and a timetable for achieving it. In doing so, he should address the question of whether there is a role for his Sports Commissioner on the OPLC, and
any successor body, or what alternative mechanism he proposes to ensure community access is central to decisions about the Park after the Games.

We further recommend that the Olympic Park Legacy Company ensures targets for community access are included in its ongoing discussions with potential future tenants or owners of sporting facilities on the Olympic Park.

4. **Issues for Consideration**

4.1 Each time an Assembly Committee completes a scrutiny, relevant proposals are sent to all witnesses at whom they are aimed, and responses invited. The Mayor does not always provide a formal response to Committee recommendations and this makes it difficult to establish the impact of the Assembly’s work on the Mayor’s policies and decisions. With this in mind, the Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee would like to ask the Assembly to use its powers under s.60 (1) of the GLA Act.

5. **Legal Implications**

5.1 Under Section 60 (1) of the Greater London Authority Act, the Assembly may submit proposals to the Mayor and require a response from him under Section 45(2)(c). Section 45(2)(c) of the GLA Act requires the Mayor to include a response to the proposals submitted under Section 60(1) in his written reports to the Assembly.

6. **Financial Implications**

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

**List of appendices to this report:**

Appendix 1 - *A Sporting Legacy for London?*
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<tr>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List of Background Papers: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**E-mail:** john.barry@london.gov.uk
A sporting legacy for London?
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Chair’s foreword

This Committee has long been supportive of the commitment to increase grassroots sport participation and to use the 2012 Games as a way of helping to achieve this. We welcome the establishment of the Mayor’s sports fund and the steps he has taken to put the GLA at the heart of strategic decisions about sports funding.

We do not underestimate the scale of the challenge though. Sports participation rates in the capital are stubbornly static and among some groups rates are disproportionately low. Similarly, no other host city can point to a sustained increase in sports participation on the back of the Games so the Games on their own are unlikely to be enough. Also, as we enter a period of a reduction in public spending it will be a challenge to ensure that grassroots sport investment is maintained.

We recognise progress has been made in bringing together the key players and identifying strategic gaps in sports provision. However, the slow progress in getting funding streams off the ground means it will be the end of this year before we can assess whether the Mayor’s fund has increased the numbers participating in sport or influenced the investment decisions of the major funders.

The Committee also looked at what was happening on the Olympic site to see if the bid commitment to use the facilities for the community after the Games was likely to be realised. While we heard of excellent work by the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority in embedding legacy uses of their facilities for the community, we found little evidence to show how the Mayor’s highly ambitious target for community access to the facilities at the stadium will be met.

A sustainable sporting legacy in the capital looks a long way away at the moment but the building blocks are there. We were impressed by the work and commitment of those pursuing this goal and through this report seek to lend our support and provide constructive suggestions to help deliver it. We are grateful to all those who gave up their time and contributed in other ways to the investigation which led to this report.

Len Duvall OBE AM
Chair of the Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee
One of the legacy promises for the Olympic and Paralympic Games 2012 was an increase in community sport to be encouraged by the galvanising effect of the Games themselves and investment in grass roots sport. In the capital, the Mayor has produced a strategy that aims for “a leaner, fitter London” and he has made a £15.5 million fund available.

A successful sporting legacy in London would see increases in participation rates overall and among those groups, such as women, disabled people and older people, who are currently less likely to participate. It would also involve bridging the gap between the supply of sporting facilities and the demand for them that varies across the capital.

Progress towards these goals to date has largely been seen in two areas. First, there has been some useful work to identify gaps in provision. Secondly, the Mayor’s Sports Commissioner is working to bring together the myriad of public, private and third sector organisations involved in the funding and provision of sport to ensure work is coordinated and does not duplicate.

Progress was initially slow in setting up the Mayor’s sports fund. This means that it will be over the next 12 months before we can start to make a definitive assessment of its impact. We have not yet seen clear evidence that this relatively small amount of funding will fill strategic gaps in provision nor that other more significant funders have been influenced by the GLA’s work in this area.

We have set two milestones over the next year that we expect to help us and others get a clearer picture. First, we have asked that the Mayor’s Sports Commissioner respond to us by May on issues we have recommended that she address:

• involving the education and health sectors in the work of the board which oversees the strategic provision of sport in London
• working with LOCOG to ensure that there is widespread use of an Olympic brand which can be used to raise the profile of grass roots sports projects
• examining the rationale for the decision to run some of the Mayor’s funding rounds in-house and to contract-out others
• ensuring that funding decisions are taking into account the research which shows where demand for swimming pools and sports halls in London exceeds supply

In an environment where public funding is being cut, including for sport, the Mayor needs to demonstrate that his funding is well-targeted and adding value. Over the next 12 months we expect to see evidence of the impact of this funding such as increased participation in the facilities funded. The Mayor is also funding projects that aim to use sport to meet wider social objectives. We have therefore asked that the Mayor’s Sports Commissioner report back by December 2011 on progress against these objectives.

London’s bid for the Games promised that the facilities on the Olympic Park would be accessible to the community after the Games and the Mayor has a target that they should be available for 90 per cent of the time. We found a stark contrast between the positive work of the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, which is ensuring community use of facilities is central to its post-Games plans, and the Olympic Park Legacy Company, which does not appear to have clear plans for ensuring the Mayor’s highly ambitious 90 per cent target is met. We have therefore recommended that the Mayor take steps to use his influence to ensure community access is central to ongoing discussions about the Park.

Achieving a sporting legacy was always going to be difficult but it is likely to become even more so. The evidence from previous Games did not support the ambitions for a sustained sporting legacy and it will be a challenge to keep community sport a priority as public spending cuts start to take effect. The Mayor needs to set out plans that go beyond 2012 and we recommend that he commit to a continuing role for his Sports Commissioner and the London Community Sports Board.

We welcome the Mayor’s ambitions and the progress made by his Sports Commissioner in some areas. The next 12 months will be important in determining the extent to which the ambitions for a sporting legacy will be realised and the impact that the Mayor’s funding and influence can have. This report is intended to help this happen.
London’s bid to host the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games carried with it the promise of a golden opportunity to inspire and enable people to take part in regular sporting activities. Not just elite athletes, who would benefit from new and improved world-class facilities, but also members of the public who would be inspired to adopt a healthier, more active lifestyle.

This is an important and widely supported goal. Achieving a sustained and significant increase in levels of sports participation among members of the public could contribute towards health and social policy objectives such as tackling obesity, reducing health inequalities, and encouraging social inclusion so as to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour.

In this report, we assess the progress that has been made to date towards a significant and sustained increase in public participation in sporting activities, and make recommendations for further work to build on what has already been achieved.

The scale of the challenge
We support the aspiration to use the Games as a catalyst for increased public participation in sport. However, the scale and complexity of the challenge will make it very difficult to achieve this aim.

More than four in five people in London do not take part in regular, moderate exercise. Almost half of London’s population is classified as being ‘inactive’.1 These high levels of inactivity have consequences for individuals and for society as a whole. They are likely to lead to illness and ill health, and are associated with health inequalities and wider social problems such as crime and anti-social behaviour.2 NHS London has estimated the cost of the levels of inactivity of Londoners at £105 million per year.3

In London, there are additional complexities and difficulties arising from the density, diversity and mobility of the population, the complex

---

1 Taking part in less than 30 minutes of moderate intensity exercise in the last 4 weeks, source: The Mayor’s Sporting Future for London, April 2009, page 14
2 Shaping Places through Sport, Sport England
3 This figure is referenced in the Mayor’s Sporting Future for London document. Its origin is a 2009 report by the Department of Health, Be active, be healthy: a plan for getting the nation moving. The cost estimate is based on the costs of treating five diseases defined by the World Health Organisation as having some relation to physical inactivity.
political governance of the city, and a lack of facilities, particularly in some areas. For example, our 2008 research into swimming pool provision found that one-third of Londoners live more than twenty minutes’ walk away from a public swimming pool and there is little prospect of this changing in the near future.

The opportunity provided by the Games
The Games offer a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to galvanise organisations to focus, coordinate and increase their efforts. There is the potential to draw together a disparate range of organisations in the public, private and third sectors under the Olympic banner in order to provide a better focus, direction and coordination. There is also the opportunity to use the Olympic brand to attract additional investment and support, for example from Olympic sponsors and others who wish to associate themselves with the ambition and inspiration of the Games. This is particularly important in a context of cuts in public expenditure that will inevitably mean there is less public funding available for facilities and programmes to increase sports participation.

These benefits are not guaranteed or automatic. There is little evidence from previous events to show that simply hosting an Olympic and Paralympic Games in itself leads to increased sports participation. Our work in 2007 on the legacy of Olympic and Paralympic Games in host cities showed that no host city has yet experienced a lasting increase in public participation in sports activities. Even cities that have achieved a positive legacy from the Games have not seen any discernible change in participation rates.

The role of the Mayor
Increasing sports participation in the capital has not always been a priority of strategic government in London. Those involved in sports participation range across the public and private sectors but it is only since the award of the 2012 Games to London that the Mayor and GLA have sought to play a central role.

---

There is a plethora of funding bodies and providers.⁵ In addition to these bodies, there are a large number of local providers of sporting facilities in the private and voluntary sectors.

This raises the question of where and how the Mayor and GLA can add value. When intervening in the provision of sports facilities, and other projects to increase sports participation, it is important to demonstrate how that intervention has made a difference.

The Mayor’s strategy for sport, A sporting future for London, sets out the reasons for his involvement and the role that the GLA could play as a strategic authority. These reasons largely centre on providing leadership and coordination for the range of bodies that do fund and provide sports facilities and programmes.

There are two related strands to the developing role of the Mayor in sporting provision in London. First, the Mayor has enabled the GLA to be a direct funder of projects to increase sports participation through a £15.5 million fund. Secondly, the Mayor’s strategy for delivering a sporting legacy identifies a lack of strategic leadership of the various bodies involved in sports provision and funding which the Mayor and GLA are seeking to fill.

The ultimate goal of these interventions, as set out in the Mayor’s strategy, is to deliver a grass roots sporting legacy by securing a sustained increase in sports participation and using sport to help tackle wider social problems in the capital.

The focus of this report
Our focus in this report is on how successfully the Mayor is providing strategic leadership on sports provision and funding and what effect this is having on the prospects for a lasting sporting legacy after the 2012 Games.

Evidence base
This report is based on our discussions with Kate Hoey MP, the Mayor’s Sports Commissioner, and the written submissions we received from a range of organisations and individuals. These submissions are published separately with this report. We have also referred to existing evidence such as research and surveys by Sport

⁵ The table in Appendix 2 summarises the key national, regional and local public bodies involved, their remit and funding.
England and the information and data contained in the Mayor’s strategy, *A Sporting Future for London*. We are grateful to all those who contributed to this review.

This report builds on our previous work on sports participation in the capital. In 2008, the Committee published a report on the prospects for a sporting legacy for young Londoners with the aim of influencing the developing work by the Mayor. We also return briefly in this report to issues we raised in 2006 on the prospects for a sporting legacy for disabled people, a subject which we intend to explore in greater detail later this year, and our broader work on legacy which drew on the experience from other host cities.

---

6 *2012 Sporting Legacy for Young Londoners*, Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee, November 2008

7 *A sporting legacy for people with disabilities*, August 2006 and *A Lasting legacy for London? Assessing the legacy of the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games*, 30 April 2007
1 What success would look like

1.1 The overall aim of the Mayor’s strategy is to achieve a sustained and significant increase in the proportions of people who participate in regular sports activity, including among those who are less likely than others to take part.

1.2 The main existing tool for measuring success is Sport England’s Active People survey, which asks a sample of the population about their participation in sports. The survey provides a useful indication of overall levels of participation in sport and points to some differences in the levels of participation in different local authority areas and among particular groups.

1.3 The Active People Survey does have some limitations as a measure of the success of investment in sports participation. For example, it does not cover less formal forms of sports participation or exercise, such as recreational walking and cycling, and it does not provide an insight into the reasons for the differences in participation levels among different groups. The Central Council for Physical Recreation warned against putting too much store in these figures pointing out “any increase in participation must be considered with caution as causality is impossible to prove”.

1.4 Other measures must be taken into account in order to gain a full understanding of the impact of policies and programmes on sports participation. For example, Sport England has developed a satisfaction survey, which it suggests is a better proxy measure of the effectiveness of investment. It will also be important to look at the outcomes of specific projects and programmes, as well as assessing trends in participation rates among the general population.

1.5 Similarly, as well as the direct health benefits, a successful sporting legacy would be able to demonstrate wider social benefits. The Mayor argues that sport can help to tackle social issues such as crime and academic underachievement and has linked funding to initiatives, which place an emphasis on this. Research from Sport England shows that there is growing evidence about the benefits that regular involvement in sport and physical activity can have for individuals and communities, including reducing anti-social behaviour and tackling
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8 http://www.sportengland.org/research/active_people_survey.aspx  Sport England is a national body funded by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport to deliver the Government’s sport legacy programme.

9 Written submissions to the Committee, p 4
crime.\textsuperscript{10} Projects funded on this basis will need to demonstrate positive outcomes beyond sports participation and improved health.

1.6 The Mayor has also sought to establish the GLA as the strategic leader of the various bodies involved in the delivery of sports participation projects. We would therefore expect to see evidence that the Mayor’s involvement has made a demonstrable difference to the types of projects funded and the way various funders have worked together to fill strategic gaps in provision which have been identified.

\textsuperscript{10} \textit{Shaping Places through Sport}, Sport England, July 2009
2 Assessing London’s needs: the scale of the challenge

2.1 A strategic approach to increasing sports participation must be based on an assessment of the gaps in existing provision of facilities and of those groups which are less likely to participate. Such an assessment is also important in establishing a baseline against which the impact of the interventions of the Mayor and others can be measured.

Facilities

2.2 Progress has been made in identifying gaps in facilities and groups for which provision should be targeted. Sport England, in partnership with the GLA’s Planning Team, has carried out a strategic facility needs assessment across the whole of London. Such an assessment is important to ensure investment in facilities meets needs and fills gaps in existing provision rather than duplicating it. Sport England notes, “no other region in the country has undertaken this level of detail to understand their facility needs”.  

2.3 Sport England’s work focused on three facilities types: sports halls, swimming pools and artificial grass pitches. It considered existing and planned provision against current demand and the future demand based on population projections to 2021. In doing so, the research identified mismatches between supply and demand.

2.4 Across London the supply of swimming pools matches demand but this masks sub-regional variations. Demand exceeds supply in the Central and East sub-regions of the capital where accessibility to swimming pools is a “big issue”. The research also found that the quality of existing swimming pools and their facilities is a bigger issue than the number of pools.

2.5 Demand for sports halls exceeds supply across all sub-regions of London and the situation is projected to worsen. Again the Central and East sub-regions have the greatest mismatch between supply and demand. Population increases by 2021 are set to increase demand for sports halls by 22,200 visits in the weekly peak period, the equivalent of 27 four-court sports halls.

2.6 Sport England has also developed a web-based tool, which creates detailed profiles for every London borough. The Local Sport Profile

11 Written submissions to the Committee, p 45
12 The Development of a Needs and Evidence Based Approach to Planning for Community Sport in London, July 2010 – summary provided to the Committee and available on request.
generates a sporting profile for individual areas in the form of charts and tables bringing together data on sporting participation and provision.13 This is intended to assist boroughs to develop and deliver interventions, which will maximise participation, and meet identified needs.

**Demographic differences in levels of sports participation**

2.7 Overall levels of sports participation in London are in line with the national average. These figures have remained largely unchanged over the last three years. Participation among women, disabled people and over-55s has remained particularly low. According to Sport England’s Active People survey, nine in ten disabled people reported that they did not participate in regular sports activities, and rates among older people are similarly low. In the 2008/09 survey of Londoners, 17 per cent of women said that they took part in regular moderate exercise, compared with 25 per cent of men.

2.8 The Mayor recognised in his Sporting Future for London strategy that certain groups “feel excluded from sporting activities and/or have particularly low rates of participation in London”. He highlighted “those in lower socioeconomic groups, young women aged 14 to 24; older people, black and minority ethnic people, disabled people, lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans (LGBT) people.”

2.9 There is support for some though by no means all of this analysis from the existing evidence. Women and those categorised as having a limiting illness or disability are less likely to participate in sport based on the Active People Survey, and this is supported by other evidence about the reasons for lower participation levels among these groups.

2.10 The survey also reports that BAME people are less likely to participate in sports activities. However, there is no disaggregation of different BAME groups, and there is a lack of evidence to inform a detailed analysis of underlying factors and causes that might contribute to the reported differences in participation rates. An approach that simply supports projects that target black and minority ethnic people is unlikely to do justice to the complex issues involved.

---

13 See [http://www.sportengland.org/research/local_sport_profiles.aspx](http://www.sportengland.org/research/local_sport_profiles.aspx)
2.11 Similarly, we are unclear what the basis is for the assertion that LGBT people are under-represented in sports participation figures nor what, if any, policy response is being proposed.

2.12 The equalities implications for sports participation are complex. We support the emphasis on trying to raise participation rates among women and disabled people. More work, however, needs to be done on understanding the factors which affect the participation rates of other equalities groups and whether a policy response, such as targeting resources, is justified.

2.13 The Committee supports a focus on projects that seek to increase participation among women and disabled people who are clearly less likely to participate in sport. We would, however, expect more detailed work to be done to understand the causal factors in lower participation among other equalities groups before policy responses are taken forward.

Increasing sports participation among disabled people

2.14 The evidence does point towards lower participation rates among disabled people. In 2006, the Committee published a report, *A sporting legacy for people with disabilities*, which set out a vision for the provision of facilities across the capital:14

“Whether [disabled people] choose to participate for fun, or to aspire to the highest levels of achievement, they will be able to find user-friendly information on what’s available, where and how to get there. Every facility, whether in a school, community hall or privately run centre, will meet a quality standard for the quality and accessibility of its services and the training undertaken by its staff.”

2.15 The progress towards realising this vision is the subject of some debate. Interactive, the lead strategic development agency for sport and physical activity for disabled people, highlighted the Committee’s 2006 report as the “catalyst” for a change in the way sport and
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14 Available from [http://legacy.london.gov.uk/assembly/reports/culture/disability-sport.rtf](http://legacy.london.gov.uk/assembly/reports/culture/disability-sport.rtf). We note and take on board the request from Interactive, the lead strategic development agency for sport and physical activity for disabled people in London, that, in future, the Committee adopts the term “disabled people” rather than “people with disabilities”.
physical activity for disabled people is viewed in the capital. Others highlighted barriers to participation by disabled people.

2.16 The relatively low levels of participation of disabled people remain a concern. The Active People Survey shows that Londoners categorised as having a limiting illness or disability are nearly three times less likely to participate regularly in sport than those who are not so categorised. The Committee proposes to return to the issues it raised in its 2006 report later this year. In doing so it will seek the views of a wide range of individuals and groups representing disabled people to assess the progress that has been made in tackling the issues the Committee raised in 2006 and the current challenges presented by reductions in public funding.
3 A coordinated and strategic approach

3.1 The previous chapter set out what is known about the levels of participation in London and the work that has been carried out recently to identify where the gaps in provision are. This chapter examines how the Mayor has sought to bring together existing bodies under his leadership to coordinate the support for community sports projects in the capital. It also looks at the role of others such as central government and local authorities and their influence on the prospects for a sporting legacy in London.

3.2 The Mayor’s strategy argued that there was a need for greater collaboration and coordination between all the organisations involved in the funding and provision of grass roots sport. This was borne out in the submissions we received from organisations involved in sports provision. Proactive Central London, one of five sub-regional networks of organisations committed to working together to increase participation, summarised the issue:

“There is a challenge to engender and support partnership working at a regional and local level and it is often easier for organisations to work to their own agenda and for their own, rather than the collective, good.”

Similarly, Sport England noted the importance of partnership working which helps “to derive greater value for money on the investment made by both organisations and ensures that investment complements rather than competes, maximising opportunities across the capital”.

The London Community Sports Board

3.3 The Mayor’s response to this need was to establish a new London Community Sports Board (LCSB) which would aim to improve coordination of ongoing activity, drive delivery and monitor progress towards meeting the legacy goals. Its role as set out in the strategy is:

• collaborating with key delivery partners on the development of action plans for delivery
• monitoring progress on the implementation of these plans
• supporting the delivery of stakeholders’ existing aims and objectives
• identifying further ways to align policies, activities and resources

15 A Sporting Future for London, Mayor of London, April 2009, p 11
16 Written submissions to the Committee, p 23
17 Ibid, p 40
• providing advice to the Mayor to shape policy and decision making at national 2012 forums (e.g. the Olympic Board and the new National Sport Legacy Board)
• advising the Mayor about GLA policies and future sporting priorities for London.

3.4 Chaired by Kate Hoey, membership of the LCSB is taken from the public, voluntary and charitable sectors, including London Councils, the British Olympic Association and Central YMCA. A full list of the members of the LCSB is reproduced in Appendix 2 to this report.

3.5 Some of those who responded to the Committee suggested that the work of the Sports Commissioner and the LCSB has started to improve collaboration and coordination of the various bodies involved. One example given was the facilities audit carried out by Sport England and the GLA and summarised above. Others referred to the benefits of ensuring that the various funding bodies were meeting regularly to discuss provision and the allocation of funds.

3.6 While most respondents to the Committee were positive about the creation of the LCSB and the forum it provided, some noted that the process of bringing together multiple organisations to work in a coordinated way remained an ongoing challenge. Proactive Central London argued that greater use could be made of Community Sport and Physical Activity Networks (CSPANs) that operate in each borough. These partnerships typically bring together the local authority, schools sports partnerships, primary care trusts and the voluntary sector.

3.7 The role of schools as key providers of facilities was recognised in the Mayor’s strategy. The state and independent education sectors could be significant players in helping to ensure maximum availability of existing facilities and there may be a developing role for the LCSB in ensuring that this resource is used effectively. Their potential role has been recognised and acknowledged by Kate Hoey. However, these sectors are not specifically represented on the LCSB. Similarly, engagement with CSPANs would bring in the health sector.

3.8 **We welcome the creation of the London Community Sports Board and the steps taken by the GLA to bring together the key organisations. We recognise that achieving a strategic approach to provision of projects supporting sports**
participation across the capital continues to be a challenge. We look to the Commissioner and Board to develop further this work to ensure effective links with the health and education sectors.

Recommendation 1
We recommend that the Sports Commissioner and London Community Sports Board develop their partnership approach to incorporate the local health and education sectors. We ask that the Sports Commissioner report back to the Committee by May 2011 on how she plans to ensure the state and independent educations sectors, and local and regional health providers, can contribute to the Mayor’s strategic aims for sports participation; and what the timescale is for this work.

Making full use of the Olympic brand
3.9 One way in which the various bodies involved in sports provision can be brought together by the Olympics is through the branding of initiatives. This is intended to help make the link between high profile elite events and community sport.

3.10 A number of organisations which submitted information to our investigation questioned the extent to which the full potential of the Olympic brand and marketing of sporting opportunities was being realised.

3.11 The Inspire Mark is a version of the London 2012 brand specifically created for the community and voluntary sectors. The brand is awarded to non-commercial projects that can use the mark to promote their activity. Some organisations suggested the Inspire Mark has not been widely adopted by sporting bodies to date, and that this represented a missed opportunity to associate their activities with the Games. The Central Council for Physical Recreation (CCPR) summed up the issue and the potential available from an Olympic brand:

“Strong Olympic participation programme branding would also raise the profile of the efforts by governing bodies, sports groups and clubs by creating a higher level of consciousness around the Games and the legacy organisers promised to create. The Inspire Mark has only been made available to a very few sports projects and its nature means that it can’t be awarded to any projects which attract any degree of private
funding. As such, its penetration is minimal. Branding such as that enjoyed by Millennium projects would create a link in people’s minds between the Games and local and community programmes and would greatly improve the visibility and credibility of efforts to get people into sport and activity.”

3.12 Others made similar points. London Swimming said, “If we were able to create a simple legacy brand that linked to the games but the IOC were comfortable with and allowed this to be used creatively and collaboratively by anyone to promote a sporting legacy it would spread like wild fire. This doesn’t need a huge budget but it does need leadership to get things out in the public domain so they can be used.” The Women’s Sport and Fitness Foundation also suggested “there is little Olympic branded activity that is capitalising on any festival effect.”

3.13 Some were critical of existing initiatives, which though well intentioned were unlikely to reach their target audience without better marketing. London Swimming emphasised the importance of “showcasing existing provision to more potential participants”. It criticised the Get Active London project as “an example of poor practice” suggesting that “the belief that if we build a single website without a marketing budget that lists existing provision across London will increase participation is really last century thinking”.

3.14 In order for the Games to act as the catalyst it should be for increased sports participation, the work to promote and support sports participation must be clearly linked to the Games. For example, there may be opportunities to enable providers to link their work to the Games and use the profile of the event to promote their facilities and programmes.

---

18 Written submissions to the Committee, p 4
19 Ibid, p 21
20 Ibid, p 27
21 Ibid, p 20
Recommendation 2

We recommend that the Sports Commissioner and the London Community Sports Board negotiate with LOCOG to broaden the way the Olympic brand could be used to raise the profile of the work being done to achieve a sports participation legacy. We ask that the Sports Commissioner report back to the Committee on this in May 2011.
4 An efficient allocation of resources

4.1 It is in the allocation of resources that the value of the interventions of the LCSB and the Mayor needs to be demonstrated. The work of Sport England and the GLA in developing the strategic facilities needs assessment and the local sport profile is intended to influence how funds are distributed to maximise the impact they will have on levels of sports participation. Similarly, as we set out above, the available data on participation rates suggests differences between the participation rates of various demographic groups and the need for targeted interventions.

4.2 There are broadly two ways in which the influence of the Mayor on funding provision may be assessed: the example set by the allocation of grants from the Mayor’s £15.5 million sport fund; and the extent to which major funders of sports projects have been influenced by the strategic lead offered by the LCSB.

4.3 In order to assess the role of the Mayor’s sports fund and the Mayor’s influence on other funders it is important to examine the funds available from other sources and the recent changes which might affect them.

Funding from central government

4.4 The Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) has the creation of a sports participation legacy as one of its priorities, and £135 million of National Lottery funding has been allocated to support this. Direct programme expenditure across all policy areas within the DCMS is set to reduce by 17 per cent by 2014/15.22 This is likely to have implications for the amount of funding that is available for sports participation.

4.5 Some national schemes have already been cancelled, including free swimming for under-16s and over-65s, which the Government assessed as not providing value for money. The Government also announced on 20 October 2010 that it was ending the £162 million PE and Sports Strategy and would not continue to provide ring-fenced funding for School Sport Partnerships.23 These partnerships brought together groups of schools to develop physical education and sport opportunities for young people. The Secretary of State for Education said that the partnerships were “neither affordable nor likely to be the
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22 DCMS business plan, November 2010, p 19
23 Refocusing sport in schools to build a lasting legacy of the 2012 Games, Department for Education press release, 20 October 2010
best way to help schools achieve their potential in improving competitive sport”.

4.6 The announcement about School Sport Partnerships proved controversial. The decision was criticised in an open letter from a group of British athletes and was the subject of a petition to the Department for Education.24 Similarly, the Assembly unanimously passed a motion in December 2010 calling on the Mayor to make a strong case to Government to continue the School Sport Partnership programme.25

4.7 The Government announced on 20 December 2010 that it would pay school sport partnerships to the end of the summer term 2011 at a cost of £47 million.26 It will also provide £65 million from the Department’s spending review settlement to enable every secondary school to release one PE teacher for a day a week in the school year 2011/12 and 2012/13. These initiatives would replace the £162 million PE and Sports Strategy.

4.8 The Government also funds Sport England through a direct grant from the DCMS and a contribution from the National Lottery. Sport England supports the 46 national governing bodies of individual sports and seeks to increase the participation levels of adults. Sport England’s budget is to be reduced by around 33 per cent by 2014/15 as a result of the decisions announced in the Comprehensive Spending Review.27 The Chief Executive of Sport England said that the CSR was “tough for grassroots sports”.28 She also said she was pleased that a request to protect its investment in the 46 individual sports had been reflected and she welcomed the reforms of the National Lottery which would bring in additional money to sport.

**Funding from local authorities**

4.9 Local authorities are key public sector providers of public sports facilities and opportunities. London local authorities spent £94 million
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24 see, for example, [http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-11896962](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-11896962)
25 “Assembly opposes grassroots sports cuts”, London Assembly press release, 8 December 2010
26 “Gove: “I want competitive sport to be at the centre of a truly rounded education””, Department for Education press release 20 December 2010
27 [www.sportandrecreation.co.uk](http://www.sportandrecreation.co.uk)
28 [http://www.morethangames.co.uk/london-2012/2013030-sports-bodies-reactions-comprehensive-spending-review](http://www.morethangames.co.uk/london-2012/2013030-sports-bodies-reactions-comprehensive-spending-review)
on sport in 2009/10.\footnote{CIPFA Finance and General Statistics 2009/10} However, the Comprehensive Spending Review suggests a reduction across all areas of local authority spending over the next four years of around 14 per cent.\footnote{Spending Review 2010, HM Treasury, Table 1, p 10} Spending on sport is discretionary for local authorities and it therefore seems inevitable that spending will be reduced.

4.10 Other funding sources for sport in the capital are the large number of voluntary groups and charities. These in turn often rely on contributions from central and local government.

4.11 It is too early to say how the reductions in public spending over the next few years will affect sports provision. It is clear though that funding will be extremely tight. This makes it especially important that the Mayor can demonstrate the value added by his direct funding of sport and the influence it has on others.

The Mayor’s sports fund

4.12 In January 2009, the Mayor directed the London Development Agency to ring-fence £15.5 million over three years for investment in projects associated with his sporting strategy. The Mayor’s sports fund is intended to provide a lever for the GLA to develop its role as the strategic lead for sporting provision across the capital. The Sports Commissioner described the fund as important because it “brought the Mayor and the GLA to the table” while recognising that even with the match funding required for successful bids the funds were not going to “solve all the problems of London”.\footnote{Transcript of Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee meeting 7 September 2010, p 14}

4.13 Others reiterated this point. The Director of London Swimming noted: “£15 million would not even buy you a single leisure centre with a swimming pool. Therefore this funding needs to be used to point the way – set a direction for sport in the capital and unlock potential”.\footnote{Written submissions to the Committee, p 18}

4.14 The Mayor’s funding is divided between three separate funding rounds over three years from 2009/10: the £7.5 million facilities fund; the £3 million training and skills fund; and the £4 million sports participation fund.
A slow start

4.15 We heard some criticism of the early administration of the funds. Writing in August 2010, the Director of London Swimming concluded: “I had expected us to have made a lot more progress by now ... it has taken a long time before the facilities round was launched, the training round is live for quick wins but not officially launched and the ‘other intervention’ pot has not been launched yet”.  

4.16 There were also specific delays to the distribution of funds awarded to some schemes. Of one of the early pilot projects, the Director of London Swimming reported: “The processes and procedures from LDA to GLA do not seem to have worked or even exist. For example, we got our contract for the mobile pools in September (we had committed to delivery in July) and we got paid in December (having been exposed to costs since July)”.  

4.17 The Mayor’s Sports Commissioner accepted these criticisms highlighting problems with the transfer of responsibility from the LDA to the GLA. GLA officers also noted: “historically the GLA has not been a grant giving organisation so this is very much a new piece of work”. Both were confident that processes had now been put in place to ensure such delays would not be repeated.  

4.18 A key step taken by the GLA to improve the administration of the funds has been to appoint external organisations with grant-giving experience to manage the allocation. For example, after a tender process, the GLA appointed the Football Foundation as the delivery partner for the facilities fund. Similarly, the skills and training fund is managed by the National Skills Academy. Kate Hoey argued that to deliver the management of these funds from within the GLA would have been more expensive and involved employing “substantial numbers of people”.  

---

33 Written submissions to the Committee, p 17  
34 Ibid  
35 Transcript of Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee meeting 7 September 2010, p 18  
36 This does not mean the facilities fund is targeted only at football; the Football Foundation is a multi-sports organisation and has distributed money from the facilities fund across a wide range of sports.  
37 Transcript of Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee meeting 7 September 2010, p 16
Facilities fund

4.19 Grants from the facilities fund are to be awarded in a series of funding rounds between April 2010 and March 2013. The first funding round was completed in December 2010 and 13 projects from ten London boroughs received funding of a total of £1.26 million.  

4.20 The second bidding round is currently under way and successful bids will be announced in May 2011 when the third round will be launched.

4.21 Feedback from those involved in sports participation suggests that the allocation of grants from the facilities fund has been carried out effectively. Sport England said that there was “close consultation around various funding streams which helps to make the most of the funding that is available”. The Lee Valley Regional Park Authority pointed to a partnership approach which “ensures that investment complements rather than competes, maximising opportunities across the capital”.  

4.22 We would expect to see evidence to support these assertions about the way funds are disbursed. Sport England recommended that the GLA use the findings of its facilities audit when considering investments from its own funding streams.

4.23 This is a stated aim of the facilities fund. The Football Foundation, which administers the facilities fund, states that the decision process will “take into account the local need for the facility [which] will be informed by the data that we compiled in our recent work in partnership with Sport England which shows where the greatest facility shortages currently exist”.

4.24 This may be difficult to achieve because of the other factors which will determine the allocation of funds. Grants awarded under the facilities round are based on bids from boroughs and other providers of sport facilities. Quality bids may not come from areas with facility shortages. Bids will also be determined by the extent to which they
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38 Twenty-sixth Mayor’s Report to the Assembly, 15 December 2010
39 Written submissions to the Committee, p 42
40 Ibid, p 64
41 The Development of a Needs and Evidence Based Approach to Planning for Community Sport in London, July 2010
42 http://www.footballfoundation.org.uk/apply/psifacilityfund/?locale=en
attract match funding and the availability of such match funding will not necessarily follow the geographical need.

4.25 It is not possible to draw definitive conclusions from the few grants that have been awarded from the facilities fund to date. After the second round of bidding we would expect to see a clear correlation between the grants awarded and the facilities gaps identified by Sport England’s research.

**Recommendation 3**

We recommend that after the announcement of the second round of successful bids for the facilities fund in May 2011, the Mayor’s Sports Commissioner report to the Committee on how the Mayor’s funding is adding to the supply of sports facilities in areas where demand exceeds supply.

*Training and skills fund*

4.26 There has been relatively little progress in allocating the training and skills fund. The LCSB set up the London Leisure Academy project, under the National Skills Academy for Sports and Leisure, to lead on the management of this fund but minutes of the Board’s meetings suggest there has been concern about the lack of clarity over likely outcomes.\(^{43}\) A small proportion of the £3 million skills and training fund has been allocated to date: the Committee was told in October 2010 only £43,386 had been allocated to deliver training to 534 individual recipients. The Mayor stated in December 2010 that over 1,000 courses had been delivered.\(^{44}\)

4.27 While we recognise that it takes time to ensure that funds are allocated effectively and achieve outcomes, the lack of progress with the skills and training fund is very disappointing.

*Sports participation fund*

4.28 The last fund to be launched was the sports participation fund in summer 2010. This is being managed in-house within the GLA with decisions made by a panel drawn from the membership of the LCSB. The fund is split into three categories: increasing participation in sport; community development; and ‘at risk’ young adults which seeks

\(^{43}\) Minutes of London Community Sports Board, 28 January 2010 – available from the Committee

\(^{44}\) Twenty-sixth Mayor’s Report to the Assembly, 15 December 2010
to support projects that use sport and physical activity to tackle issues such as crime, worklessness, homelessness or drug and alcohol abuse. The first round of grants from this fund was announced at the beginning of December 2010.45

4.29 Given the statements from the Sports Commissioner about the early management of the Mayor’s sports fund and the new role this will create for the GLA as a grant-giving body, managing the sports participation fund in-house is not without risk. The rationale behind the decision to contract-out the management of the other two funds was, we conclude, well argued and we will therefore want to ensure that the management of the sports participation fund is carefully monitored.

**Recommendation 4**

We recommend that the Mayor’s Sports Commissioner evaluate the costs and benefits of the different approaches that have been taken to managing and allocating the Mayor’s funds. We ask that she report back to the Committee in May 2011 on the outcome of this review and how they will be taken into account in future funding rounds.

*Measuring the success of the Mayor’s investment in sport*

4.30 The success of the Mayor’s interventions will be judged against the two objectives set for it: its direct impact on participation rates; and the influence he has had over other funders.

4.31 In order to measure success therefore, those receiving grants need to demonstrate what impact the investment has had on participation rates overall or on different target groups. We do not wish to add to the administrative burden of those organisations in receipt of grants from the Mayor’s sports funds. We note that grant recipients are expected to have in place ongoing research and monitoring programmes to demonstrate their effectiveness and consider that this monitoring should be publicly available.46

---

45 “Mayor announces further funding for community sports participation”, press release, 6 December 2010
46 See, for example, Sports Participation Fund, GLA, August 2010, p 29
4.32 The sports participation fund also incorporates a wider role for the funding by earmarking funds for wider social objectives such as reducing crime among young people. While we note the Mayor’s arguments that there is some research to support the view that sports projects can contribute to these wider policy goals, we would not want to see the primary goal of increasing sports participation watered down.

4.33 Furthermore, the Mayor needs to demonstrate that the direct funding he has awarded and the leadership provided by the LCSB has directly influenced the funding decisions of other bodies. We welcome the positive comments of a number of bodies about the influence of the Mayor’s Sports Commissioner and the LCSB. We expect to see in the coming months some clear examples of how strategic decisions about the allocation of resources across London have been influenced by the work of the LCSB and Mayor.

Recommendation 5
We recommend that in December 2011 the Mayor’s Sports Commissioner report to the Committee on the outcomes from the grants awarded from the Mayor’s sports funds. This should include details of the numbers of additional people who have started taking part in sport and progress against other social objectives set out for the funds.

We further recommend that in reporting back to the Committee in December 2011, the Mayor’s Sport Commissioner set out how the work of the London Community Sports Board has sought to influence the funding decisions of others and the progress that has been made in filling the strategic gaps identified by the Board’s work.

4.34 Two years after the Mayor directed the LDA to provide £15.5 million for sport in the capital and 18 months since the publication of his strategy, grants are now being awarded and other funders are working with the GLA through the London Community Sports Board. The next 12 months will be important in determining the extent to which these interventions are starting to affect levels of sports participation. The recommendations in this chapter are intended to ensure that the Committee and others can evaluate their effect. This should inform future decisions about funding and other resources in the longer-term.
5  Sustaining the legacy beyond 2012

5.1 Most of the activities described in this report relate to the work being done in advance of the Games. For this work to have a lasting impact, work will need to continue beyond 2012.

5.2 Some commentators have criticised organisers for being shortsighted in planning the sporting legacy for the UK. John Amaechi, a former Olympian has criticised the lack of a legacy plan post 2012.47 Similarly, Sir Steve Redgrave, a government 2012 sports champion, has said, “there has been little talk about what is going to happen in the years after the Olympics. The success of these Games will not even be what happens in 2013, but what happens in 2020 and beyond”.48

The Mayor’s role after 2012

5.3 The Mayor’s ability to affect the extent of any sporting legacy after the Games will depend on the continuing role of the GLA in sports provision and the influence he is able to bring to bear on the community use of new facilities built for the Games.

The London Community Sports Board and the Sports Commissioner

5.4 The work of the London Community Sports Board and the Mayor’s Commissioner for Sport has to date focused on bringing together the key organisations and managing the allocation of resources from the Mayor’s sport fund.

5.5 The Mayor’s strategy does not extend beyond 2012 – its focus is on actions that can be taken prior to the Games, taking advantage of the profile and attention that are associated with the run-up to the event. The Mayor’s sport fund runs out at the end of 2011/12.

5.6 There is a continuing role for a London Commissioner for Sport and for the LCSB beyond 2012. Without this it is difficult to see where the strategic oversight will come from to build on the impetus of the Games. The problems of a disparate range of funding and delivery bodies in the capital will quickly re-emerge without somebody to provide a strategic lead. In a reduced funding environment this risks undoing much of the work that has been done to date and missing the opportunities that the Games will bring.

47 http://news.bbc.co.uk/sport1/hi/olympic_games/8291308.stm
Recommendation 6
We recommend that the Mayor commit to retaining a role for his Sports Commissioner and the London Community Sport Board after 2012. We ask that in a response to this report in May 2011 he set out his plans for delivering a sporting legacy beyond 2012 and the extent to which seed funding might be available to ensure the GLA role is retained.

Olympic facilities

5.7 Our focus in this report is on community rather than elite sport but there is still potential for some of the new facilities built for the elite events during the Games to increase the provision for community sport in the long-term. This was recognised in the London bid which promised that, after the Games, the Park facilities would be “accessible for all levels of ability and blend sport, culture and the environment in a way that makes sports an integral part of the community”. 49

5.8 The facilities on the Olympic Park are an important resource and offer significant new facilities in east London. Kate Hoey told the Committee that while her responsibilities lay with grass roots sport rather than the Games themselves she recognised the potential of the facilities. Of the prospects for a football club taking over the Olympic Stadium she recognised the potential noting that other stadiums she had visited around the world were “humming during the day” and were used for community activities such as nurseries. 50

5.9 The Mayor has a target that Olympic Park facilities will be available for use by the community for 90 per cent of the time after the Games. This is on the basis that most elite facilities are only in use for relatively short periods. The 90 per cent target seems optimistic. We were told that it is going to be very challenging to achieve but it remains important as an indication of intent. Kate Hoey noted,

49 Olympic Games concept and legacy, Candidate file, July 2007, p 23
50 Transcript of Economic Development, Culture, Sport and Tourism Committee meeting 7 September 2010, p 6
“everyone else may have gone away from that [the 90 per cent target] but we are still trying to push it”.

5.10 It is not clear what mechanisms are in place to ensure that community access remains central to decisions about the Park in legacy use. The Mayor’s Sports Commissioner continues to argue for it but accepted that she does “not really have the power to change” though she has “some” influence.

5.11 The potential for community use of Olympic facilities can be seen from the work of the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority. The Authority is in charge of the White Water Centre, VeloPark and Tennis and Hockey centres at Eton Manor, from the bid stage right through to legacy use. It has worked in partnership with the associated National Governing Bodies as part of the detailed planning for how venues will be used by elite and grass roots both during and after the Games. It recently supported England Hockey’s concerns for adequate hockey facilities for competition post games and ensured that the specification for Eton Manor gave hockey a suitable post-Games competition venue.

5.12 The Authority has clear plans and goals for sporting use of the venues after the Games. It is keen to introduce new people to the sports of canoeing, cycling, tennis and hockey and argues that by increasing the amount of people taking part in these sports at a grass roots level, it is likely that more people will continue activity into club and then elite level sport. It hopes to engage 400,000 new participants in sports on the site each year and has set out plans on how to do this.

5.13 We commend the work of the Lee Valley Park Regional Authority in ensuring community use of Olympic facilities after the Games is central to its developing plans. Its work is an excellent example of how a sporting legacy can be embedded into the preparations for the Games and provides a useful blueprint for others.

5.14 By contrast, at this stage, it is far from clear what plans are in place to embed a sporting legacy in the venues that will be managed by the Olympic Park Legacy Company (OPLC), including the Stadium, Aquatics centre and Handball arena. While we recognise the 90 per
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cent target is optimistic, community access for anything over 50 per cent of the time would represent a useful addition to the provision of sports facilities and needs a target to form the basis of negotiations with potential tenants.

5.15 There is nothing to suggest the 90 per cent target has formed part of negotiations. In March 2010, the OPLC launched a ‘soft market testing exercise’, inviting potential tenants to set out how they could use the stadium. A summary of responses received stated that all respondents expressed the desire to make the stadium accessible to the public, although the level of access was not specified.

5.16 There are other opportunities for the OPLC to help facilitate a sporting legacy. The CCPR noted, “if the park is able to provide affordable and fit for purpose accommodation for sporting bodies this would be a key contribution to sporting legacy and help to retain a sporting ethos within the park post-games”.

5.17 Access to the Park after the Games is likely to be an important factor in maintaining the interest of the local community and ensuring a long-term engagement with the facilities. The Lee Valley Regional Park Authority noted the risk from the fact that the Park will be closed to the public until 2013/14 suggesting this “has the potential to disengage the local community”. It suggests, “events and activities for the local community be incorporated within the plans for redevelopment, so that local people immediately reap the benefits of the park.” It is not obvious to us who will be in a sufficiently influential position to pursue such ideas under the current governance model.

5.18 The Mayor has influence over the Olympic Park after the Games through his 50 per cent ownership of the Olympic Park Legacy Company. This influence will be even stronger if it is reconstituted as a Mayoral Development Corporation. There is little to suggest that the Mayor’s Sports Commissioner currently has a platform to pursue sporting legacy goals in the ongoing discussions about the Park.

---

54 Olympic Stadium Legacy: Memorandum of Information, Olympic Park Legacy Company March 2010
55 Written submissions to the Committee, p 2
56 Ibid, p 65
5.19 The sporting facilities on the Olympic Park are significant assets and provide an opportunity for the Mayor to realise his sporting legacy goals. We are disappointed that there appears to be no mechanism currently in place to ensure that targets for community access, and retaining a sporting ethos in the Park after the Games, are realised. The role of the Mayor’s Sports Commissioner is not being given appropriate prominence in discussions about the future of the Park.

Recommendation 7

We recommend that by May 2011 the Mayor set out to the Committee: whether he remains committed to a 90 per cent target for community use of Olympic Park facilities; and how he proposes to meet any target, with key milestones and a timetable for achieving it. In doing so, he should address the question of whether there is a role for his Sports Commissioner on the OPLC, and any successor body, or what alternative mechanism he proposes to ensure community access is central to decisions about the Park after the Games.

We further recommend that the Olympic Park Legacy Company ensures targets for community access are included in its ongoing discussions with potential future tenants or owners of sporting facilities on the Olympic Park.
6 Conclusion

6.1 The big ambitions for a sporting legacy from the 2012 Games were always going to be difficult to deliver. We recognise the unique challenges faced by the capital in encouraging and facilitating people to take part in sport. There is also a very different financial situation from the one faced when the bid was won in 2005.

6.2 Some good progress has been made. We commend the work of the Mayor’s Sports Commissioner and the London Community Sports Board in starting to bring together the disparate groups that contribute schemes and facilities to support sports participation in the capital. This is likely to remain an ongoing challenge but is essential if existing resources are to be used to their maximum potential and new sources of funding are to be applied in a strategic way.

6.3 We welcome the fact that many of the issues we have raised previously in this policy area have been taken on board and we continue to support the efforts made to realise a sporting legacy from the 2012 Games. Our proposals in this report are intended to support and enhance the existing work and ensure that all the resources available are channelled in the most effective way.

6.4 Future funding sources are uncertain. Even the huge potential offered by the venues on the Olympic Park has only been partially realised to date. A categorical commitment for community use of these venues after the Games can still, and must, be delivered.

6.5 While the national frameworks and funding sources for sports participation remain uncertain, the onus is on the Mayor to drive this agenda at a regional level embedding the goal of sports participation in the decisions he still has to make about the Games. The Mayor also needs to demonstrate that his interventions in the funding and provision of community sport meet the objectives he has set.

6.6 A little realism is clearly necessary. The evidence from previous Games did not support the ambitious targets for increases in sports participation made at the time of the bid. More importantly, the retrenchment in public finances has squeezed already limited funds to invest in infrastructure for facilities and
coaches, which will be needed if any sort of a sporting legacy is to be delivered.

6.7 Perhaps unsurprisingly there is little evidence to date of a “Games effect” on the sports participation rates of Londoners, which remain unchanged from previous years. Furthermore, the Games are still over a year away. Only in the last few months has significant progress started to be made in the allocation of grants from the Mayor’s fund. And many of those responding to our investigation highlighted the difficulties of trying to ensure a strategic oversight of the decisions of disparate funding bodies and providers.

6.8 Over the next 12 months though as we get closer to the Games themselves the funding provided by the Mayor, and the influence he has had over the funding of others, will need to start to show results. We have set out in this report what we and others will expect to see and intend to monitor progress carefully.

6.9 The Mayor’s ambition for a “leaner, fitter London” after the Games is a welcome one. There is much to be done for it to be realised. The recommendations in this report are intended to help make some contribution towards this goal and we urge those involved to take them on board.
Appendix 1  Recommendations

Recommendation 1
We recommend that the Sports Commissioner and London Community Sports Board develop their partnership approach to incorporate the local health and education sectors. We ask that the Sports Commissioner report back to the Committee by May 2011 on how she plans to ensure the state and independent educations sectors, and local and regional health providers, can contribute to the Mayor’s strategic aims for sports participation; and what the timescale is for this work.

Recommendation 2
We recommend that the Sports Commissioner and the London Community Sports Board negotiate with LOCOG to broaden the way the Olympic brand could be used to raise the profile of the work being done to achieve a sports participation legacy. We ask that the Sports Commissioner report back to the Committee on this in May 2011.

Recommendation 3
We recommend that after the announcement of the second round of successful bids for the facilities fund in May 2011, the Mayor’s Sports Commissioner report to the Committee on how the Mayor’s funding is adding to the supply of sports facilities in areas where demand exceeds supply.

Recommendation 4
We recommend that the Mayor’s Sports Commissioner evaluate the costs and benefits of the different approaches that have been taken to managing and allocating the Mayor’s funds. We ask that she report back to the Committee in May 2011 on the outcome of this review and how they will be taken into account in future funding rounds.

Recommendation 5
We recommend that in December 2011 the Mayor’s Sports Commissioner report to the Committee on the outcomes from the grants awarded from the Mayor’s sports funds. This should include details of the numbers of additional people who have started taking part in sport and progress against other social objectives set out for the funds.
We further recommend that in reporting back to the Committee in December 2011, the Mayor’s Sport Commissioner set out how the work of the London Community Sports Board has sought to influence
the funding decisions of others and the progress that has been made in filling the strategic gaps identified by the Board's work.

**Recommendation 6**

We recommend that the Mayor commit to retaining a role for his Sports Commissioner and the London Community Sport Board after 2012. We ask that in a response to this report in May 2011 he set out his plans for delivering a sporting legacy beyond 2012 and the extent to which seed funding might be available to ensure the GLA role is retained.

**Recommendation 7**

We recommend that by May 2011 the Mayor set out to the Committee: whether he remains committed to a 90 per cent target for community use of Olympic Park facilities; and how he proposes to meet any target, with key milestones and a timetable for achieving it. In doing so, he should address the question of whether there is a role for his Sports Commissioner on the OPLC, and any successor body, or what alternative mechanism he proposes to ensure community access is central to decisions about the Park after the Games.

We further recommend that the Olympic Park Legacy Company ensures targets for community access are included in its ongoing discussions with potential future tenants or owners of sporting facilities on the Olympic Park.
## Appendix 2 Sports legacy bodies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
<th>Remit</th>
<th>Budget (where available)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCMS</td>
<td>Deliver a safe and successful Olympic and Paralympic Games in London in 2012, and urgently form plans to deliver a genuine and lasting legacy</td>
<td>£135m National Lottery funding for national legacy plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>Sponsored by DCMS to grow levels of adult sporting participation for all sport except in-school (including curriculum PE) and elite level sport</td>
<td>£250m / year £135m Exchequer and £116m National Lottery funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Sports Trust</td>
<td>An independent charity working to encourage all young people to take part in five hours of PE and sport each week, both in and out of school time.</td>
<td>£15m per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Governing Bodies (46)</td>
<td>Bodies responsible for individual sports, e.g. UK Athletics</td>
<td>£120m (National Lottery and Exchequer) per year, from Sport England</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Remit</th>
<th>Budget (where available)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor of London / GLA</td>
<td>Deliver a grass roots sporting legacy for Londoners from the 2012 Games by securing a sustained increase in participation in sport and physical activity amongst Londoners.</td>
<td>£15.5m until 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Community Sports Board</td>
<td>Non-statutory advisory group to oversee the delivery of the Mayor’s strategy and investment of the £15.5 million, and to advise the Mayor on London-wide delivery of grass roots sport and physical activity.</td>
<td>No associated budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sub-regional / Local

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget/Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPLC</td>
<td>Long-term planning, development, management and maintenance of the Olympic Park and its facilities after the London 2012 Games.</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Valley Regional Park Authority</td>
<td>Management of the remaining venues: Velopark, Hockey and Tennis centre and the White Water Centre.</td>
<td>Funding secured from Sport England: £200,000 per year for each London region to 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Active Partnerships</td>
<td>Five in London: East, Central, North, South and West of London, part of the national County Sports Partnership network. Each Partnership consists of a network of organisations to increase participation in physical activity and sport.</td>
<td>Nº asociated budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Host Borough Unit’s Strategic Regeneration Framework | By 2015, the SRF targets are that the host boroughs will:  
• narrow the gap on adults exercising for 30 minutes three times a week to 0.5% points (an extra 15,000)  
• narrow the gap on adults not taking any physical activity to 1% point (an extra 25,000 adults)  
• ensure that nearly all children will be participating in school sport (an extra 48,000). | Nº asociated budget                                       |
| Boroughs                                  | Local delivery of sport and recreation                                                                                                                                                                     | £94 million in 2009/10                                    |
The membership of the London Community Sports Board is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kate Hoey MP (Chair)</td>
<td>Mayor’s Commissioner for Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Bitel</td>
<td>Chief Executive, London Marathon Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaun Dawson</td>
<td>Regional Sport Champion for London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Dickens</td>
<td>North Lambeth/North Southwark Sport Action Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr John Fahy</td>
<td>London Councills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Colin Moynihan</td>
<td>Chairman, British Olympic Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangita Patel</td>
<td>London Community Sports Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosi Prescott</td>
<td>Chief Executive, Central YMCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Sesnan</td>
<td>Chairman, ProActive Central; Managing Director, GLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Sparkes</td>
<td>Chief Executive, Amateur Swimming Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Sutch</td>
<td>Chair, London Federation of Sport and Recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3 Orders and translations

**How to order**
For further information on this report or to order a copy, please contact David Bellman, Administrator, on or email:
david.bellman@london.gov.uk

**See it for free on our website**
You can also view a copy of the report on the GLA website:
http://www.london.gov.uk/assembly/reports

**Large print, braille or translations**
If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of this report in large print
or braille, or a copy of the summary and main findings in another
language, then please call us on: 020 7983 4100 or email:
assembly.translations@london.gov.uk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Hindi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Bengali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Urdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>Gujarati</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Report to: London Assembly

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 16 March 2011

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

1.1 The Mayor and Assembly jointly disposed of all but three of the recommendations contained in the August 2009 report of the Senior Salaries Review Body (SSRB) on the remuneration packages of the Authority’s elected members (SSRB Report No. 69), immediately following its publication. The three remaining recommendations were referred to an Advisory Panel, jointly appointed by the Mayor and Assembly, and its report is now submitted for approval and adoption.

2. Recommendations

2.1 That the recommendations of the GLA Advisory Panel on the 2009 SSRB review, as set out in sections 3.7, 4.7 and 5.8 of the Panel’s attached report, be agreed and formally adopted by the Assembly, jointly with the Mayor, as the Authority’s formal response to the outstanding recommendations of the 2009 SSRB report.

3. Background

3.1 Prior to the 2008 GLA elections the Mayor and Assembly agreed to defer the triennial review of elected members’ remuneration until after those elections to allow the new Authority to determine any changes to be introduced and to reflect the extension of the Authority’s powers through the provisions of the GLA Act 2007, some of which were only to be implemented that spring. Accordingly, by a letter dated 24 September 2008, the Mayor and Assembly asked the Senior Salaries Review Body (SSRB) to undertake the periodic review.

3.2 The SSRB’s report (August 2009) contained 15 recommendations that covered a range of issues including GLA pay, the up-rating mechanism, allowances paid by the police and fire authorities under their own legislation, dual mandates, salary abatement, register of interests, frequency of reviews, and severance arrangements.

3.3 When dealing with the SSRB report in November 2009 the Mayor and Assembly accepted – or referred to the relevant functional body – the majority of the report’s recommendations, and established an Advisory Panel to undertake the reviews proposed or necessitated by three recommendations.
3.4 The Advisory Panel comprised one Member from each of the political groups on the Assembly, a representative of the Mayor and, from the Standards Committee, the Chair and one other Independent Member.

3.5 The Advisory Panel received information as to -
- the statutory position
- current practice in the national and other regional bodies in the UK
- evidence from GLA elected members and relevant national organisations
- published work (where it existed) on the issues raised, as well as
- the legal implications of the SSRB’s recommendations.

3.6 The Panel considered that, with -
- its representation drawn from the Standards Committee’s independent members as well as Mayoral and Assembly interests,
- the benefit of advice regarding legislative frameworks and practice in central, regional and local government, and
- the views of relevant external bodies,

it was competent to undertake a mini-review of the issues on behalf of the Authority and reach informed conclusions on the issues raised by the SSRB.

4. Issues for Consideration

4.1 The Advisory Panel’s consideration of the three outstanding SSRB recommendations is summarised below.

**Recommendation 9 – Dual Mandates**

4.2 The SSRB proposed that the Authority should review whether elected members should be able to hold other public sector positions. The Panel concluded, for the reasons stated in its report, that such dual mandates could be beneficial, that members, being accountable to the electorate, could decide what level of activity was not detrimental to their GLA duties, and that financial remuneration received by members from other public sector positions should be published on a central database maintained by the Authority.

**Recommendation 10 – Abatement of GLA Salaries**

4.3 The SSRB proposed that, in the event of the above outcome, the Authority should consider whether to extend the current salary abatement arrangements to include other public sector positions. The Panel concluded that extension of the abatement provisions beyond the existing categories was impracticable as there was too much ambiguity about the senior roles cited by the SSRB, and that in any event it was for the Secretary of State to vary the existing Order.

**Recommendation 11 – Register of Interests**

4.4 The SSRB proposed that members should be required to register and publish details of any time spent on private and public sector activities apart from GLA membership, and remuneration received for these roles. The Panel concluded that the changes proposed in the Localism Bill to the standards regime and the registration of interests made such a decision premature, that the complexities inherent in the proposed regime would undermine the perceived benefits, and that therefore the SSRB recommendation be not approved.
5. **Legal Implications**

5.1 The Assembly has the power to do what is recommended in this report.

6. **Financial Implications**

6.1 There are no direct financial implications at this stage.

---
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GLA Advisory Panel on the 2009 SSRB Review

Report to the Mayor of London and the London Assembly

1. PERIODIC REVIEW OF ELECTED MEMBERS’ REMUNERATION

1.1 Prior to the 2008 GLA elections the Mayor and Assembly agreed to defer the triennial review of elected members’ remuneration until after those elections to allow the new Authority to determine any changes to be introduced and to reflect the extension of the Authority’s powers through the provisions of the GLA Act 2007, some of which were only to be implemented that spring. Accordingly, by a letter dated 24 September 2008, the Mayor and Assembly asked the Senior Salaries Review Body (SSRB) to undertake the periodic review, with detailed terms of reference as follows:

1. To review the salary and pension provisions for the –
   - Mayor of London
   - Deputy Mayor
   - Chair of the London Assembly
   - Members of the London Assembly;

2. To consider the application of relevant comparators for similar roles and responsibilities within the elected / public sector;

3. To make alternate recommendations to the Head of Paid Service of the Greater London Authority for revised remuneration packages for those office holders to take effect on 5 May 2008 and 1 April 2009; and

4. To comment on –
   - the appropriate review cycle for these remuneration packages, and
   - the appropriate cost of living mechanism for elected members’ salaries in order to ensure that, between reviews, they track the salaries of the preferred comparator group identified under 2 above.

5. To review the Authority’s resettlement grant scheme for the Mayor and Assembly Members, having regard to the SSRB’s previous recommendations that an Authority scheme should be modelled on the Parliamentary scheme.

1.2 In the event, the SSRB’s report (August 2009) contained 15 recommendations that covered a range of issues including GLA pay, the up-rating mechanism, allowances paid by the police and fire authorities under their own legislation, dual mandates, salary abatement, register of interests, frequency of reviews, and severance arrangements.

2. ADVISORY PANEL ON THE 2009 SSRB REVIEW

2.1 When dealing with the SSRB report in November 2009 the Mayor and Assembly accepted – or referred to the relevant functional body – the majority of the report’s recommendations, and established an Advisory Panel to undertake the reviews proposed or necessitated by three recommendations.
2.2 The Advisory Panel comprised one Member from each of the political groups on the Assembly, a representative of the Mayor and, from the Standards Committee, the Chair and one other Independent Member.

2.3 Its terms of reference were set as follows:

2. To review recommendations 9 (public sector positions), 10 (abatements) and 11 (register of interests) of the Senior Salaries Review Body’s report (published August 2009) and the narrative explanation provided.

3. To consider comparative practice in Parliament, other devolved assemblies and public bodies, the relevant sections of the Committee on Standards in Public Life’s report on MPs’ expenses and allowances (published 4 November 2009), and any other relevant and available research, whether or not published.

4. To report to the Mayor and Assembly on appropriate responses to the SSRB recommendations.

[The Mayor accepted that, where the SSRB recommendations referred to Assembly Members, the role of the Mayor should also be considered.]

2.4 The Advisory Panel received information as to:

- o the statutory position
- o current practice in the national and other regional bodies in the UK
- o published work (where it existed) on the issues raised, as well as
- o the legal implications of the SSRB’s recommendations.

2.5 The Panel decided that written evidence should initially be sought from the Mayor and Assembly Members individually, London Councils, the Local Government Association, the Audit Commission and the Local Government Improvement and Development Agency.

2.6 In the event, responses were received only from: the Local Government Association, London Councils, Mike Tuffrey AM on behalf of the Liberal Democrat Group and Len Duvall AM on behalf of the Labour Group; and these were taken into account during the Panel’s deliberations.

2.7 The Panel considered that, with -

- o its representation drawn from the Standards Committee’s independent members as well as Mayoral and Assembly interests,
- o the benefit of advice regarding legislative frameworks and practice in central, regional and local government, and
- o the views of relevant external bodies,

it was competent to undertake a mini-review of the issues on behalf of the Authority and reach informed conclusions on the issues raised by the SSRB.

2.8 The background to the three SSRB recommendations and the Panel’s considerations are set out in the following sections.
2.9 However, at the outset the Panel notes the Government’s promotion of its Localism Bill. It is anticipated that the relevant provisions of the Bill will not come into effect any earlier than mid-2011. The Government’s announcements regarding the Bill are directly relevant to the SSRB recommendations under consideration:

§ It is proposed that the Bill will abolish the Standards Board regime, the mandatory Code of Conduct, and standards committees with the power to suspend elected members.

§ If passed in the form indicated, the provisions - when implemented – will mean that elected members will be required to register their interests in a public register, as they do now, but what interests they will be required to register (and what constitutes such an interest) will not be set out in the Code of Conduct that authorities are currently required to maintain.

§ Failure to register an interest, or deliberately seeking to mislead the public about an interest, will be a criminal offence.

§ It is unlikely that the new requirements to register interests under the Bill will cover the details set out in Recommendation 11. If this is correct, whether the Authority will be able to require its elected members to register such details (as an enforceable matter of conduct) will depend upon what requirements it will be able to - and agrees to - impose on its members over and above the provisions of the Bill, when enacted.

§ The Bill’s provisions overall are likely to have implications for any future changes to the Authority’s Register of Interests, and its early introduction at Parliament is therefore relevant to the consideration of SSRB recommendations 9 and 11.

3. **SSRB RECOMMENDATION 9 – DUAL MANDATES**

3.1 The SSRB recommendation 9 reads as follows -

*We recommend that the Mayor and Assembly conduct a review before the next Assembly election to determine whether it remains appropriate for Assembly Members also to hold any public sector position, for example a position of special responsibility on a council, requiring their attention during the Assembly's usual business hours.*

3.2 The preamble to the recommendation is framed by the assumption that the role of an elected member of the Authority is full-time and by the SSRB’s concerns regarding public sector activities that may require attention during the Authority’s usual business hours. However, the SSRB report does not define the term ‘usual business hours’, which for most elected members of the Authority are likely to extend regularly into evenings and weekends, nor does the report make plain the reason for differentiating this activity from private sector work which features in SSRB recommendation 11 and for which the SSRB does not suggest a responsibility or time allocation test.

3.3 Equally significantly, the SSRB report does not address the facts that the GLA Act specifically –

a. places on elected members the responsibility to serve on the police and fire authorities, and
b. provides a mechanism for the Secretary of State to legislate for a member’s GLA salary to be abated where he or she is also serving as, for example, a Member of Parliament or is receiving
remuneration “in respect of their membership of any other public body (whether elected or appointed”).

3.4 Clearly, the Act recognises that a member of this Authority is not prevented in principle from holding other elected office or other public sector appointments. Members of the Authority may potentially be appointed – in their own right, and not as members of the Authority – to a wide range of public bodies although in practice there have been relatively few appointments other than elected office.

3.5 Of the national, regional and local government institutions, only the Northern Ireland Assembly has moved to bar dual mandates (service as an MLA and local councillor having been deemed incompatible).

3.6 The Panel consider that there is a fundamental inconsistency between, on the one hand, the SSRB’s isolation of public sector activity in the recommendation for review of appropriateness and for possible salary abatement, and, on the other, recommendation 11’s broader proposal to publish details of private sector activity as well. Further, it is unclear why the SSRB recommends considering restricting (non-GLA) public sector activity when a) functional body membership is enshrined in the GLA Act, recognising some degree of complementarity of roles, and b) there is no hint of restricting private/third sector work, either by legislation or in the code of conduct that currently applies to members (noting that the Government proposes to abolish the mandatory code of conduct when the Localism Bill comes into effect).

3.7 The Panel RECOMMENDS the Mayor of London and the London Assembly to –

A. Accept its deliberations as fulfilling the SSRB recommendation 9 for “a review … to determine whether it remains appropriate for [elected members of the Authority] also to hold any public sector position, for example a position of special responsibility on a council, requiring their attention during the [Authority’s] usual business hours”;

B. Accept that it is beneficial that elected members of the Authority hold additional roles as they bring with them different knowledge, skills and experience;

C. Acknowledge that, providing all other public sector positions are declared, it is for elected members to judge what additional roles they can undertake without detriment to their GLA duties and it is for the electorate to decide if these additional roles are appropriate; and

D. Agree that the financial remuneration received by elected members of the Authority for all the public sector roles that they hold should be published on a central database maintained by the Authority to aid transparency and public accountability.

4. SSRB RECOMMENDATION 10 – SALARY ABATEMENT

4.1 The SSRB recommendation 10 reads as follows –

We recommend that if, as a result of the proposed review into public sector positions held by Assembly Members, the Greater London Authority decides that it is appropriate for Assembly Members to hold public sector positions requiring their attention during the Assembly’s usual business hours, then the
Greater London Authority should consider whether to extend the current abatement arrangements to include other public sector positions.

4.2 The GLA Act 1999 provides for the Authority to approve salaries for its elected members that differentiate between GLA roles (namely the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor, the Chair of the Assembly and other Assembly Members) but does not allow the Authority unilaterally to abate salaries for remuneration from external, non-GLA, public bodies.

4.3 The only power within the GLA Act to abate salaries lies with the Secretary of State who may, by order, abate a member’s GLA salary where he or she receives relevant remuneration - a) pursuant to a resolution of either House of Parliament relating to the remuneration of members of that House, b) as a United Kingdom MEP, or c) in respect of their membership of any other public body (whether elected or appointed) which is specified in the order.

4.4 However, the GLA (Limitation of Salaries) Order 2000 – amended in 2008 – applies this provision to MPs, office holders in the House of Lords and MEPs only and it is not currently applied to those receiving relevant remuneration by virtue of “membership of any other public body”.

4.5 The SSRB deals separately with allowances paid by the MPA and LFEPA and so, although its approach is consistent, the SSRB was presumably here focusing on roles in local authorities and other public bodies such as NHS trusts. It is unclear in what ways public sector positions are materially different from employment / private sector etc “paid activity”. The abatement is applied to the GLA salary, irrespective of the pay attracted by the other role. The abatement mechanism is not therefore proportional to the member’s total remuneration.

4.6 There are no arrangements in the national, regional and local government institutions for their elected members to have their salaries abated in the event of receiving remuneration from other public body offices, apart from a limitation (equivalent to the GLA’s) for Welsh / Northern Ireland Assembly Members who are also MPs/MEPs. Local government allowances (basic or special responsibility) are not abated statutorily for remuneration from other public office.

4.7 The Panel RECOMMENDS the Mayor of London and the London Assembly to –

A. Accept its deliberations as fulfilling the SSRB recommendation 10 to “consider whether to extend the current abatement arrangements to include other public sector positions”;

B. Accept that, in regard to more senior roles, there is too much ambiguity around what constitutes such a role, and that this makes any extension to the current arrangements impracticable; and

C. Accept that abatement arrangements (which, in relation to GLA salaries, can only be extended by the Secretary of State) do not need to be extended as elected members of the Authority should be able to hold other public sector roles generally, and it is, again, for the electorate to decide if this is appropriate;
5. SSRB RECOMMENDATION 11 – REGISTER OF INTERESTS

5.1 The SSRB recommendation 11 reads as follows –

_We recommend that the Standing Register of Interest be updated to include details of the average time spent, in hours per month, carrying out public and private sector activities, other than membership of the Greater London Authority, and the remuneration received for these roles._

5.2 Unlike SSRB recommendations 9 and 10, this recommendation wraps up private sector activity with other public sector appointments, and relates to transparency rather than appropriateness or fairness. Although Westminster, the Scottish Parliament and the Welsh Assembly have or are moving towards similar provisions, the Northern Ireland Assembly and local authorities generally have no such requirement.

5.3 Significantly, however, the Panel notes that it is understood that the Localism Bill, the relevant provisions of which it is anticipated will not come into effect any earlier than mid-2011, is likely to make it a criminal offence for prescribed interests not to be registered and that this is likely to have implications for any future changes to the Authority’s Register of Interests. It is unlikely that the new requirements to register interests under the Bill will cover the details set out in SSRB recommendation 11. If this is correct, whether the Authority will be able to require its elected members to register such details (as an enforceable matter of conduct) will depend upon what requirements it will be able to and agrees to impose on its elected members over and above the provisions of the Bill, when enacted.

5.4 Following the principle that members should be elected on the basis of terms that are known and clearly understood before their election, the Panel takes the view that any change to the Standing Register of Interests should be made at the beginning of a new Mayoral term. It could be considered now only in principle, and initially only on the basis of a voluntary arrangement.

5.5 A common-sense approach is needed in deciding what information should be made available. There are practical difficulties in accounting separately for the time spent in different roles, particularly for Assembly Members who are also members of a functional body or a local authority. Although the Mayor publishes monthly reports detailing the work he undertakes in his capacity as Mayor, it would not be practicable to publish detailed information on the exact hours/days spent in a particular role.

5.6 Declarations should not be complicated and impractical to make, and the Panel believes that members would need to ask officers to prepare very clear guidance if accidental errors were to be avoided. Even then, as indicated in paragraph 5.3 above, what requirements as to interests the GLA will be able to and agrees to impose on its elected members, over and above the provisions of the Localism Bill, will not be known until the relevant provisions of the Bill are enacted. Further, there may be issues of commercial confidentiality in relation to non-Authority activity, for example, in relation to consultancy work where the employment is already registerable but not the fee or duration. The Panel believes that there are sufficient transparency and accountability mechanisms already in place in the Authority, and takes the view that, even if the proposed legislation reduces the obligation on elected members, the Authority should maintain the current levels of disclosure.

5.7 Having regard to these considerations, any decision at this time – and therefore ahead of Parliament’s consideration of the Localism Bill and the introduction of new statutory arrangements - to amend the Register with effect from May 2012 would be premature.
5.8 The Panel RECOMMENDS the Mayor of London and the London Assembly that SSRB recommendation 11 be not approved on the grounds that the proposed legislative changes make a decision at this time premature, and that the complexities inherent in the proposed regime would undermine the perceived benefits.

Claer Lloyd Jones
Chair, GLA Advisory Panel on the 2009 SSRB Review
November 2010
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This report will be considered in public

1. Summary
1.1 The Assembly is asked to consider the motions submitted by Assembly Members.

2. Recommendation
2.1 That the Assembly considers the motions set out below.

3. Issues for Consideration
3.1 The following motion has been proposed in the name of Victoria Borwick AM and will be seconded by Caroline Pidgeon AM:

“This Assembly believes that the closure of the paediatric cardiac surgery unit at Royal Brompton Hospital, which will seriously de-stabilise all services at Royal Brompton & Harefield NHS Foundation Trust, will adversely affect health outcomes for adults and children with heart and lung conditions, including cystic fibrosis, severe asthma and Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease, and thus negatively impact on health inequalities in London.”

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

“This Assembly supports retention of the 50p tax rate for those earning over £150,000, and regrets the Mayor’s call for its abolition. It notes that a family with two children and a household income of £150,000 would be in the richest 1% of households in the country, and believes it is fair to expect the very richest households, many of whom live and work in London, to contribute more to the national finances, particularly at this time.

The Assembly therefore requests that the Chair writes to the Chancellor of the Exchequer expressing this Assembly’s support for keeping the 50p tax rate.”

3.3 The following motion has been proposed in the name of the Chair, Dee Doocey AM, and will be seconded by Roger Evans AM:

“This Assembly sends a message of loyal greetings to Her Majesty the Queen on the occasion of the marriage of her grandson, HRH Prince William of Wales, to Catherine Middleton on 29 April 2011 and extends its warmest wishes to the happy couple for a long and happy life together.

The Assembly instructs the Chair to write to Her Majesty conveying its respect and greetings.”
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