

GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY

[REDACTED]
(By email)

Our Ref: MGLA231118-8874

17 December 2018

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your request for information which the GLA received on 23 November 2018. Your request has been dealt with under the Freedom of Information Act.

Our response to your request is as follows:

1. *how much advertising revenue will be lost from TFL from the Mayors announcement to ban junk food advertising*

This question has previously been responded to at Mayors Question Time. On [13 September 2018](#) the Mayor confirmed that:

The proposed ban would reduce children's direct exposure to junk food advertisements and it would be aimed at products, not brands, so a brand could still advertise a healthier product in their range. The revenue of advertising of less healthy food and drink on the TfL advertising estate is estimated to be in the region of £13 million per year. However, we do not necessarily expect there to be any significant impact on overall revenue as we expect brands advertising these products to switch to advertising the healthier products in their range. Our consultation has only recently closed. We are now considering all the responses. At this stage we are not yet in a position to confirm what restrictions on junk food and drink advertising would involve but my officials are working with industry partners to ensure we minimise any unintended consequences.

2. *any correspondence between the Mayor and his political advisers surrounding the ban*

The GLA does not hold any information in scope of this part of your request.

3. *any impact studies carried out by the GLA about how effective the ban will be*

Significant work has been undertaken to review evidence relating to the effectiveness of introducing advertising restrictions. This includes a growing body of evidence that the more children are exposed to advertising for less healthy foods, whether on TV, on the internet, or via outdoor advertising, the more they express a preference and desire for unhealthy food products, and the higher the risk of increasing their consumption of those foods, and of becoming

overweight or obese¹. Universal and preventative interventions, rather than individually-focussed treatment approaches, have the greatest potential for impact². An analysis (published in the Lancet in 2010) of the top six population-level interventions in seven OECD countries including England, shows that marketing restrictions to protect children from HFSS marketing are likely to have the most significant effects on health and be cost-effective, over the longest term³.

It is accepted that this one measure alone will not solve child obesity in London. The policy's effectiveness will therefore rely on the successful implementation of a whole-system approach under the London Food Strategy that includes proposals such as restrictions on new takeaways opening within 400 metres of schools, a requirement for new takeaways to sign up to the Healthier Catering Commitment, work to improve the healthy food on offer to children of all ages (through the Mayor's Healthy Schools and Healthy Early Years programmes), and plans to promote the take-up of Healthy Start Vouchers and healthy eating more generally

If you have any further questions relating to this matter, please contact me, quoting the reference at the top of this letter.

Yours sincerely

Paul Robinson
Information Governance Officer

If you are unhappy with the way the GLA has handled your request, you may complain using the GLA's FOI complaints and internal review procedure, available at:

<https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/governance-and-spending/sharing-our-information/freedom-information>

¹ <http://obesityhealthalliance.org.uk/2018/06/20/six-facts-junk-food-marketing/>

² <https://foodfoundation.org.uk/bite-size-breaking-down-the-challenge-of-inner-city-childhood-obesity/>

³ https://www.who.int/choice/publications/Obesity_Lancet.pdf