

London Assembly (Mayor's Question Time) – 13 July 2017

Transcript of Agenda Item 4 – Questions to the Mayor

2017/2742 - Mayor's Transport Strategy

Gareth Bacon AM

What percentage of the proposals in the Mayor's Transport Strategy are fully funded?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thank you for your question. Transport is a cornerstone of my vision for a fairer, greener, healthier and more prosperous city. Transport not only shapes our daily lives and determines how we get around London; it can create new opportunities for Londoners and shape the character of our city.

As has been the case for previous Mayors, a Strategy that covers a period of 25 years includes projects and proposals that are not yet fully funded. A mayoral term is four years, a business plan five years.

The previous Mayor's Strategy contains tens of billions of pounds worth of unfunded and part-funded projects, including extending the Bakerloo line, building Crossrail 2, extending the Docklands Light Railway (DLR) to Barking Riverside, building new river crossings in the east, to name but a few. That is not all. In the first year in office, he scrapped funded projects like Thames Gateway Bridge. In his final years in office, he then came up with unfunded and rather baffling proposals like an island airport in the Thames Estuary, an underground orbital ring road and a package of 13 unfunded river crossings, in addition to wasting public money on vanity projects like the cable car.

In contrast, the first five years of my Strategy are fully funded; no vanity projects, no baffling proposals. Current funding arrangements are set out in the Transport for London (TfL) business plan, which covers the five-year period to 2021/22 and sets out how TfL has undertaken the largest-ever overhaul of its operations since its creation in 2000. Since I became Mayor, the day-to-day operating costs of running London's transport have decreased by £153 million, the first such reduction in TfL's history. TfL has reduced the number of staff earning over £100,000 by nearly a fifth in one year.

Proposals in my long-term 25-year Transport Strategy encompass many programmes which will continue to run beyond the five-year business plan period. For example, Tube upgrades are currently funded in the TfL business plan but will require continued funding in the longer term. My Strategy for London is dependent on securing progress on Crossrail 2, for example, which we continue to lobby the Government about.

It is also important to note that direct responsibility for the operation and improvement of London's transport system is not currently unified under my control. Some proposals will need to be funded through other bodies; for example, Network Rail upgrades will be part of the

Network Rail investment programme. Much of the funding for the infrastructure investment in the Strategy such as Crossrail 2 will be raised in London, but London also needs its fair share of funding from the Government for this investment. I hope all Members of the Assembly will join me in making that case.

Gareth Bacon AM: Thank you for your answer, Mr Mayor. Transport strategies are always long-term and aspirational, and I accept what you say on that point. The original question was: what percentage of the proposals in the Mayor's Transport Strategy are fully funded? Do you have a figure for that?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): For the business plan period, the first five years, they are fully funded.

Gareth Bacon AM: Yes, but as a percentage of the aims and aspirations in this document, do you have a figure for how much of it is fully funded?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): No. They are all deliverable and they are all funded for the first five years of the business plan. Clearly, when I am in my second term and I publish my next business plan, that period will be fully funded.

Gareth Bacon AM: Yes, and so you do not have a percentage for the aspirations that are in this document? You have put a figure on it. You said that £3.3 billion a year would need to be spent by TfL and others from now until 2041 and so you have rough figures for it. How much of that is currently funded at this stage?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): The reason why the question is based on a false premise is some of the things we cannot predict. For example, will the Government fund Crossrail 2? It is currently asking for half from us. We can do that. There is the issue of land value capture. We are piloting the Bakerloo line on land value capture. If that is a success, it will be able to fund some of that. There is discussion about business rates retention. You will appreciate that some of the things are outside our control. Another example is one of the ambitions we have in relation to congestion and road price charging, but that is contingent in relation to Vehicle Exercise Duty (VED) being devolved to us as well.

We are still working on these plans, irrespective of the Government yet not being in the place it needs to be.

Gareth Bacon AM: Yes. As I stated in my supplementary, Mr Mayor, I accepted that it was an aspirational document and that it would depend on various things falling your way, many of which will probably achieve cross-party support. Crossrail 2, for example, we would fully support you on.

However, the question was: what percentage of the aims and aspirations in the document at the moment are fully funded? Do you have a rough figure for that? I know what you said about the first five years but, as a percentage of what is in here, what is that?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): One hundred per cent of the first five years is funded.

Gareth Bacon AM: Yes, I am not asking about the first five years, though. I am asking about the aspirations that you have in your Transport Strategy. How much of that is fully funded at the moment?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): As I explained, the reason why that question cannot be answered is that Crossrail 2, if all goes according to plan, in 2033 comes on stream. The river crossings in the east: we are hoping to get the cycle/pedestrian crossing in 2020/21 and the Silvertown Tunnel with the improved bus links, and so it is soon. The other river crossings will take some time.

Gareth Bacon AM: What I am trying to get to is delivery. I am perfectly accepting that you are not omnipotent and neither was either of your predecessors. People will want to know what you can deliver. The document is aspirational. There is a direction of travel in it, some of which I certainly agree with, some of which less so, but people can judge the Strategy on its own merits. They will want to know how much you can actually deliver. I accept the argument that you will be putting to the Government over Crossrail 2 and over some of the other devolution that needs to happen for you to be able to deliver some of this, but they will want to know how much you can actually deliver as part of your Strategy. That is the premise of the question.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): With respect, it is the same with all strategies over 25 years. The previous guy and the guy before him also had Transport Strategies over 25 years.

Gareth Bacon AM: I have acknowledged that and I have said that they are aspirational strategies and I have said that all along. What I want to know, Mr Mayor, is how much you can deliver now on this and what percentage of your Transport Strategy is deliverable by you under the current circumstances?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I can deliver all that is set out in my business plan for the first five years.

Gareth Bacon AM: You do not have a percentage for the actual Strategy that is in your business plan? You cannot put a figure on it now?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): For the first five years I can; for the business plan period, 100%.

Gareth Bacon AM: I do not think we are making any progress here. Road pricing, Mr Mayor, is quite a radical concept. It is something that is suddenly rising on the agenda. In your Transport Strategy, you have stated and I quote:

“A new approach to funding and delivering the transport network is therefore required. This must include addressing the fundamentally inadequate and unfair way in which road use is paid for in London, with motorists paying too little, and in effect being subsidised by public transport fare payers.”

Do you think that ordinary Londoners would agree that motorists pay too little, Mr Mayor?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): The issue is that we do not get the money we pay. The money Londoners pay in relation to road tax and other issues is not kept in London. It is used to subsidise funding across the country. The issue is to get our fair share of the funding we get in London.

On the issue of how motorists pay, some pay more than they should be paying and that is one of the reasons why we are not getting into the issue of road pricing. We should look at factors like time of day, emissions and congestion. What we would do is have a bespoke system to ensure people pay based upon usage.

Gareth Bacon AM: Would you ask, then, that there will be some kind of offsetting discount on things like road tax, MOT [tests] and fuel duty?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Yes, good question. One of the things we are discussing with the Treasury is in relation to the deal we get for London because the frustration we have is that London is subsidising motorists around the country. Londoners are subsidising road improvements around the country. That is the point I make to the Treasury. When it comes to fiscal devolution or financial devolution, you should look into the issue of VED and also the other issue that London is contributing towards other parts of the country. If we could keep what we as motorists spend, we would be able to do much more for Londoners, including motorists, of course.

Gareth Bacon AM: To clarify, then, your ask from the Treasury would be further devolution of some of the vehicle-related taxes that are raised in London to be retained in London to fund improvements in London?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Yes, very basically yes.

Gareth Bacon AM: That is the argument you will be making?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Yes.

Gareth Bacon AM: Have you made that argument yet? Have you had meetings with the Treasury and put that to them?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Yes, we have.

Gareth Bacon AM: Where are you at with that? What has been happening?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I do not want to give a running commentary, but the Treasury is listening, which is not usual. Sometimes when you make a point with them, they can often metaphorically close the door shut. We are in discussions and I think the Chancellor [of

the Exchequer] understands the frustrations Londoners have in relation to the current arrangements with things being too centralised.

Gareth Bacon AM: OK. A final question on this, then: do you have the powers at the moment to implement road user charging?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): We are exploring what powers we do have. The issue is not simply powers; it is technology. The Congestion Charge (C-Charge) technology is coming towards the end of its lifetime and the question will be whether we invest more in that technology or look at other technology around road pricing. If you remember years ago when the C-Charge was first introduced, it was the first of its kind in the world. No global city the size of London - small villages and towns are not really comparable - has done road pricing on the scale we would need to do it. It is not simply a question of powers; it is a question of technology as well.

That is one of the things the long-term Strategy sets out. It is looking at the issue of a strategy for road pricing. A question that Assembly Member Pidgeon will ask later on is on this issue. It is something that we are attuned to and we want to look into.

Gareth Bacon AM: My final area of questioning is around the private hire industry. I am aware that it is a long-term aspiration of yours to have the power to set caps on the number of private hire licences that are issued. Are there any other tools or mechanisms at your disposal at the moment that could have an impact on the number of private hire vehicles (PHVs) on the roads?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): The other thing we are lobbying for, just for completeness, is not simply devolution to cap but also the issue of cross-border licences. It is possible for somebody to obtain a licence in a part of the country where the conditions are even less strict than in London and then drive all around London and not go back to the place where they got the licence from.

We have a number of powers but the basic rule is the licensing authority, TfL, must give a licence to anybody who satisfies the conditions. I am not sure if you are suggesting an indirect way of --

Gareth Bacon AM: It occurs to me that there are some powers that you have which could have an impact but would not have the same impact as being able to cap the number of licences. For example, PHVs are exempted from the C-Charge and the new Toxicity Charge (T-Charge). Some of those vehicles would not fall foul of either anyway, but those are powers that you have at the moment. Have you considered using those?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): We are reviewing the issue of the C-Charge and its impact on PHVs, yes.

Gareth Bacon AM: That is a watch-this-space.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): The objective there is to address the issue of poor-quality air, not as an indirect way to get a cap on PHVs.

Gareth Bacon AM: That is not a measure that you would consider using?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): It is a measure we are considering using for air quality issues.

Gareth Bacon AM: Not for capping the number of PHVs?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): No.

Gareth Bacon AM: No? OK. Thank you very much, Mr Mayor.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): Assembly Member O'Connell?

Steve O'Connell AM: Yes, thank you very much. Mr Mayor, continuing on the subject of road pricing, I know Caroline [Pidgeon MBE AM] has a question later on the context of the C-Charge, but I am more interested in where road pricing emerged from in your plan because this is something that will be of controversy. I have an understanding around it about congestion; I have an understanding around it about air quality.

However, the first point really is: did you use the phrase or commit to or even mention road charging in your manifesto?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): There are a number of things in my manifesto. I do not have it to hand but I can certainly send you a copy of the manifesto and highlight the reference....

Steve O'Connell AM: There was or there was not?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I do not have the manifesto here.

Steve O'Connell AM: All right. We will have a good look, but I am a bit surprised because you probably expected questions about this. Anyway, I suggest that it was not and that Londoners were probably unsighted on it. That is one question.

You often say you are a south Londoner, an outer Londoner, a southwest Londoner and all that sort of stuff. You will be aware of the reliance at the moment in certain areas of London on car usage, areas in my constituency that have Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) ratings of 1 or 2, where there is an absolute need to use a car. Would you not agree that already the motorist, through car tax, through fuel duty, through MOTs - which mine failed yesterday, unfortunately - is already heavily subsidising the tax system and the road system?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): That is why we are having a negotiation with the Government about making sure we get our fair share.

You are absolutely right to remind all of us that there are some Londoners for whom the car is essential because of poor-quality public transport, particularly those of us who live in the south. One of the reasons why we are keen to do things like looking into the extending the tram, moving the buses from around Oxford Street to other parts of London including near hospitals and trying to make sure we extend public transport in those parts that are deprived is to give people the option.

Also, I recognise that we need a more sophisticated way of making sure drivers pay an amount that is proportionate and fair rather than subsidising road users in other parts of the country.

Steve O'Connell AM: Yes, but, Mr Mayor, I take your point that you may wish to consider or a Mayor may wish to consider road pricing, but offsetting that by a much-improved public transport system. Londoners may well consider it if they knew that they could have a bus network in outer London with no bus stop further than, say, 200 metres away from their stop. I would suggest, Mr Mayor, would not road pricing be something for a second term --

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Absolutely --

Steve O'Connell AM: -- when you could actually go out to Londoners on a mandate, which was missing, and ask them specifically, "Would you vote me in ... ?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Can I just say this? I say this with respect because I do not want to be criticised by the Deputy Chair for being rude to an Assembly Member. The problem with your question is that it is based on the same false premise as the previous question. This is a 25-year Transport Strategy. Nowhere have I suggested road charging in term one. In fact, I am being criticised by these guys for a manifesto promise not to increase C-Charging in term one.

The issue is that we have to be exploring the technology to look at the issue of road charging in future years. The Strategy is for 25 years and so it is almost laughable the idea that a serious politician would ask for the whole 25 years' funding, but there you go.

Steve O'Connell AM: You will not be introducing road pricing in your first term?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): No.

Steve O'Connell AM: Thank you.

2017/2935 - Lessons Learnt from Grenfell Tower

[Andrew Dismore AM](#)

How soon can lessons be learnt from the Grenfell Tower fire?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I will begin by just saying that I am sure all of us have in our thoughts and prayers the families and friends of the victims and everyone affected by this fire.

It is imperative we get answers to all our questions about what happened to make sure justice is delivered and to make sure nothing like this ever happens again. I am taking immediate steps to make sure lessons are acted upon in those areas where I have the powers to do so. For example, I have asked the Commissioner of the London Fire Brigade to investigate what extra specialist equipment and support they might need to keep the capital safe and I have asked my team to consider what can be done through the new London Plan to improve fire safety. The police's criminal investigation is not a matter for me, but I know the Commissioner [of Police of the Metropolis] is determined to secure justice for all those affected.

Most of the questions arising from the Grenfell Tower fire, however, have wide-ranging national implications. They ask us as a country to look at our approach to a range of issues such as how we respond to disasters and look after their victims, how we make sure our buildings and in particular tall buildings are safe for those who occupy them, how we ensure that public bodies listen to and respect all local residents, and how we house some of the least well-off people in our society. These questions need and deserve clear, comprehensive answers that draw on careful expert investigation of the fire, the factors that may have contributed to it and the subsequent response.

This is why the public inquiry into the Grenfell Tower fire is so vital. I want to make sure that survivors, the families of victims and the local community are involved from an early point in discussions about how it should progress. However, the scope of and process for the inquiry remains unclear. The exercise must be transparent and genuinely independent and it must involve those affected by the fire. I have called on the Prime Minister to ensure that this is the case. I have also been clear to the Prime Minister that we do not want to have to wait years to start learning the lessons of what happened at Grenfell Tower. This is why I have said to that the inquiry should produce an interim report in the summer to allow swift implementation of any urgent steps that need taking around fire safety.

Andrew Dismore AM: Thank you. I am sure we all join you in expressing our sympathies and condolences to the survivors and the bereaved and also in commending the outstanding courage and bravery of the firefighters, police and ambulance staff.

For all of the lessons to come out, we are going to have to await the outcome of Sir Martin Moore-Bick's judicial inquiry and you are right to demand the full involvement of the residents with appropriate legal aid backing and also await the interim report of Sir Ken Knight. Would you agree that one obvious lesson is the need for far better communication with and co-ordination of immediate help and support for those affected by the fire and who have lost everything?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): The communication has been awful from day one. I was there again yesterday. Yesterday was week four. I met residents and voluntary groups. The bad news is, I am afraid, the communication has not got much better.

Andrew Dismore AM: We have already seen that the Fire Commissioner has increased predetermined attendance for high-rise fires. As you say, you have rightly asked the Commissioner to advise on what additional resources she considers the Fire Brigade needs.

Would you agree that we need to look at the requirements for and suitability of taller aerial appliances like the one we borrowed from Surrey and of drones like we borrowed from Kent? Will you look at extended-duration breathing apparatus sets and also radio communications, which was also an issue thrown up by the King's Cross inquiry 30 years ago? What approaches have you made to the Government to make sure it contributes its fair share towards the Fire Brigade's requirements?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Of course there is going to be a public inquiry and of course there is going to be a criminal investigation, but that could take some time and I am not willing to wait that long. In consultation with the Chair of the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA), I asked the Commissioner to meet with me and the Chair of LFEPA. I said to the Commissioner through the Chair that what I would like from the Commissioner is an urgent review, based upon her experience from Grenfell Tower, of what further equipment she thinks the fire service needs, learning the lessons of Grenfell Tower. I have received the urgent review from the Commissioner and I have written to the Home Secretary asking her for additional support financially to make sure our firefighters have the equipment they need.

The patent point I make is this. The arrangement and agreement we have with the fire service is one that is quite remarkable when you think about it. Firefighters, men and women, agreed to go into a burning building running towards danger, risking their personal safety and the personal safety of their colleagues. It is not unreasonable for them to, quid pro quo, ensure they have the right equipment. The relevant LFEPA committee will meet in the next couple of weeks to discuss the issue of funding, but we need to ensure that they get the equipment as soon as possible.

It is worth bearing in mind, though, that some bits of equipment take some time to receive once we have ordered it. What I have said to the Commissioner is that my promise to her is she will get whatever she needs.

Andrew Dismore AM: Thanks. Would you also agree that we need to revisit the cuts of the previous Mayor, especially the reduction of fire safety inspecting officers? I am sure you will not tell me to get stuffed, like Boris Johnson [MP, former Mayor of London] did when I challenged him at the time. Do you also agree that a wider issue may be the former Mayor's cuts to stations, pumps and fire crews, although that is another issue for the inquiry to look at?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): We are revisiting the London Safety Plan in relation to Grenfell Tower. You will remember that Anthony Mayer did a report in relation to the impact of the previous Mayor's cuts on the London Fire Brigade. As a consequence of Grenfell Tower and the advice from the Commissioner, we will be revisiting some of the issues around the Safety Plan.

Andrew Dismore AM: Thanks for that. Lastly, the Brigade had done a lot of work predating the Grenfell fire on the need to improve the regulatory framework, the recall of defective whitegoods and - especially after the Lakanal House fire - the need to implement the Coroner's recommendations on the retrofitting of sprinklers. Indeed, apart from Grenfell, only last week we saw a school burn down in Hackney because it did not have sprinklers fitted. Will you be raising these Fire Brigade recommendations again urgently with the Government as they do not need to await the findings of the inquiry?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I have raised them regularly at the taskforce meeting that the Prime Minister chairs. It is worth remembering the timelines. The Lakanal House fire happened in 2009. The Coroner's inquest in 2013 recommendations made, including the three ones that are relevant for the purposes of your current question, are: (1) all buildings and tower blocks which are at major risk should have sprinklers retrofitted; (2) the regulations around cladding should be revisited; and (3) the advice given to tenants and residents should be looked at again, bearing in mind the issue of cladding in the Lakanal fire. They were the 2013 recommendations made and 2015, of course, was the prosecution. There had been a considerable time lapse and that still has not happened, which is the point I make about the reason for an interim report this summer from the chair of the public inquiry.

Clearly, the Government has not listened to the Coroner's report and we need action there. In relation to whitegoods, the Member of Parliament (MP) for Hammersmith, Andy Slaughter, has for the last year been trying to persuade the Government to take more action in relation to concerns he has raised around safety of tumble driers and other forms of whitegoods. Again, no action taken, but these are points that were made around the taskforce meeting that the Prime Minister chairs. Relevant Ministers were present and I am hoping they take heed of the points you have made, I have made, residents have made and experts have made over the last few weeks, months and years.

Andrew Dismore AM: Thank you for that. The King's Cross inquiry 30 years ago produced a step-change in safety and personal protection for firefighters. Let us hope that the outcome of this tragedy is another step-change in safety for residents of tower blocks.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Agreed.

2017/2787 - Mayoral support for ambitious local walking and cycling schemes

[Caroline Russell AM](#)

How will you support boroughs in the planning, design and delivery of ambitious local walking and cycling schemes?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thank you. My new draft Transport Strategy sets out my vision for transport's role in maintaining London as the greatest city on earth. It sets out ambitious plans to tackle the challenges facing London.

Central to this is the Healthy Streets Approach, the first time that such an approach has been applied across the whole transport system of a city like London anywhere in the world. Through

this, we will promote active travel, in particular walking and cycling. This will help us to improve health and air quality and reduced reliance on cars.

The boroughs, working in partnership with TfL, are critical to delivering this transformational change. A £1 billion Healthy Streets fund has been committed to the delivery of borough schemes over the life of TfL's current business plan. This includes funding for the existing Quietways and Central London Grid programmes, continued funding for the three Mini Holland boroughs and, starting in the next financial year, almost £100 million for the new Liveable Neighbourhoods Programme. This new programme has been designed specifically to deliver my Strategy outcomes.

TfL will offer boroughs strategic analysis and data, giving key information, to identify potential areas for investment. For example, TfL has recently published the Strategic Cycling Analysis. This identifies where we should expand the cycling network. TfL will also make available research and lessons learned from projects already implemented such as the Mini Hollands. TfL can also provide design and traffic modelling expertise to boroughs to help them in developing and delivering schemes. As part of the consultation on the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) guidance, boroughs are invited to identify what TfL can do to support them.

Caroline Russell AM: Thank you. I am currently leading an investigation into outer London junctions on behalf of the Transport Committee and I recently met with Waltham Forest councillors, officers and campaigners who are involved in delivering the Mini Holland scheme. They told me that early engagement with the public, good communication and very robust political support have been absolutely crucial in delivering these ambitious changes to the local streets and getting it all off the ground.

I am interested in how you will support local councils to bring residents on board during public consultations on Healthy Streets schemes. Will make TfL's expertise and specialist public engagement experience available to these councils who are spending TfL money on Healthy Streets?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Yes.

Caroline Russell AM: Marvellous. Thank you very much indeed. Going on from that, there are local elections coming up next May [2018] and at election times debates can become quite binary and a bit tetchy, even. What will you and your Walking and Cycling Commissioner, Will Norman, be doing to ensure that there is resilient political backing from councillors and candidates of all parties for the radical changes needed for you to bring about the increases in walking, cycling and public transport use that your Strategy is banking on; that is 80% using those modes by 2041?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): When you look at the three boroughs that are the Mini Holland boroughs, Kingston in the south - Conservative controlled - Enfield and Waltham Forest, they are different sorts of boroughs. What has been interesting is their experience of the Mini Holland schemes and we are learning lessons all the time from them. It has been difficult and you are right to refer to that in your questioning. Will [Norman] was with you, I

know, in Waltham Forest and we are keen to work with the councils, but during council elections there is the rough-and-tumble of politics. I appreciate that views can be polarised, but what I do not want to do is to step onto the field and take sides, particularly with accusations in Kingston where the Conservative Council has worked with residents but often has been unpopular, and I do not want to be inadvertently accused of politicking on what is an important issue. Look, we will use our expertise where we can but, also, I recognise that some of this stuff has been difficult for councils and I want to support them.

Caroline Russell AM: Thank you. You picked Will Norman for his particular skills in selling ideas and bringing about behaviour change. I am looking for a big London-wide campaign on this with some good key messages and a highly visible champion. When do you think he is going to get on with this? Is this not what his job is?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): That is a bit unfair. I think you are playing to your election next year in the council elections, rather than being a sensible Assembly Member.

Will is qualified for the job. We advertised openly. He was not my mate. He was not a journalist. He is a qualified expert in this area. He works with boroughs, with TfL and with experts. He has a conciliatory approach rather than rushing in headlong without taking people with him. His conciliatory approach has won friends all across London. We have had to look at the whole issue of Cycle Superhighways and the whole issue of Quietways and the whole issue of recognising that a lot of these schemes only happen in partnership with local authorities. If local authorities do not themselves want to encourage more people to walk and cycle, we have to persuade them that it is the right thing to do using evidence and the views of local residents, but we cannot force councils to do things when they are not our roads. That conciliatory approach is what we need and Will is doing a cracking job. He has done more bridge-building and more persuasion in his first few months than the previous chap did in many years.

Caroline Russell AM: Certainly, I am all for bridge-building and persuasion and getting everyone on board. You mentioned some of the really high-quality schemes that did see considerable pushback before they were delivered such as the Lea Bridge Road, the village in Walthamstow and the East/West and North/South Cycle Superhighways, which are now successfully in place, being used and enjoyed by Londoners and the sky has not fallen in.

What lessons have you learned from these now successful schemes that were once very controversial?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Better consultation; speak to residents; take them with you; persuade them of the case; do not steamroll over local residents' views. Some of them have genuine concerns that should be addressed. It is really important that we do that.

Also, we cannot have within TfL a them-and-us attitude. TfL works to serve Londoners. TfL cannot be seen as simply people who are interested in road users who drive vehicles. They have to be looking after walking and cycling as well. That is why we have at the centre of our Transport Strategy walking and cycling and encouraging more people to walk and cycle.

When it comes to, for example, funding, we are going to reward councils in relation to the LIP stuff when they are following our agenda. Look, the harsh reality is that London's population is growing. We are 8.7 million now and we are going to be 10 million by 2030. We need to have more people walking and cycling. My ambition is 80% walking and cycling. Also, if you are walking and cycling 20 minutes a day, you will lead a healthier, longer life.

Caroline Russell AM: That is great. I am really glad to hear that you are taking on that emphasis of the importance of dialogue and conversation and consultation.

Just thinking about the quality of the schemes and making sure they are really good quality, some joint TfL and borough schemes that are coming through the pipeline now are not consistent with the Healthy Streets Approach. For instance, there is a new plan for Fiveways junction in Croydon, which came out this week. Cyclists are being asked to move out of a cycle lane and merge with three lanes of fast-flowing traffic. There is a little note on the diagram that says, "Ahead cyclists to merge with vehicles". There is no protected space for cycling going from north to south. This is not really a cycling project for people who are aged 8 to 80. You would not want your 12- or 13-year-old cycling to school to be coping with that. People on Twitter have been wondering if the TfL modelling team actually got the Healthy Streets memo.

Are you aware that there are schemes that are not compliant with Healthy Streets that are being put out to consultation? What will you do about that?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Steve [O'Connell AM] is not in his seat but I will speak to the Assembly Member and also Dr Will Norman to look into that particular case. I do not know enough about it.

Caroline Russell AM: Mike Brown [MVO, Commissioner of Transport for London] promised me back in June last year [2016] that the Healthy Streets check tool would be applied to all junction schemes at a design stage. It looks as if that did not actually happen at the Fiveways junction. If it did, I would be very interested to see what score it got. Is it possible for you to get that for me?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Like I said, I will look into it with the Assembly Member and also Will Norman.

Caroline Russell AM: Thank you. The Healthy Streets check tool is useful for scoring specific junctions or bits of public realm in a lot of detail, but there is a need for a tool that can test the quality of an entire route objectively to check that it is fit for funding and to check that TfL money is being spent really well. Will you ask TfL to create a whole-route quality check for TfL-funded schemes like those that you hope to see in the boroughs?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): When a cyclist goes from home to work or home to college, the route he or she takes is different depending on where they live and where they go to and stuff. We cannot check every single route Londoners take.

Caroline Russell AM: Of course, but if you are talking about a specific Quietway or Cycle Superhighway route?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): What TfL has published is the Strategic Cycling Analysis and we will make sure we analyse all 25 of those. I have to be realistic about the ambition. The ambition is to have more and more people cycling and for there to be more and more routes. The idea for us to have control-freakery from the centre in relation to controlling all the routes does not work because we have 32 boroughs plus the City of London. Of course, we will help them with the modelling we have.

Caroline Russell AM: You are not keen on a whole-route thing but you are happy for the Healthy Streets check tool to be used to sign off on all projects that come out?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): We want to make sure we use the data we have to assist councils to reach the right decision. Look, no council sets out to create a dangerous route or a route that will not be used. Councils like having the information. Where we have data, we will make it easily available to councils so that they can make the right decisions, but I cannot imagine that any council would want a route that is not safe.

Caroline Russell AM: Finally, I have received some reports from borough officers about TfL holding back schemes that boroughs and the Department for Transport (DfT) are keen to get on with, especially by being slow to complete the modelling. Is there anything you can do to get TfL's modelling team to work a bit faster?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Can I just say? There will be smirks across the faces of many TfL staff at the idea of borough officers accusing TfL of dragging its feet. Bear in mind that there are council elections next May [2016] and we know what happens in the months preceding council elections. "Pot, kettle, black" is the answer I give to that.

Caroline Russell AM: Fair enough. Thank you.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): Assembly Member Kurten?

David Kurten AM: Thank you, Chairman. With some of the Mini Holland schemes that we just talked about - particularly in Enfield, I know, because some constituents have written to me - there are concerns that putting in cycle lanes on roads that are already quite narrow can lead to an increase in congestion. How are you going to make sure that that does not happen in the future?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Actually, cyclists take up far less road space than vehicles do, bearing in mind how many people cycle. If you have a population going from 8.7 million to 9 million by 2020 and 10 million by 2030, we cannot have them moving around by driving cars.

David Kurten AM: That is true, but there are also buses and there are also service vehicles that need to use the roads. We hear that some of the journey times for those kinds of vehicles have increased and so there are concerns. Do you consider those concerns legitimate?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Sure. You will agree because we have discussed this before that it is a bit unfair to blame cyclists for the congestion in London. There are a whole host of reasons for congestion in London: the rising population, increasing numbers of people ordering stuff by the internet and having it delivered in vehicles, the amount of PHVs. That is a common issue that we raise all the time. There are complicated reasons for congestion. We are doing a study in relation to looking at what the issues are. However, it is unfair to perpetuate the myth that cyclists are to blame for congestion in London.

David Kurten AM: Thank you for your view.

2017/2631 - Speakers' Corner

[Peter Whittle AM](#)

For more than a century, Speakers' Corner in Hyde Park has been a focal point for political thinkers, who have offered the British public their own unique view of the world; among them, the Suffragettes, George Orwell, C L R James, the late, great Methodist preacher Lord Soper and political theorists of all descriptions. However, I note that in June of this year, the Metropolitan Police banned ladders, platforms and soap boxes from being used by speakers at Speakers' Corner. The police subsequently informed The Times that the ban had been introduced 'due to concerns for public safety'. I find this explanation wholly unconvincing and regard it as yet another attempt to circumscribe free speech. Do you agree with the stance taken by the police on this matter?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thank you for your question. I believe that free speech is a fundamental right for all citizens. As you say, for many decades, Speakers' Corner has been an important place in London where people have exercised this right. We must all work to ensure that this remains the case for decades to come and that London remains open for all to express their views. You should be assured that upholding people's right to free speech is an issue I take incredibly seriously.

I have now looked into this matter as a result of your question and I think you may have misunderstood the Metropolitan Police Service's (MPS) activity. This is not about freedom of speech. The news report related to a criminal assault earlier this year when in March an individual debating on a two-step ladder was pushed off and assaulted, causing the victim to fall to the ground, sustaining injuries as a result. An investigation into this incident is ongoing.

The MPS has a duty to maintain law and order and so at Speakers' Corner they have taken action to fulfil this duty and are conducting activities to safeguard the public following the assault. Public safety officers have attended the scene and provided safety advice to speakers opting to use ladders. These officers are continuing to provide sensible safety advice at Speakers' Corner to members of the public who choose to stand on high ladders or railings, particularly when the area is crowded and the risk of another incident is at its highest. Additional patrols have taken place in the vicinity with a view to providing reassurance and to help identify the assailant of the assault. These patrols will continue.

I want to be very clear. The police response to a specific incident is not a ban on public speaking at Speakers' Corner, nor indeed is it even a ban on the use of ladders or soapboxes. I am sure Londoners will agree that officers on the ground have taken a common-sense approach in response to a recent criminal assault in order to safeguard the public from any further harm. For the avoidance of doubt, people are free to use ladders and soapboxes if they wish. The police appear to be balancing the need to keep people safe and respond to a specific incident while at the same time enabling all to participate in the open-air debates and speeches for which Speakers' Corner is world-famous.

Peter Whittle AM: Thank you for your response, Mr Mayor. From what I can understand, you say that it is not a ban on ladders but, as I understand it, it means that you can only go up two steps on a ladder.

The thing is that it seems to me that this is police meddling of an extraordinary nature. The thing is that, particularly at Speakers' Corner, there was an assault, as you rightly say, but when the police came in and told some people - I think there were about seven people - to get down off their various stools and ladders, there was no assault going on. This was like a pre-emptive thing. The assault had happened sometime earlier, about two or three months earlier, and it seems to me to be part of this growing sense of prevention which actually has the effect of restricting.

I know that it is Speakers' Corner, but this is symbolically incredibly important. It has been going for 150 years, as you rightly point out. Surely, the road to hell is paved with good intentions, and if this is brought in with the rigour that has already been applied in this instance, do you not think this is dangerous?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): A few things just around what you have asked. Firstly, the police are not stopping somebody standing on steps three, four, five - or 20 on a ladder. They are giving sensible advice if there are crowded situations. You will appreciate, bearing in mind that you appear to know the history, that 150 years ago they were not using two-step ladders.

Peter Whittle AM: Yes, but, Mr Mayor, look, you know. You speak in public quite a lot. The whole point is that people have to be raised, as it were, from an audience.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Especially when you are my height.

Peter Whittle AM: Particularly for those of us - and that includes me and you - who are height-challenged, we need that. However, at the same time, surely this is bringing in a situation where there could be - do you not see - more public unsafety because people will all be on the flat? The police are behaving in a pre-emptive way, surely.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): They are not. The police are not stopping anybody wanting to stand on a soapbox or a ladder. When it is crowded, they are simply giving some advice, which is common-sense advice. It is free to people to take their personal safety in their own hands if they want.

Peter Whittle AM: In that case, someone is not telling the truth somewhere because, in fact, this was reported to *The Times*. When this was filmed, this particular incident, people were told, "You are not allowed to stand on anything other than your own two feet". That came from the police. They also said that there was now a ban due to health and safety.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Sure. As a result of your question I looked into this and that is not the advice I have received.

Peter Whittle AM: Could you clarify further for us, in that case?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Sure.

Peter Whittle AM: Look, a recent poll showed that 42% of Londoners now feel that they cannot speak as freely as they once thought they could. This is a large number and, therefore, this sort of thing is terribly important.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Sure. Chairman, with your permission, I am happy to look into this and write to the Assembly Member, dealing specifically with the points he has raised at this Mayor's Question Time (MQT).

2017/2736 - Transparency

[Andrew Boff AM](#)

How transparent is your administration?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Can I thank you for giving me the chance to be transparent with the Assembly about how transparent my administration is? Not only is my administration transparent, but I am determined to go further than any previous administration. Under the last administration, Freedom of Information (FOI) requests took longer to respond to despite there being fewer requests made, finances for projects like the Garden Bridge and London Stadium were not transparent and were left in a mess, and some reports such as an independent report on air quality were hidden.

I said in my manifesto that I would be an open and transparent Mayor. To cite just a few examples of the work we are doing, we have published the Greater London Authority (GLA) group's first-ever gender pay audits, both enhancing the transparency of City Hall and setting an example for others; never done before. I have approved a revised GLA Group Corporate Governance Framework with enhanced transparency provisions and the governance team here at City Hall will monitor progress; never done before. The newly formed Corporate Investment and Homes for Londoners Boards are publishing minutes of their meetings; never done before.

TfL is for the first time routinely publishing replies to all FOI requests it receives and the GLA is responding to more FOI requests than ever before, while meeting its performance targets. During my first year in office we saw a 55% increase in the number of FOI requests, but yet reached the GLA's strongest performance since the introduction of the [Freedom of Information] Act in 2005. We responded to 92% of requests within the 20-day deadline.

There are many other examples of my administration being the most transparent ever. We live-stream public scrutiny events, such as the State of London Debate and People's Question Time, through social media to make them fully accessible to the public. We now live-stream TfL Board meetings and publish minutes from the TfL Board and subcommittee meetings. The Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) is developing new and innovative performance dashboards that will show progress against the Police and Crime Plan and drive better performance. I have also launched a small number of focused reviews with full public reports published or to be published. These are an important exercise in transparency.

I have also set about making this a listening administration. This is why I will be conducting an open and thorough consultation exercise on my *A City for All Londoners* document. That is why we consulted extensively on my Police and Crime Plan. That is why we are working to give the public more options to raise questions and queries digitally and we carry out online surveys to gather Londoners' views on a wide range of issues. That is why, for example, I spent two hours this week talking to and taking questions from the public about 'good growth'. It is why our consultation exercise on my plans to improve air quality received a record number of responses. It is why I will not hide air quality reports that show that deprived school pupils are disproportionately affected by toxic air.

We have made huge progress in the last 14 months. However, I am not complacent. I will ensure that the GLA Group continues to lead the way on transparency and accountability.

Andrew Boff AM: Mr Mayor, the Deputy Mayor for Transport came to a transport Plenary and she stated that she was not aware that you had refused to release the Garden Bridge transcripts and audio to the Assembly. She said, "The Mayor is very committed to transparency".

In light of that, will you reverse what you said to me at the last MQT and release the full transcripts and audio from the review of the Garden Bridge?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I will rely upon the advice of the FOI officers who look at the relevant legislation and the relevant guidance. It is for them to decide. I do not decide these things. They decide when requests are made under FOI.

Andrew Boff AM: Will you supply to me, Mr Mayor, the advice that you have received from the FOI officers regarding releasing the transcripts and the audio of the Garden Bridge review?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I suggest you write to City Hall making a request under FOI and I am sure the officers will use the legislation and guidance and then --

Andrew Boff AM: That is not what I am asking for, Mr Mayor. I am asking for you to submit to me the advice that you have received that props up your position that you will not release those transcripts and audio?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I will repeat again. I will follow the advice given by the officers. We employ experts to do an expert job and I think it is important --

Andrew Boff AM: That is fine and I commend you in following that advice, Mr Mayor. I commend you in following that advice. Will you show me that advice?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Chairman, I will repeat again for the fourth time. I will follow the advice given to me by experts we employ. We pay them a lot of money to follow the legislation and the guidance and to provide me with advice. I follow their advice.

Andrew Boff AM: Mr Mayor, was that advice written on a piece of paper or was that advice in an email or was that advice verbal?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Chairman, he can ask a question seven times in nine different ways and my answer is the same, which is: I follow the advice of my experts. My experts, by the way, are officers who are impartial.

Tony Devenish AM: And transparent?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): They follow the relevant legislation and the relevant guidance. I am really proud that at a time when the numbers of FOI requests have gone up to record levels, our response rate is 92% within 20 days. If the Assembly Member wants to make a further request, he is more than happy to do so.

Andrew Boff AM: Mr Mayor, how did you receive that advice?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I am happy for the Assembly Member to make the request to the officers using FOI.

Andrew Boff AM: I am not making a request to the officers, Mr Mayor. I am making a request to you and for some reason you are unable to tell me how you received advice. In what medium was it presented? Did it get emailed to you? Was it via an officer briefing? Was it on a piece of paper? Was it via a Ouija board? I really do not know, but what we have to know is how you are being informed. It is a part of our job.

Just a bit of education: our job is to ensure that you are making decisions with all the information available to you. It is your legal duty to do so. All I am asking is to see that information.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Chairman, can I respond to this three-minute question quite simply? It is the height ofchutzpah when an Assembly Member who has been a Member since 2008 is saying that his job is to scrutinise the Mayor when the last Mayor over the course of eight years spent more than £30 million of taxpayers' money on a Garden Bridge without guarantees to make sure the construction would be paid for, without guarantees to make sure it would be maintained and possibly leaving Londoners with a blank cheque for construction of the bridge and maintaining the bridge. It is quite clear from the report from Dame Margaret Hodge that corners were cut. For an Assembly Member, who was a Member for the last eight years while that person was the Mayor, to have the audacity to lecture me about

his job being to scrutinise the Mayor beggars belief. Frankly, the situation is this. Assembly Members far sharper than this one have tried to get around FOI legislation. I will abide by the advice I am given by officers who are skilled in FOI, who follow the legislation, who follow the guidance and I will follow their advice.

Andrew Boff AM: Mr Mayor, I have been in politics a long time. I thrive on personal abuse. I am going to ask the question one more time, bearing in mind the subject matter of this section is transparency. Just remind ourselves what the question is about.

Mr Mayor, will you release to me the advice that you have received that means that you will not release the transcripts and the audio from the Garden Bridge review?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I am really happy for the Assembly Member to make the request using FOI legislation to the officers and I hope the officers will follow the relevant legislation and the relevant guidance and respond in speedy time. Ninety-two per cent of responses are within 20 days. It is quite remarkable, bearing in mind that the number of requests has gone up.

Tony Devenish AM: Mr Chairman, we are not getting answers to questions and this is Question Time. Can we have an answer to the question? That is all we want, Mr Chairman.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): If you are asking for some kind of ruling, it does seem to me, Mr Mayor, and I am desperately trying to be objective on this, that you are the only one who knows how you received this information and so I am at a loss to know why you are suggesting that somebody should be asked how you received a piece of information.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): It is quite simple, Deputy Chairman Arbour.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): Yes, go on.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): The Assembly Member could quite easily make the request using FOI and ask the question he is asking me through FOI. He is trying to get around the FOI legislation. You and I have been in the game long enough to know that this is poor politics because it does not get us to the truth of the matter.

The truth of the matter is that we asked the former Chair of the Public Accounts Committee to look into the issue of the Garden Bridge project. Her report was damning of the last administration when he was a Member and --

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): Mr Mayor, this is not a question about the Garden Bridge report. It is a question as to how you personally received a piece of advice. I guess I am not alone in wondering how it is that a third party knows how you received a piece of advice that only you received.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): What I am not going to do, Deputy Chairman, as much as you would like me to do so and that side of the room would like me to do so, is to circumvent FOI legislation. I know you are all embarrassed. I know why you are embarrassed. Boris Johnson [MP, former Mayor of London] spent a lot of taxpayers' money on this vanity project. It is really embarrassing for you. Some of you were here while he did it and I am really sorry for the embarrassment but I am not willing to allow taxpayers' money to be wasted on it.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): All right, Mr Mayor. I do not think we are going to get an answer on that point.

Andrew Boff AM: Let us try something else.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): Would you go on to something else?

Andrew Boff AM: Absolutely. With regard to your request for me to submit an FOI, that is fine. I am happy to submit an FOI to ask for how you have received reports about FOI. I kind of thought, "You are here; you are in the room; I may as well ask", but obviously you do not want to answer.

Let us move on to another question. How was the decision made to pay Margaret Hodge £9,500?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): You have made that request using FOI and that will be answered in due course.

Andrew Boff AM: No, I have not made that request, Mr Mayor. I am asking you. How was the decision made to pay your friend Margaret Hodge £9,500?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I do not have the details here and I am sure we can write to you about that.

Andrew Boff AM: You will write to me?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I will make sure that the officers are happy with following the legislation and the guidance they have but, once they are happy, of course I will write to you.

Andrew Boff AM: Once the officers are happy? Who is running this ship, Mr Mayor?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): You will be aware that one of the things that we have to do when there is a good administration is follow the rules. The previous guy did not. I intend to follow the rules. That includes following the rules that the experts advise me in relation to FOI legislation and FOI guidance.

Now, I am really sorry that the previous Mayor you supported did not follow the rules. I intend to follow the rules and that is what the taxpayers expect me to do.

Andrew Boff AM: If you talked to the previous Mayor and said that Andrew Boff supported him, it might be news to him. Did you decide to pay your friend Margaret Hodge £9,500?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Decisions are taken by a number of people, I am sure, but, once again, I can look into the details - I do not have them to hand - and, subject to advice I receive from the officers who follow the legislation and the guidance, I am happy to respond.

Andrew Boff AM: There is a Mayoral Direction, MD2108, that says that you authorised the payment to Margaret Hodge. Why did you authorise it then and now you have no memory of it?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Let me respond to you once I have the facts in front of me after following the advice from the officers who will look at the guidance and the legislation.

Andrew Boff AM: It was not your idea, was it, to pay Margaret Hodge £9,500?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I am happy to look into it and, once I have the advice from the officers, I will write to you.

Andrew Boff AM: Was it your decision, Mr Mayor?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I do not have the facts here but I will look into it and get the --

Andrew Boff AM: You do not know whether or not it was your decision?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I am happy to respond to you once I have the advice from the officers who will follow the legislation and the guidance.

Andrew Boff AM: You do not know whether or not you took that decision - is that what you are saying - and you have to ask officers whether or not you made that decision?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): That was not the question you asked four questions ago. The question you asked four questions ago, which you are repeating --

Andrew Boff AM: Yes, I moved on. I got no joy out of you four questions ago and so I am moving on, Mr Mayor. Come on.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Well, you are trying to ask the same question 17 different ways and my answer is the same. Look --

Andrew Boff AM: It is not the same question. Did you decide to pay Margaret Hodge £9,500?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): You will be aware - because you are a longstanding Member of the Assembly, having served with Boris Johnson who approved the Garden Bridge - that although the Mayor signs the Mayoral Direction, he receives advice from others. The point I am making to you - and I am trying to be as polite as I can, bearing in mind the repetitious nature of the questions - is, look, I am happy to look into this and, subject to the advice I receive from the officers, who I am sure will look at the guidance and the legislation, I will respond to you if you want a fuller answer.

I know it is frustrating for you and I can understand why you are embarrassed, but Boris Johnson is not my responsibility; he is yours.

Andrew Boff AM: I want to talk about this Mayor; you want to talk about the previous one. I understand that. I understand why you would do that. You are trying to --

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Well, I thought --

Andrew Boff AM: This is a technique you use all the time, Mr Mayor.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): The review was into the Garden Bridge --

Andrew Boff AM: When you do not want to answer a question about transparency, you talk about something else. The public can see it coming a mile off. Ask Sadiq Khan a difficult question and he will talk about Boris Johnson. That is fine. Did Margaret Hodge email you to ask for the £9,500?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I have not received any emails in relation to the Garden Bridge, but I am sure I can look into this and the officers will look into this and then, subject to the relevant legislation and guidance, respond to you.

Andrew Boff AM: You have not received any emails regarding the Garden Bridge?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): You asked the last question, I answered it and now you are trying to be --

Andrew Boff AM: No, I am just clarifying what you have just said. You did not receive any emails regarding --

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): There is no need to clarify. I have answered it.

Andrew Boff AM: Sorry?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I have answered the question. I will make sure that the officers, after they follow the guidance and the legislation, respond to questions you have about the Garden Bridge. Listen. The Garden Bridge review was into the work done on the Garden Bridge by Boris Johnson. I know it is embarrassing and I know it is frustrating, but that is the way it is.

Andrew Boff AM: Mr Mayor, leading up to that decision to --

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Which one?

Andrew Boff AM: Leading up to that decision to pay Margaret Hodge £9,500, did you have meetings with her regarding that sum of money?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I have not met with Margaret Hodge about the Garden Bridge during the course of her independent review.

Andrew Boff AM: You have not met with her? That is great. That, Mr Mayor, is known as an answer. Will you undertake to write to me and reveal all correspondence between you, your office and Margaret Hodge regarding the Garden Bridge from September last year [2016]?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Just to repeat, what I will do is take advice from officers, who will look at the relevant guidance and the relevant legislation and, subject to the expert advice that we pay a lot of money for, I will respond to the Assembly Member.

Andrew Boff AM: Thank you very much, Mr Mayor. I am sure Londoners would very much appreciate that lesson in transparency. Thank you.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): It is really important that we are as transparent as we can be, Deputy Chairman Arbour. You will appreciate that we are the most transparent administration there has been. It is not my fault that the quality of questions at MQTs is so poor.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): Yes, I appreciate that this has been a good game of political ping-pong.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): There has been a lot of pinging and a lot less ponging.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): Assembly Member Bacon?

Gareth Bacon AM: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. Just a sweeping-up question, Mr Mayor, because I am a bit confused. I have been a Member of the London Assembly for nine years now and my understanding was that in MQT the process was that Members came and they asked the Mayor questions and they received answers. After that exchange, I now think that the process of MQT is that you will only answer questions that are subject to the FOI Act. Is that correct?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): No.

Gareth Bacon AM: No? OK. You started your answer by boasting about being so transparent. I do not think there is a single person sitting in this room who thinks that that exchange was transparent. The limit for responding to a FOI request question is £450 and the

average cost - and people have looked into this - for responding to a Mayor's question is £70. Do you think it is a reasonable use of taxpayers' money to not answer Assembly Members' questions and ask for them to put a question in through FOI?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): There is a very good reason why we have FOI legislation. It is important that officers who give advice are able to discuss that advice robustly. That is the very important reason why, for example, we do not encourage members of staff to breach the confidences within an organisation. What we have to realise is that if it is the case that a half-smart politician is trying to circumvent FOI legislation, there for a good reason, by asking questions that he knows contain --

Gareth Bacon AM: Mr Mayor --

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Let me answer. I have been asked a question. I should be able to answer the question.

Gareth Bacon AM: No. Sorry, Chairman, he is not answering the question. He is deflecting again, which, as Assembly Member Boff has just said, is a well-proven tactic of the Mayor.

The question I asked you was: is it a good use of taxpayer resource for you not to answer questions at MQT and ask people to submit FOIs instead?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): It is really important when you have rules that you abide by them. I could very easily have given --

Gareth Bacon AM: Mr Mayor, where is the rule that says that you cannot answer questions at MQT?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): The rules are that if there is, for example, a discussion and if legally privileged advice is received, if officers are giving advice to policymakers, for very good reasons, that --

Gareth Bacon AM: I see. Was that legally privileged advice, then?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I am trying to answer the question.

Gareth Bacon AM: You are not trying to answer the question, Mr Mayor. You are trying to waste time. Was that legally privileged advice, the advice about Margaret Hodge, the advice about the Garden Bridge and not releasing transcripts? Was that legally privileged?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Is it my turn now?

Gareth Bacon AM: Yes.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): The issue is that we are well aware from previous questions raised by Assembly Member Boff that he has issues about the Garden Bridge. He has concerns

that we have uncovered the amount of taxpayers' money wasted by the previous Mayor and he is embarrassed by the independent review from the former Chair of the Public Accounts Committee. What has happened as a consequence is this smoke and mirrors and he is trying to use a process point to hide his embarrassment. Londoners are not being fooled by this.

Gareth Bacon AM: No, Mr Mayor. Sorry. I have to interrupt you again, Mr Mayor. If you do your homework properly, you will understand that Andrew Boff [AM] is on public record as opposing throughout the entire process the whole Garden Bridge process. His concern specifically is around the transparency of Margaret Hodge's report and your attitude to it. After the exchange that we have just had, I think everybody in this room will now go away thinking that the only way to get answers from the Mayor of London at MQT is to submit an FOI in advance, which costs five times the amount of a Mayor's question.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I am sorry if you do not like the rules but the rules are there for a reason.

Gareth Bacon AM: Those are not the rules, Mr Mayor.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): By the way, my response to FOIs are far swifter than the previous Mayor's.

Gareth Bacon AM: Yes, you have said that about 10 times now.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): -- but it is really important to recognise that they are there for a reason.

Gareth Bacon AM: Mr Mayor, I have already asked you and you are deflecting again. I have asked you to show me where the rule is that says that you cannot answer a question unless it is subject to FOI legislation. Can you point me to that rule? Can you promise to write to me with that rule? Or do I need to submit an FOI for that as well?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I will try to answer this question without being interrupted and I will try my best and look towards you to just give me the courtesy of answering a question fully without being interrupted --

Gareth Bacon AM: Courtesy goes both ways, Mr Mayor.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): Point of order.

Len Duvall AM: Point of order, Chairman. Look, can I just seek some clarification here? Is it that the Member has been denied access by the FOI Act to one of the questions? Then he is indeed trying to circumvent by asking questions in this forum when officers have turned him down. He needs to rephrase it or get the information another way. It really is not the purpose of Assembly Members' question time to vent processes that exist within the GLA, if that is the case, because I am getting slightly confused --

Gareth Bacon AM: You are not the only one.

Len Duvall AM: -- by some of the aspects. Is it that the Member has not been successful in accessing that information and has been denied that information appropriately and efficiently by GLA officers? It is not the use of MQT to try and come back and have a second bite if you have been turned down. You need to phrase the questions differently. Chairman, in that sense, I am looking for a ruling --

Andrew Boff AM: Chairman, my question was specifically about what the Mayor knows, not what the organisation knows.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): Yes -- sorry --

Len Duvall AM: In my point of order, Chairman, I am looking for a ruling that somehow we seek some guidance around the table about that to avoid this ever happening again and to be more productive and to get some answers in a two-way process.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): Yes, I understand that. Assembly Member Boff, as indeed the Mayor pointed out, attempted to ask the same question very many times, but one of the questions he did ask did relate to an answer that the Mayor gave today, which he could not possibly have asked by FOI, which was: how was the information that the Mayor was given transmitted to him? That had not been the subject of an FOI. Yes.

Andrew Dismore AM: Chairman, I see that Assembly Member Boff's actual tabled question is, "How transparent is your administration?". If we are going to allow questions to go into all this detail about things that are not actually in the question, are we getting to the stage where you might as well ask what the Prime Minister's engagements are rather than asking a specific question? If Mr Boff wanted a specific question to be answered, perhaps he should have tabled a specific question rather than a very general, wide one.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): I think I have been here longer than any of you. That is in fact the way this place works. This is our form of, "What are you doing today?"

Andrew Boff AM: Which you have used yourself many a time, Assembly Member Dismore; many, many, many times.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): Have you finished on this question? Can I proceed to the next question?

Andrew Boff AM: Yes. The only thing I would say --

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Is it a speech or a question?

Andrew Boff AM: Mr Chairman, the Mayor did accuse you of partiality and said that this was not impartial.

Tony Devenish AM: Outrageous.

Andrew Boff AM: I would just like to say. Does he think he gets a better deal from Jennette Arnold [OBE AM, Chair of the Assembly]? I actually think she gives him a tougher time.

2017/2907 - Rehousing Grenfell Tower survivors

[Tom Copley AM](#)

How can the GLA work to ensure all survivors of the Grenfell Tower disaster are permanently rehoused either within North Kensington, the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea or where they wish?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thank you. There will be many impacts on the local community of the Grenfell Tower fire. We owe it to everyone affected by such a profound tragedy to make sure they and their families are properly looked after. As you rightly suggest, a key priority must be to ensure survivors of the disaster are permanently rehoused in a home of their choice and this home must be in the local area if that is what people want.

I am afraid that the powers of the Mayor and the GLA are limited. In the days after the fire, I wrote to the Prime Minister calling on her to confirm that all residents affected by the Grenfell Tower fire would be rehoused in the area unless they choose not to do so. At the first meeting of the Prime Minister's taskforce, I further stressed just how crucial it was for rehousing efforts to be speeded up and to ensure all residents who lost their homes have found somewhere else to live locally.

In the weeks since, as well as repeating these calls, I have also made members of staff from City Hall available to offer practical help with the rehousing efforts. That has involved GLA employees helping to set up processes for assessing what survivors might need and want, helping to identify what permanent rehousing options might be available. Kensington and Chelsea Council belatedly asked for support from neighbouring councils and I welcome the fact that Westminster City Council is now helping to ensure survivors of the fire are rehoused. Officers from my team have been involved with these efforts to help get the process of assessing households' needs and preferences up to speed.

It is clear that much more needs to be done to find appropriate homes for Grenfell survivors. The Prime Minister's deadline of three weeks for everyone who is affected to be rehoused nearby has passed. As the deadline was reached, just three households had moved into new temporary accommodation and no families had moved into permanent housing. My team will continue to work to support efforts to find the homes we need and I will continue to call on the Government to meet its commitment to house all survivors from Grenfell in a home of their choice.

Tom Copley AM: Thank you for that answer, Mr Mayor. It is incredibly concerning that this deadline has passed and so few Grenfell families have been rehoused. I do appreciate that, as

you said in your answer, this is not a direct power or responsibility of the GLA, but I appreciate that you have been working both with the Government and with K&C. Do you get a sense from your conversations with Kensington and Chelsea and the Government as to when all the families will be permanently rehoused?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Can I just be frank? I have been to North Kensington many times since the fire. Kensington and Chelsea Council is inept, incompetent and close to being useless in the eyes of residents and I concur with the residents. They have been missing in action. They have failed to provide the residents the support they need.

What is important is also that there are mutual aid provisions available. If there is a crisis for a council or a disaster, the council can rely upon the help of other councils to assist. Kensington and Chelsea took too long to ask for the help and I am afraid the confidence of local residents in Kensington and Chelsea is gone. I am not sure it is going to be restored by the new Leader.

What the residents wanted was a new broom with somebody untainted and untarnished. The Government could quite easily have done what it has done with other councils: send in commissioners and outside experts to go in and take over the running of services. It chose not to do so. Instead, a backroom deal was hatched out between the new leadership and the Government where the new leadership carries on and there is some sort of outside consultants used. It is not good enough.

Tom Copley AM: Can I just move on slightly? Obviously, the immediate priority has to be the permanent rehousing of the families affected but, in the longer term, there is also going to be a need to ensure that the homes that were destroyed are replaced and replaced within the local area. Do you believe that anything less than the replacement of all 129 homes, both the socially rented homes and homes belonging to leaseholders, on a like-for-like basis in North Kensington would be unacceptable?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): It would be, but can I just say this? Many residents I have spoken to do not want something else built where Grenfell Tower currently is. There is some talk about a memorial garden.

Tom Copley AM: Yes, I appreciate that.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): We have to be sensitive to the wishes of the residents, but we need to make sure that there are at least 129 new homes built. It is worth reminding ourselves that the 68 homes that Berkeley has fast-tracked and brought forward are affordable homes previously agreed via planning. These are not new affordable homes. They as well need to be backfilled because those 68 homes that were meant for others are now being used, rightly, for some families that were previously in Grenfell Tower. You are right that would be unacceptable for those 129 homes not to be replaced but, additionally, we need to backfill the 68 and others that will be used, rightly, to house those families.

Tom Copley AM: Thank you, Mr Mayor.

2017/2836 - Tackling congestion in London

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM

Why does your draft Transport Strategy contain no proposals to change the C-Charge or bring in road pricing to tackle congestion?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thank you for your question. My draft Transport Strategy very clearly sets out my vision for how we should address the challenges London faces and reveals bold plans to reduce reliance on the car by increasing levels of walking and cycling and improving public transport. I have set a target to increase the proportion of people walking, cycling and taking public transport to 80% of journeys by 2041 compared to 64% now, meaning an average of 3 million fewer car journeys in London each day.

I recognise the role that road user charging may have to play in achieving this in the long term. It can also contribute to the other objectives set out in the draft Strategy. We also consider a raft of other measures; for example, seeking new powers to cap the number of PHVs in London and tackle cross-border hiring and powers to help TfL manage roadworks on major roads.

I was elected on a manifesto commitment to maintain the C-Charge at the current level. It is important to keep to that commitment, but it is right that in a 25-year Strategy we look further at how we use that and other charges in the future. For example, a more sophisticated, fairer system, which integrates the different schemes in London into a single per-mile charge that more accurately reflects the impact of people's journeys may be required in the longer term. Proposal 18 in the Strategy states that we will keep all road user charges, including the C-Charge, under review to ensure they continue to meet the aims of the Strategy.

I have stated in my Taxi and Private Hire Action Plan that we will investigate the role of PHVs in contributing to congestion in central London, but we may need to look at the hours of operation of the existing C-Charge when the busiest time for PHVs in the charging zone is now outside charging hours.

Proposal 19 says that we will give consideration to developing the next generation of road user charging. As the C-Charge technology comes up for renewal, we will look at how new technology might allow for a more sophisticated scheme. This could more closely reflect road usage and impacts by including other factors like distance, time and emissions and will ultimately create a fairer system of paying for road use in London.

Proposals 20 and 21 state that we will support the boroughs wishing to bring forward workplace parking levies and/or road charging schemes as part of their own reduction strategy where they are consistent with the policies and proposals of the Strategy and this includes compliance with my target of reducing traffic levels by 10% to 15% by 2041.

I have asked TfL to commission an independent study into understanding and managing congestion, which will help inform the development of my final Transport Strategy.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Thank you for that. There is much in your draft Transport Strategy that I welcome. I felt the one area where the narrative was great but I was not really convinced of the actions is around tackling congestion because it is getting worse. It has got worse even in the last year. It costs the economy billions of pounds every year. It is a waste of Londoners' time and it is dangerous to health. Your Strategy does state that you will give consideration to development of the next generation of road user charging systems, but there is not a timetable. Even if it is perhaps in what would be your next term, assuming you are re-elected, why have you not set that out? Will we see that in your final Strategy?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): This term we have the T-Charge coming this year and the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) coming in in 2019, subject to consultation for other vehicles in 2020 and further afield in 2021. The technology is not there for the ULEZ and so we are going speedily ahead to get the ULEZ technology ready. If you remember, the previous timeline was 2020. That in itself is taking a huge amount of time. It will be the first of its kind in the world. We have learned from the C-Charge, now quite old. ULEZ technology is not developed around the world. The reason why I cannot give you a timeline for road user charging is that there is no global city that does this on the scale we need to do it. We will, obviously, invest in technology but we have to be realistic. Some of the innovation will come from outside of London and we are working with other experts around the world to see what we can do.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: May I ask you some specifics?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Sure.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Your Strategy talks about supporting boroughs with their own schemes. For example, if a borough came up with, say, something around Heathrow and putting in a particular scheme, would you support that?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): We are already in conversation with some boroughs - but it is not fair for other boroughs to talk about which boroughs they are - about some exciting plans they have and we will work with them.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: There are some plans in progress with boroughs?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): There are conversations taking place with boroughs. They are very good conversations and are quite advanced, yes.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: We heard at the Transport Committee yesterday about Hounslow's plans to look at developing a workplace parking levy to fund a specific transport project. Is that the sort of thing that you would support?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): That is one of the boroughs talking to us about some plans they have. Look, most roads are controlled by boroughs - you know this - and so it is important to have the boroughs' buy-in. That is why, in answer to a previous question, there is no point us doing command-and-control from the centre. You cannot get things done. We have been

collegiate in working with them, but we are really keen to provide whatever assistance, expertise and help they need, including sometimes resources.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: Great. I really understand your points about fast-moving technology and I really get that and the ambition ultimately in here. However, in the short term, the C-Charge could be more effective even using the technology that is in place. I am wondering whether you would at least consider whether you could vary the charging of the C-Charge or the hours it operates in order to really tackle that immediate congestion in central London.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): We always keep the C-Charge under review and it is really important that we keep it under review. I have alluded to you in my answer about the patterns we have noticed in relation to particularly the hours after you stop paying the C-Charge. We are looking at hours and, in particular, we are looking at the issue of PHVs. What I am not going to do is to increase the C-Charge in term one for the obvious reason that I made a promise not to. It is important to keep to that promise.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: You cannot, but you are considering some of these other --

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): We are reviewing that, yes. There is some really interesting data we have in relation to surges and stuff around different hours, which we have to respond to.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM: I would really welcome you doing something on this and looking longer-term to do something. London is grinding to a halt. Our report from the Transport Committee on congestion showed that. You need bold measures. Yesterday Professor [David] Begg [Plymouth University], who came to our Committee, said that there is no substitute for mayoral leadership on this issue and I really hope we see that leadership going forward. Thank you.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I agree with David, yes.

2017/2761 - Lord Harris Review

[Susan Hall AM](#)

How many of the 127 recommendations in the Lord Harris Review of London's Preparedness to respond to a Major Terrorist Incident have been fully implemented?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thank you, Deputy Chairman. The Harris Review made 127 recommendations in total. A number of recommendations are aimed at agencies within my direct jurisdiction, although many are not. However, I am pleased to say that all of those agencies with recommendations aimed at them have engaged with MOPAC. Over a third of the recommendations have already been implemented, with the vast majority well in train. This includes a multiagency approach in March this year aimed to test every phase of the emergency services' effectiveness with a river-based terrorist attack. Some of the recommendations completed include improving communications with Londoners during and after an attack; input

into the London Resilience structure; improved and updated advice to owners of crowded places; the implementation of Project Servator, where specially trained armed officers undertake engagement and prevention work; and better security on the River Thames.

Since the publication of Lord Harris' review, London's response to a major terrorist incident has been tested in real life, with cowardly attacks against innocent Londoners and visitors. The response to these attacks by emergency services was extremely impressive and demonstrates what Lord Harris meant by his overall assessment, "Preparedness is greatly improved, even compared to five years ago". Of course we need to reflect on the lessons learnt from the recent attacks. It is important that we give our emergency services time to review their response before we consider what changes need to be made, but crucially, being prepared also relies on the overall resources that our police have to deal with these issues. Policing has to be treated as a system and you have to fund and support the whole system.

Analysis of the Westminster attack in March of this year by the MPS shows that 70% of the officers involved in the response were deployed outside of Westminster, abstracting from resources which should be available for other local priorities. In the first 48 hours, the response cost £1.5 million and involved over 5,200 officers and staff, but less than half of this spend was National and International Capital Cities (NICC) grant-funded activity and just one-fifth was actually funded by the core counterterrorism grant. In short, we need more resources.

Susan Hall AM: Thank you for that, Mayor. You did, on a press release directly after this was released, say that you would publish a formal response in due course. I have been told that it is 258 days since the review and there has been no response published.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Was that a question there?

Susan Hall AM: Yes. Do you think that that is acceptable?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Sorry, I do not know the question.

Susan Hall AM: Try to listen. Do you think it is acceptable that it is so long since the report has been done and you have not published any response?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Yes.

Susan Hall AM: Well, lots of us do not. Your Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime said that your response was not coming out until next October [2017], which means it will be a year since. Do you not think that with 127 recommendations, the public would like to know what you have and have not done?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): The reason why it is not sensible to publish a report at this stage is because things are moving very fast. There are a number of reviews that are currently taking place in the Government. I will give you some examples. David Anderson [UK Independent Reviewer of Terrorism] has been asked by the Prime Minister to undertake a review into the three separate terrorist attacks in Manchester, Westminster and London Bridge and

now a fourth in relation to Finsbury Park. The MPS counterterrorism team are separately undertaking reviews in relation to work they did and what lessons are to be learnt. Some work is backward-looking, but a lot of the work is forward-looking, to make sure we are safe. Separately, there is work being undertaken by those responsible for the river, like the DfT, the Port of London Authority and the Royal National Lifeboat Institution (RNLI).

There is also further work that has been taking place in relation to London Councils and working with the police in relation to vehicle impact restriction models to make sure that vehicles cannot go into crowded places. You will have seen some of the barriers being put on some of the busiest bridges in London. You will also be aware that we are dealing with planning to make sure that those public realm places, whether it is in Westminster, whether it is in Whitehall, have the very safety they need. Now, it would have been quite easy to publish a report three months ago, but it is out of date. What is more important is being sensible, being savvy and working with the experts in relation to making sure we are taking the steps to make London as safe as we possibly can.

I will tell you what hinders us, though, is lack of resources. If the Assembly Member is genuinely keen - rather than posturing for the gallery or her Twitter account - to keep London safe, then she should be working with me to get more resources for London.

Susan Hall AM: Yes, and to work with you, Mayor, it would be helpful if we knew what had been done and what had not. Let me refer you to recommendation 7, which is to appoint a counterterrorism advisor. Where are you on that?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I have been working closely with the security services and I am reassured that the advice I receive is robust, resilient and sensible. I met this week with the head of counterterror and he has reassured me in relation to the advice we are receiving. I met last week with the Commissioner [of Police of the Metropolis], Cressida Dick, and so I am reassured in relation to the advice I am receiving as the Mayor of London to make sure we are safe from terror attacks.

Susan Hall AM: You are not going to go with that recommendation 7? You are not going to appoint somebody?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): No. More than a third of the recommendations have been implemented. What I am not going to do is give a running commentary on each and every one of the recommendations. What I will do is continue to work around the clock to make sure I work with the experts, including the police, counterterror and others to keep our city safe.

Gareth Bacon AM: No transparency.

Susan Hall AM: Yes, it is all down to transparency. We would like to know; we are very interested. This is a very important subject, especially given recent terror attacks, and we would like to know what you are doing about it. This is why we do want transparency. This does not look very transparent to me. Around 50% of the recommendations you touched upon - I can make faces as well, Mr Mayor, if you like; we can both do it - are not within the Mayor's powers.

Of those 50% of recommendations, how many have been rejected by those who should be implementing them?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): The one that has been rejected so far is by the Home Secretary, somebody called Amber Rudd. What she then has rejected are core, to have the full amount of NICC. Roughly speaking, it should be £340 million, but the Home Secretary has rejected our response, to give us the full finance. We are losing £170 million and I am really sorry the Home Secretary has rejected that. I would hope Members of the Assembly who are members of her Party can lobby her to give us that response.

Another proposal that has been rejected is proper resourcing of our policing in London, but any help she can give to ensure we get that would be much received.

Susan Hall AM: Yes, but you do not mention that some have been accepted. I see that you now attend Cabinet Office Briefing Room A (COBRA) meetings, which was one of the recommendations. You can nit-pick and tell us what you do not like that has been rejected, but we cannot point you towards the good that has been done because you are not being transparent again and printing what has been done about this important review.

Can you bring your response to this review forward so that we can see what has been done and so that we can praise you for what you have done and measure the successes of it, as opposed to waiting until October? You can say that other things are constantly coming up in the meantime, but that is the case, that is life and it will do, but some of us are very interested in counterterrorism and want to know what you are doing.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): The question I was asked is which of these have been rejected. I answered the question and have given an example of one of the things that was rejected. I am now being criticised for giving an example of what was --

Susan Hall AM: No, I said how many and what are they doing. There is not just one or two, there are lots, but not one of us can hold you to account again if we do not know what has been done and what has not.

Susan Hall AM: Yes. Is this what I have to do, an FOI request on what has been done and what has not?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): What we know - and you will know this, having asked the questions to the Commissioner and the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime at the last Police and Crime Committee - is the progress made in relation to keeping our city safe. Look, more than a third of the recommendations have been implemented. The ones that affect me have been carried through, by and large. We are working closely with the other agencies. I have no locus over the other agencies. We work closely with them.

You will be aware, as somebody who recognises the terror threat we face, that the threat is evolving. We have to find new ways to keep our city safe. The way we keep our city safe is not set in stone, based upon Lord Toby Harris' excellent report, but there are new ways to keep our

city safe based on the evolving threat. It would be unwise for any of us to assume if we implemented all of the recommendations from Lord Toby Harris - and we are trying to get there - that it is enough. It is not enough.

Susan Hall AM: You are the one who instigated the Lord Harris review. We want to know what is being done about his recommendations: 127 is a lot. We, to hold you to account, need to know what has been done and what has not. If you do not publish what has been done and what has not, how do we know and how can we do our job properly by holding you to account? You are just not transparent and that came across earlier. It would be helpful for all Members here to know what you have done and what you have not done so that if you have done a lot we can say, "Well done, Mr Mayor". At the moment, we are not saying, "Well done, Mr Mayor", because we have no idea.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Is that a question? I do not --

Susan Hall AM: Have we?

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): When she says "how" and "have", those are interrogative terms and you know how to deal with them, Mr Mayor.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I disagree with the question.

Susan Hall AM: The whole reason for this review was to give the public assurance and comfort by knowing that things were happening. How can we do that when we do not know what has been done and what has not?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Shall I answer that one?

Susan Hall AM: Yes, it is MQT. That is what you do: you answer the questions.

Tony Devenish AM: No, he does not.

Susan Hall AM: Well, he does not, no.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): Do you know? There is an enormous amount of repetition here. Repetition is OK if the questions are subtly changed, but on this one we have had the same question several times and the Mayor has given his answer several times.

2017/2869 - Design & Build Contracts and defective development

[Tom Copley AM](#)

In light of the major defects in the GLA part-funded development at Orchard Village in Havering, will you in future refuse to fund schemes procured via design and build contracts through the GLA's Affordable Homes Programme?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I have concerns over building control and oversight processes generally and the potential serious safety implications for a range of buildings in London. I welcome the Government's decision to establish an independent expert advisory panel to advise on what immediate measures can be taken to make buildings safe. I have made representations to the panel via the Prime Minister and hope the expert panel will be able to make positive recommendations speedily about what the Government can do.

Office-to-residential permitted development (PD) rights do not cover external alterations to a building and so amendments to external cladding would require planning permission. Moreover, building regulations approval is different from a planning permission. The two are based on different pieces of legislation and fulfil different roles. Schemes delivered through PD rights are still required to meet relevant building regulations. Building regulations set out the safety requirements of buildings. I currently have no responsibility for building regulations and there is no building control body within the GLA. This is the responsibility of each local authority. However, I have asked my team to investigate what can be done through the planning system to improve fire safety and anything I can do through planning, I will.

There also seems to be some very serious questions to be answered about the age and robustness of the current regulations, guidance and the independence and robustness of the competitive building control environment. Therefore, on top of the previous representations I have made, I will be making further representations to the Government to call for a comprehensive review of the building regulations, which is fully resourced, open and transparent, to ensure they are fit for purpose. The review should not be bound by the Red Tape Challenge or the Government's desire for less regulation. The Grenfell fire and the subsequent testing of cladding has clearly shown that the current safety regime is not fit for purpose.

In the immediate term, I will continue to do all I can to support the Government in making buildings across London and the rest of the country safe. It is paramount that we ensure resources are targeted in the most efficient and strategic way to address fire safety concerns. To that end, it is vital for the Government to issue clear, well-evidenced advice to housing providers.

Tom Copley AM: Thank you for that answer, Mr Mayor. According to the London Development Database (LDD), over 1,000 residential units are completed every single year as a result of PD rights. Do you know whether all those 1,000 homes will have been checked by local authority building control departments to ensure they comply with all the fire regulations?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): No, I do not. One of the problems with the building regulations regime is of course if the regulations themselves are not fit for purpose, even if they were inspected, that does not guarantee they would be safe. That is one of the reasons why although that is not the premise of City Hall, that is local authorities, we are looking at what we can do in planning to address that. As you alluded to in your question, PDs are very different in relation to the loops you have got to go through and this so-called deregulation, less red tape, does lead to the sort of problems that you are alluding to.

Tom Copley AM: I agree with you. Of course, as you say, PDs are not subject to the same rigours as a development that goes through the planning system. Alison Butler, Croydon Council's Cabinet Member for Housing Regeneration and Planning, has expressed concerns. She said those blocks do not come under the same scrutiny as they would if they had to apply for planning permission.

I completely agree with you with regards to the building regulations and not keeping up anyway, but do you think the Government should suspend PD rights until it can assure London Councils that effective monitoring is in place?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): We have made representations to the expert panel raising some of the concerns raised to us by London Councils. That may be the sensible thing to do, what you are suggesting.

It is worth reminding ourselves that the Government instituted a Red Tape Challenge to reduce red tape and I am afraid that for those who speak pejoratively about red tape, about health and safety and about regulations, the Grenfell Tower [fire] is the consequence of reducing health and safety requirements, reducing red tape and reducing good quality regulations. One of the issues that you are driving at is a consequence of less red tape, PDs, less safe homes. That is why it is crucial that the experts' panel looks at the issue of PDs. At the moment, the focus is aluminium composite material (ACM), but ACM is just one part of the equation of what makes a building not safe.

Tom Copley AM: My view, Mr Mayor, is that red tape saves lives, but thank you very much for your answer.

Len Duvall AM: Thank you, Chair. Can I thank you, Mr Mayor, for your commitment about trying to use the planning regime in the best possible way? You earlier said that you wanted to move faster with due diligence in terms of not waiting for public inquiries or some of the lessons learned at a later date. We see that within the fire service almost taking early decisions now and pre-empting some of those inquiries for the safety of Londoners.

If we can turn to your London Plan, do you envisage, in the conversations that you have with GLA officers, that we would be looking to see more about maybe sprinklers and water suppression units in new designs and new buildings and could you envisage the London Plan saying something around the issues relating to cladding and designs? Would that be what your thinking is?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): The short answer is yes, but just to tell you the dilemma, new buildings by and large are safe, including tall buildings; they have sprinklers in there as a matter of course.

There are other issues we could be looking at, for example, should there be lifts that are fire-proof, should we look at the issue of cladding, because I am afraid when you look at some of the ACM used, some of the buildings that are identified as being not safe as part of Government

testing. Many of them were new builds because of the cladding they used. Planning does not give us all the tools because some of it is building control.

What we are trying to do is see if we can be innovative and I suspect - and you mentioned this in your question because of your interest in safety - that the London Plan will probably have some pioneering stuff using the planning regime to make our buildings as safe as they possibly can be.

Len Duvall AM: Look, we cannot tell London boroughs, planners and other professionals to do their job and nor should we, but did you think of bringing those professionals together for best practice and to talk and learn those lessons in a better way, in a better way than probably was done when we had previous tragedies?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): We are trying our best to work collegiately with all 33 boroughs just to help them. They have been really receptive to our assistance, not simply in Grenfell Tower, embedding people in, but also giving them advice and assistance. The real challenge is not with the new builds, it is how you retrofit the existing tower blocks. Councils and housing associations, with limited resources, are trying to improve the quality of life of residents by refurbishing a building. It is how you do that safely, issues around the type of cladding, how it is installed; other issues about are the doors self-closing, fire-proof; when it comes to maintaining a building, are you making sure that you are looking at access? All these things are looked at on a daily basis by housing associations and councils and the concern is we can do what we can in relation to planning and the London Plan, but that is new build, not the existing stock.

Len Duvall AM: All right. Thank you.

2017/2941 - Permitted Development Rights

[Nicky Gavron AM](#)

This 30th September the Government is introducing an extension to permitted development rights to include light industry. We have already seen the damage permitted development rights have had on office to residential. What preparations are you making to mitigate the effects of this new policy?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thank you for your question. London's light industrial workspaces play a vital role in the city's economy, providing space for a range of activities, such as cultural and creative industries, food preparation and fashion, maker spaces and mechanics. These small businesses are an essential part of what keeps London moving. We need to make sure we have places to live in London, but we also need to make sure we have places to create, fix and work in London too. However, from our own research evidence, we know that London has lost too much industrial land in recent years and this has particularly affected smaller industrial workspaces. The Government's new PD rights will make it more difficult for local authorities to plan for their areas and will put more pressure on small businesses. A number of boroughs such as Southwark, Hackney and Hounslow are taking positive action by putting in

place Article 4 directions that restrict these new PD rights, as is the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation (OPDC). I am encouraging all boroughs to explore doing the same.

Recently-published evidence shows strong demand for industrial space in London which can be used by boroughs to support their Article 4 directions. In my new London Plan, I am also considering how we can meet the needs of smaller industrial businesses. We are exploring how we should protect industrial activity throughout London as well as looking at innovative solutions such as industrial intensification and collocating industrial uses with other uses to knit light industry into the fabric of the city. We are also looking at how the London Plan can support the provision of smaller workspaces and find ways to provide affordable workspace for the small businesses and entrepreneurs that make such a positive contribution to the economic life of London. Bearing in mind your expertise and the experience in this area, I hope you will feed into the draft London Plan. I will be publishing detailed policies in my draft London Plan in the autumn.

Nicky Gavron AM: Thank you, Mr Mayor, for that answer. It is very heartening what you are saying about your proposals for creating new light industrial space and premises through the London Plan, but this rule change, which comes into effect in October [2017], is now looking at changing light industrial premises into the substandard homes that we have seen with offices to residential. These premises are the non-designated ones. That is a term; 'non-designated' means that they are scattered all over London. They are mainly though located behind high streets, and as you said, they are the makers and the mechanics and so on. They keep the supply chains going and they keep the local economy going and of course they provide local jobs. Now, what is a threat is 36% of the total of industrial premises, all over London, 36% of the land.

Now, you quite rightly have encouraged boroughs to take out Article 4 directions. Some have, and more than you even said in your preamble in answer to my question. The problem about Article 4, and I have looked at it, is that it will only safeguard very limited amounts of this space, so an enormous amount is under threat.

Now, in the light of what you have just published, which is a fantastic evidence base, your industrial land demand study, armed with that, I am wondering, could you not now go to the new Ministers - it is Alok Sharma [MP], is it not, for Housing, and Greg Hands [MP], Minister for London - and ask that in the light of that, in the light of what Tom Copley [AM] was saying, in the light of many things, actually, and what is at stake for London's economy and local economies, that London should be exempt from this very pernicious rule change?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Yes. No, it is a really good point you make. We were unsuccessful before the general election in persuading the Government on those points, but you are right. There is no reason why we should not revisit this. As a consequence of your representations, the action for me is to revisit it with the new ministerial team. Grenfell Tower has highlighted it and we have always known that the Red Tape Challenge can have unintended adverse consequences.

Of course we want to see more housing in London, but a consequence cannot be losing light industrial workspace because you are right that that is the lifeline of Londoners getting jobs in areas that they otherwise would not do. Just like we need more homes in London, we need more workplaces too. Let me think about what you have said and think about renewing my efforts to try to persuade the Government to change its mind.

Nicky Gavron AM: Excellent. Thank you.

David Kurten AM: Thank you, Chair. Yes, Mr Mayor, in January [2017] I asked you about the Helmsley Art Centre, which is related to the topic of this question. I did appreciate your answer and you expressed your concern for the businesses that would have to relocate, as Haringey Council was going to redevelop the Art Centre that Assembly Member Whittle and I went to visit. You said you were going to write to Haringey Council. Did you hear anything back?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Yes. Thanks for bringing this issue up again. My statutory Deputy Mayor, Joanne McCartney, has been working with the Council and has met with some of the retailers and the Council has agreed to try to find them premises locally so that they are not lost because with small businesses, many of them are from the Latin American community, and for them it is really important; they support families and it is a virtuous circle. The Council did undertake to make sure to try to find them places within the borough. Some found new places anyway, but anybody who has not, the Council will help.

David Kurten AM: Are you sure that it is the same thing? I know the one with the Latin American businesses is something Assembly Member Boff has raised a lot with Pueblito Paisa in Seven Sisters. This is one in Crouch End and so I am not sure. There are two issues.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Is this the protected building, the special building?

David Kurten AM: This is the Helmsley Art Centre I am talking about.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I beg your pardon, that as well. We had meetings with the Council and the Council is working with the local businesses to find them alternative spaces as well.

David Kurten AM: Great. Thank you.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thank you for that.

2017/2743 - Strike Action

[Keith Prince AM](#)

Does the Mayor welcome the fact that the recent proposed RMT strike action over the sacking of a ticket staff member is not going ahead?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thank you, Deputy Chairman. Like all commuters in London, I am always pleased when the threat of industrial action is lifted. My focus since I

became Mayor has been to undo the former Mayor's toxic legacy of dealing with the unions, reset relationships and get people together to ensure constructive discussions take place. The former Mayor allowed the Night Tube dispute to drag on for almost a year. Through constructive talks and genuine engagement, I delivered the Night Tube within just a few months. There has been a 53% reduction in the average days lost to strikes under my administration compared to the last.

My Deputy Mayor for Transport, Val Shawcross, and I are doing something my predecessor refused point-blank to do. That is to meet regularly with union leaders, those who represent hardworking transport workers, to ensure we have a new and more constructive relationship based on partnership, not conflict. I have had constructive high-level meetings with senior trade union leaders and my Deputy Mayor for Transport also meets with them regularly.

Just some of the examples of the fruits of these discussions that benefit all Londoners include ensuring that cleaners at the London Transport Museum are paid the London Living Wage; we have established a new minimum professional bus driver wage across all bus companies; improving facilities and safety for bus drivers across London; increasing station staff at London Underground stations to improve both customer and staff support; the Night Tube launched last August. These are just some of the benefits. I am modernising TfL to make the organisation more efficient. As part of this, effective local discussion and engagement with the workforce is absolutely crucial. I know that TfL is committed to this and I will continue to press TfL to do it well.

Keith Prince AM: Thank you, Mr Mayor, that is very kind. Actually, on the London Living Wage, which is something we introduced in Redbridge under my leadership and I absolutely support that, will you support or ensure that the subcontractors who work at the London Stadium will be paid the London Living Wage? I believe that comes under your remit.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Yes, a really good question. What happens is we often manage to persuade the main contractor to pay the Living Wage and we forget subcontractors. What happened with the stadium is a similar issue we have had with others where we think we have ticked the box - I do not mean that in a pejorative way - and they have guaranteed the Living Wage, but the people who work on a daily basis are not receiving the wage.

The good news is that has been resolved now and we have got that commitment from them. We have got to keep an eye on this and vigilance is crucial. With the London Transport Museum example, we were not aware that some people were not receiving the London Living Wage, but the trade union let us know and we have sorted that. If Members hear stories, let us know and we will look into it.

Keith Prince AM: Yes, that is helpful because West Ham was being unfairly blamed for not paying the London Living Wage on that.

Moving back to the question, do you now support the Trade Union Act of 2016 and do you welcome its impact?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I will make sure we follow all legislation. The reason we have reduced industrial action by more than 50% is because of good discussions, not because of any Acts of Parliament. What is important is that we have good relationships with trade unions. They work their socks off to make public transport run. They should be treated with respect.

Keith Prince AM: That is not strictly true, though, is it, Mr Mayor, because under your mayoralty, before the Act came into force, you had the worst record of any mayor in relation to strikes?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): That is not true.

Keith Prince AM: Do you regret voting against the Trade --

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): You cannot make things up.

Keith Prince AM: I am not. It is quite true. Unlike you, Mr Mayor, I am very transparent. Do you regret voting against the Trade Union Bill when you were an MP, Mr Mayor?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Let me answer that question. Firstly, trade unions perform an important role. Unlike the Conservative Party, I respect trade unions.

Keith Prince AM: So do we.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Number two: my record on industrial disputes is better than the former Mayor by a country mile. We have reduced strikes by more than 53% by talking, by working with them, by treating them with respect.

Number three: I am really proud that one of the reasons why I secured the best-ever result in mayoral history since there has been elections is because of the poor hardworking transport workers across London. We need their support to make our transport system run well. You do not do that by demonising them; you do not do that by being pejorative towards them; you do not do that by treating them unwell. You treat them with respect, which is what I have been doing for the last 14 or 15 months, and the fruits of that are not just operating costs down for the first time ever in 17 years of TfL running, TfL fares being frozen, but also improvements in public transport across London. That is because of good relationships between the Mayor of London, my team here and transport workers.

Keith Prince AM: Have I run out of time? No. Just for clarity, Mr Mayor, do you recognise that under your leadership, as before 1 March [2017], there were four strikes that came under your --

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): Yes, you have run out of time.

Keith Prince AM: -- leadership, and as a result of that, on a pro rata basis, you were the worst Mayor in --

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): Yes, Assembly Member Prince, you have run out of time. I am being impartial.

2017/2916 - Policing resources

[Unmesh Desai AM](#)

We have seen reports of a leaked letter from Assistant Commissioner of the Metropolitan police, Mark Rowley that the counter terrorism network has not been able to operate at full strength and that risk is being pushed to other areas of policing as resources are diverted to deal with counter-terrorism policing. Are you confident that the Met are able to cope with the current demands being placed upon it?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): First and foremost, let me be clear that London remains one of the safest global cities in the world, in no small part thanks to the dedication, skill and professionalism of the men and women of the MPS. I have been open and upfront with Londoners and with the Government: policing in our city is under real pressure, having to work with decreasing resources to deal with a level of demand increasing in both volume and complexity, and of course in recent months facing the dreadful terror attacks and the investigation into the Grenfell Tower tragedy. As Deputy Commissioner Craig Mackey said to the Assembly's Budget and Performance Committee last month, "If you do not understand how the system works, unfortunately you end up with gaps along the way". For example, counterterrorism funding is ringfenced and protected, but it requires the whole of the policing system to work. You have to treat policing as a system and you have to fund and support funding for the whole system.

The MPS is required to make £400 million of savings by 2021, which if carried out is going to result in police station closures, basic command unit (BCU) mergers and possibly even a reduction in frontline officers, although this is something I will work flat-out to avoid. I have been quite clear that the Government need to fund the MPS properly so that this situation does not arise. I hope that all Assembly Members will agree with me, even those on that side of the Assembly. That is why I continue to call on the Government to fund the MPS properly through the police grant and through the NICC. Policing is not a collective of individual teams working in isolation, it is a team effort, with all parts of the organisation working together. The policing response in the aftermath of recent terror attacks drew in policing resources from across the city, not just counterterror officers, and involved response, detectives, neighbourhood teams, family liaison officers and many others working together to protect, investigate and reassure.

Again, I stress this point: the Government must act to provide real-terms increases to help the police protect us.

Unmesh Desai AM: Thank you for that answer, Mr Mayor, through you, Chairman. I am not asking or expecting you to give a running commentary on each of the 127 recommendations of Lord Toby Harris' report. I would rather wait for a full and considered response in due course, which we will get in October, but one of Lord Harris' recommendations was for the Home Office to fully fund the NICC. Now, I accept we have to keep this campaign alive, but is there any sign that you detect from central Government? Is this thinking getting through to them of the need

to fund the MPS properly and also very specifically the NICC, where we are grossly underfunded?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Can I just say? I appreciate that Assembly Members who are Conservative do not like the fact that their Government is letting them down. I said before the general election that the current Prime Minister is the most anti-London leader of the mainstream parties since I can remember. The evidence is borne out by the lack of resources we get to keep our city safe. We get only half the amount of NICC money you referred to. The police funding formula the Government wants to introduce could lead to us losing £700 million. In relation to the further cuts in our police core grant, we could lose another £400 million.

The bad news is that at the moment I do not think the Home Secretary or the Prime Minister are listening. The good news is that Londoners recognise that our police service work incredibly hard and they need our support.

By the way, the same contract I referred to between us and the Fire Service applies between us and the police. The police often run towards danger, they confront the bad guys, they risk their personal lives and they encourage us to run to safety. Part of that deal has to be there being sufficient police officers to do that job. Part of that quid pro quo has to be them having the resources we need. It beggars belief that rather than Assembly Members on this side joining us in lobbying the Government, they are playing silly political games and posturing for their Twitter followers.

Unmesh Desai AM: Thank you, Mr Mayor. As you said in your response to Assembly Member Hall earlier, we all - and I stress all of us - need to continue to lobby central Government and to join you in your campaign to get more money for London's police service.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thank you.

Steve O'Connell AM: Just a point of personal information on your last comment, which was wrong, criticising Members on this side for not supporting a fair settlement. As Chair of the Police and Crime Committee, in consultation with leads, I am writing this week to the Government to express our disappointment around the NICC formula and also to ask that London gets a fair funding settlement.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Sorry, I am not sure if that was a question or --

Steve O'Connell AM: No, that was a personal explanation.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): You no doubt will welcome that, Mr Mayor.

Steve O'Connell AM: If you were listening, sir.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Welcome what?

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): His point of information was that representations have been made.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Deputy Chairman, you cannot have it both ways. On the one hand you have just said it is a point of personal explanation. On the other hand, with respect, you are not acting like an impartial Chair. You are asking me whether I welcome it. Now, I am happy to respond if that is a question. What you cannot do is on the one hand say it is a point of personal explanation and on the other hand make a comment unnecessarily in your position as Chair.

Steve O'Connell AM: Mayor, do not turn this into an unpleasant exchange. I was just making a point and a personal explanation that you criticised Members on this side regarding the funding settlement. The point I was making was that as the Conservative Chair of the Police and Crime Committee, in consultation with group leads, I have written this week to the Government requesting that it puts right the wrong of the NICC and ensure that London's MPS has a fair financial settlement. That was my point.

Andrew Boff AM: You did not need to FOI that.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Deputy Chairman, would you like me to respond or --

Steve O'Connell AM: You do not need to say anything.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): Least said, soonest mended. Yes, thank you.

2017/2788 - Communicating CCTV retention times on public transport

[Sian Berry AM](#)

What steps have you taken to publicise the retention time limits for CCTV evidence to people who may need to report crimes on public transport?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thank you for your question. A full breakdown of retention periods is published on TfL's website on its privacy and data protection policy pages. At my request, TfL has now also made changes to the website by linking these webpages to the advice that it publishes on how to report a crime or incident on the transport network. The retention periods for CCTV evidence can range from 72 hours to 30 days, depending on factors, including the type of camera, storage capacity and its purpose. Not all cameras record moving images, as automatic number plate recognition captures information such as the vehicle registration mark and a still photographic image of a vehicle. Public transport in London remains a safe, low-crime environment. There is course though no room for complacency.

CCTV plays a valuable role in keeping the network safe, leading to a number of prosecutions, recent examples being the North Greenwich counterterror incident, and on 6 June [2017], a man was jailed for a series of sexual assaults on women on buses. This makes clear that people

must report any incident of crime they experience on the network. TfL has been working with the police to improve the reporting of crime on public transport. This includes working with the MPS service, British Transport Police (BTP) and City of London Police through Project Guardian and the Report it to Stop it campaign to increase confidence in reporting of sexual offences, challenge unwanted sexual behaviour and target offenders; additional public awareness messages addressing the barriers to reducing hate crime, widely-recognised as being under-reported across society. We are continuing to look at what more can be done as part of this campaign to highlight the importance of reporting incidents as soon as possible so the police have the best chance of catching offenders.

2017/2867 - Excess Summer Deaths

[Leonie Cooper AM](#)

What plans are in place in London to prevent excess summer deaths?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Can I thank you for this really important question, particularly at this time of the year? London is experiencing hotter and drier summers and this trend is likely to continue. However, the urban heat island effect can cause London to be up to 10 degrees Celsius warmer than neighbouring rural areas. Increased temperatures, coupled with the urban heat island effect, are linked to adverse health outcomes and can be associated with excess summer deaths. This is when there is an increase in the number of deaths that occur during a heatwave period compared to the number of deaths expected during a non-heatwave period. A heatwave plan for England is published by Public Health England (PHE) and used at a local level in London. The purpose of the heatwave plan is to reduce summer deaths and illness by raising public awareness and triggering actions in the National Health Service (NHS), public health, social care and other community and voluntary organisations to support people who have health, housing or economic circumstances that increase their vulnerability to heat.

The Met Office provides advance warning for heatwave type conditions in London on a weekly and, where relevant, a daily basis during the summer months. PHE shares this information with the GLA and warnings with simple actions that avoid serious heat harm are issued directly to the public from PHE, the NHS and a range of other agencies in London. PHE also works closely with the fire, social and emergency services to ensure that information gets to the most vulnerable people. My office is working closely with PHE, boroughs and TfL to reduce the impact of increased temperatures and heatwaves and protect Londoners as well as London's environment.

Leonie Cooper AM: Thank you for that, Mr Mayor. I mean, you will be aware that last summer, not long after we arrived in City Hall, the heatwave in July was linked to quite a large surge in deaths across the whole of England. The Office for National Statistics (ONS) found that there were 200 more deaths on 17 July [2016] alone compared to the five-year average for that specific day.

Now, this is a particularly big concern in London, where the soaring temperatures are often combined with toxic air, which can be lethal, as you very well know. You have been doing an

awful lot to publicise the problems with the toxic air. As with the excess winter deaths, it is very often elderly people, infants and people who have got the underlying respiratory and cardiovascular conditions who are going to be most at risk when there is a heatwave. You have been issuing public health warnings just last month in June about air toxicity, as we experienced the hottest day in June for 40 years.

What other action beyond the work with PHE do you think could be taken to really draw it to the attention of the Londoners when heat combines with toxic air? Some people have said perhaps we could use the indicators in bus stops and things like that to really get those messages out there. I am just wondering. Is there more we can do?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Can I just remind all of us, as Londoners and good citizens, what you just said, because it is really important we understand this? The at-risk groups in relation to times of increased heat, particularly in London because of the urban heat island effect, is older people, the very young and people with pre-existing medical conditions, as well as those whose health, housing or economic circumstances put them at greater risk from very hot weather, those with limited mobility as well. If any of us have a neighbour or somebody we know who is in one of those at-risk groups, it is worth keeping an eye on them. Many of them might have fans or other things that will keep them warm. It is really important we do so. We are working with PHE in relation to what more we can do. There is a variety of other things we are doing in relation to helping those in the worst-affected areas, what we can do in relation to using green space and vegetation because this is not going to go away, this problem.

Also, what we can do in relation to mechanical cooling in new developments and infrastructure in all developments. There is work we are doing with PHE; we are talking to local authorities as well. Public education is really important and that is why I underscore the point you made about the at-risk groups. These conversations are taking place with PHE. We have got no statutory role. We are also working with our London Resilience Plan to make sure that we are resilient to this sort of stuff happening. You allude to it in a question later on - and hopefully we will get to it - for example, when there is a combination of heatwave plus severe drought, it is, in a negative sense, a perfect storm. We are looking at all sorts of issues, but it is about talking to the other agencies involved, not simply us trying to do it by ourselves.

Leonie Cooper AM: In fact, as you mentioned, talking to the other agencies and statutory responsibilities, is there more that you think that the Government could be doing in this area? Is there anything it could do to step up and really help?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Actually, if you look at the reason, which I looked into, why it is that the temperature in London has such a disproportionate effect compared to rural parts of the country, it is because of what I refer to as - and you know all about - the urban heat island. That is where the Government can help us in relation to it because this is as a consequence of human activities, temperatures leading to levels that are dangerous. Of course the Government can help, and I have talked in previous MQTs of the importance of addressing the issue of what we do around poor-quality air because, as you rightly said, a combination of poor-quality air plus increased temperatures leads to respiratory problems and other issues as well.

There is a huge amount we can do working with the Government. I am hoping that the new Secretary of State for the Environment, who hitherto last year's Brexit campaign did not believe you should listen to experts, believes now that we should listen to experts in relation to addressing the issue of poor-quality air that will help the impacts of the urban heat island. We are doing stuff in relation to investing in the Underground. Again, if the Government keeps on reducing the amount of investment we get and does not believe in devolution, our ability to do the things we want to do is limited.

The same goes in relation to encouraging people to walk and cycle. We are doing what we can to encourage more to walk and cycle. The ambition is 80% by 2014. The Government can help us in relation to some of the devolution of taxes, whether it is VED, whether it is business rates retention, whether it is areas around land value capture. They all help.

Leonie Cooper AM: Then just finally, when that toxic air comes together with heat, that has a significant effect on individuals, but also on our emergency services. The London Ambulance Service (LAS) received more than 300 Category-A phone calls on the hottest day of last year, which is a big number. What discussions have you had with TfL, the MPS and the LAS about their preparedness for heatwaves?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): One of the things that I discussed at the resilience meeting that happened recently was what to do in relation to extreme temperatures. It is not simply getting ready for winter but also dealing with summer as well. Around the table include people from all the relevant agencies you have referred to. A lot of that is public education. You will have seen when you used the Underground simple things like, "Please carry a bottle of water on the Underground". Some of it is advice to stop people suffering the effects of a combination of consuming alcohol in extreme heat. A lot of it is preventing people having to rely upon the emergency services. Some of it is better co-ordination and we carry on doing that.

Leonie Cooper AM: Thank you very much, Mr Mayor.

2017/2985 - Good Work Standard

[Fiona Twycross AM](#)

How will your Good Work Standard improve working conditions in London?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thank you, Assembly Member Twycross, for your question. I promise you the most pro-business Mayor London has ever seen and I firmly believe that a strong economy and a fairer city should go hand in hand. I want London to be the best city in the world in which to work as well as to do business. We have one of the most dynamic and prosperous economies in the world, but I am determined to strike up a serious conversation about the future of employment and how we can ensure prosperity is shared by all Londoners.

My Good Work Standard will be a key part of delivering this and encouraging the very best employment standards across London. On 4 July [2017] I launched a call for evidence to ask businesses and other employers to advise me on what they think should be included and

promoted through the Good Work Standard. With fair pay and the London Living Wage at its heart, my Good Work Standard will seek to tackle the low pay and poor employment practices that sadly still exist in some workplaces, while supporting employers to adopt best practice and achieve high standards in areas such as flexible working, diversity and inclusion, apprenticeships and training and employee voice. I will also be hosting a series of public evidence-gathering sessions to explore the barriers that exist to better workplaces and to find examples of best practice that could be used as a template across the city. I will work with major employers from all sectors, especially those with high standards, to support businesses and other employers who would like to develop them.

Since becoming Mayor, I have been determined to lead by example to promote economic fairness. I lead one of the capital's largest employers, employing almost 80,000 people, 1.4% of London's workforce across City Hall, the capital's transport network, police and fire service. As a result, I am able to improve many Londoners' experiences of work through the GLA group's practices. The GLA group spends £11 billion per year with its suppliers, who also employ many people. I have published a strengthened response and procurement policy, which reflects my determination to establish fair employment practices for the GLA's suppliers.

Can I just end with this? My team and I regularly have the privilege of meeting with business leaders from across all sectors and many of them share my goals.

Fiona Twycross AM: Thank you. This was one of the policies in your manifesto that I most welcomed, because it recognises that low pay is just one of the many factors that affect people in some of the lowest-paid jobs in the city. I wondered how it would work for the people that are being dealt with in quite a lot of the Taylor Review, for those who are currently defined as self-employed but whom many of us would describe as being in bogus self-employment and how you will address that particular issue through the Good Work Standard.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): What we need in relation to those who work in the gig economy is for the Government to amend by primary legislation the rights they have. At the moment it requires an Act of Parliament or legislation from Westminster and so we have to recognise the limited powers we have here in City Hall. We can use the voice of City Hall to persuade employers and businesses that all the evidence is that if you treat your employees/workers well and you pay them well, it can lead to increased productivity, increased profits for the employer and also workers being treated with dignity and having a decent standard of living in what is an expensive city.

That is part and parcel of one of the reasons why we froze TfL fares for the first time for years. The former Mayor oversaw - they [GLA Conservatives] do not like talking about the former Mayor - a 42% increase in the last eight years. Plans by the Conservative [mayoral] candidate, they supported, was for an increase by 17%. We froze TfL fares that help people like the people you are talking about. That is why we have introduced help in relation to those who need deposits for living in London, a three-month deposit scheme. It helps those people. We are helping people with children in relation to childcare. We need to have more people earning a London Living Wage, really important.

Fiona Twycross AM: Thank you. Matthew Taylor's review was published very recently. Do you think the recommendation of 'dependent contractor' will help resolve the unfairness currently associated with bogus self-employment?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): No. What we cannot afford to have is a two-tier workforce. I am not sure a three-tier workforce makes much of a difference to those working in the gig economy, who want a decent salary for a decent day's work. They want to be able to go on holiday and get paid for that, and if they are sick, rather than them having to drive a moped around delivering food - which could be dangerous to their wellbeing and for others, because they are sick - because they need to do it or they do not get paid, they are having a decent time off for sick and being remunerated for that. What we need instead is the Government to take on board the points that Matthew Taylor made and be ambitious and go even further and give those workers dignity but also decent remuneration for a decent day's work.

Fiona Twycross AM: Will you be lobbying the Government to that effect? I agree with you on the new proposed status.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Absolutely. I meet regularly with the Government and lobby on a whole host of issues. One of them is that, look, I want to be the most pro-business Mayor London has ever seen and, at the same time, London has to be a good place for you to work.

By the way, they are not mutually exclusive. When somebody treats their employees with dignity, gives them a decent salary, invests in their training, gives them time off for holidays and gives them time off when they are sick or for family emergencies, that person is more productive and they have a better standard of living, but also the employer benefits from increased productivity.

Fiona Twycross AM: Thank you.

2017/2632 - RAF Northolt

[David Kurten AM](#)

To ask the Mayor what representations he has made to the Secretary of State for Defence, or the Civil Aviation Authority about the fact that RAF Northolt has been stealthily increasing the volume of its commercial flights over recent years, so that now, most flights are non-military. The Ministry of Defence has successfully used the airbase's military status to allow 12,000 commercial flights a year, whilst carefully avoiding any meaningful public consultation on what is essentially, a change of use. With airlines like FlyBe openly lobbying for access to Northolt, local residents are concerned that this airbase is set to become another Luton by the back door and effectively, Heathrow's fourth runway.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thank you. I should make clear that I would be firmly against any increase in commercial flights at RAF Northolt. The Government has announced that RAF Northolt will close for some months in 2018 to undertake improvements to the runway and to extend its life. Assembly Member Shah wrote to me about this last month.

I am not aware of any proposals to expand the number of commercial flights from the airbase. I understand the airline FlyBe has published proposals to operate commercial scheduled flights, but I am informed this has not received any official backing, nor is it being taken forward. My formal powers in relation to the RAF base are very limited, but I will of course monitor the situation and if it becomes clear that an increase in commercial flights is being progressed, I would raise both my concerns and that of local people, as was raised to me by Assembly Member Shah and now yourself, at the highest levels of Government. I will continue to actually protect the interests of Londoners regarding possible aviation expansion.

David Kurten AM: Yes, great. Thank you for your answer and I appreciate your concerns. According to my information, there are now 12,000 commercial flights a year going out of RAF Northolt. What do you think of that number?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): The number I have, you are right, it currently accommodates 12,000 business aircraft movements per year in the London area, placing it beyond Luton, Farnborough and Biggin Hill. I understand why residents are concerned. It is supposed to be a military airfield and so, if there were plans for there to be an increase in the amount of flights, of course I would listen to what is being said by Assembly Members and local residents and make our views well known to the Government.

David Kurten AM: The other figure I have is that over 70% of the flights leaving from RAF Northolt now are non-military. What do you think of that figure?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I have very little power in relation to the status quo. What I can do is lobby and impact in relation to any changes they make. My current position, like I said in my answer, I would not support any increase in commercial activities from the airbase. We do need the airbase there, the military need the airbase there, it provides an important function, but clearly if the Ministry of Defence (MoD) or somebody else was to come forward with plans to increase air flight capacity in that part of London, I take on board the concerns raised by Assembly Members and residents and I object to that.

David Kurten AM: Yes. I absolutely agree that we need a military airbase. Some of them have closed down in the country and there are far too few, in my opinion, but the concerns that local residents have is that there is a possible change of use. It seems to have already happened in some circumstances in this way without actually being official. Do you think there should be a public consultation on what has happened or possible future plans? Do you think that is a good idea?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): If there were future plans, if there was a change of course there would need to be consultation, but some of the reasons why residents are concerned is because of FlyBe lobbying to operate scheduled domestic flights from the airbase, suggesting it could be an overspill until the Heathrow expansion happens. As you know, I am against the Heathrow expansion as well. I am not against Heathrow, but against the expansion. Any plans to move from where we are would demand public consultation and I can assure you that I would listen to you, Assembly Member Shah, and others in relation to our response.

David Kurten AM: Yes, great. It is just that the residents are concerned. Joining the dots together, you see the change in use, the percentage of business and commercial aircraft going up.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I can see that.

David Kurten AM: Then FlyBe is making these noises and so I appreciate your answer and it is something that we need to keep a very close eye on.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Absolutely.

David Kurten AM: You are committed to do that?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Yes.

David Kurten AM: Thank you.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: Mr Mayor, Northolt is in my constituency and I want to express my concerns also. I am really reassured by the fact that you will ensure there is public consultation should there be any changes to this commercial use of this airport. Thank you very much.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thank you.

2017/2984 - 'Good Growth'

[Navin Shah AM](#)

Who should 'good growth' be good for?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thank you for your question. As I said in my speech on Monday at the Learning and Skills Council (LSC), 'good growth' is for all Londoners. I want London to be a more inclusive and sustainable city, an inviting place to live, work and visit, a place that promotes health and wellbeing for all Londoners. 'Good growth' is a principle set out in my vision *A City for all Londoners* and is a guiding principle for all of my strategies and my forthcoming new London Plan. The Good Growth by Design programme will help us to further define what 'good growth' means for Londoners. It will guide our work across the GLA group and will have the assistance of my newly-appointed Mayor's Design Advocates, who are half women and a quarter black and minority ethnic (BAME). In order to make London a city for all Londoners, I need to uphold the highest of standards in steering the capital's development.

This will be achieved through research into the challenges and opportunities posed by new development, improving design review to ensure higher standards and providing leadership conversations about the city's future. The programme will investigate how to increase opportunities for Londoners to participate in shaping the neighbourhoods, getting the most out of development to deliver social value for local people and ensure that those making decisions are as diverse as London's population. It will support Public Practice, a new social enterprise

that will broker placements for outstanding planning and place-shaping practitioners within local authorities, fostering a shared culture of commitment to 'good growth'. I have already launched a number of other existing initiatives: the Skills for Londoners Capital Fund to respond to current and future skills requirements, the crowd-funded London Campaign to boost community local regeneration and the Good Growth Fund to deliver the best regeneration projects.

Navin Shah AM: Thank you, Mr Mayor. My question today on 'good growth' is focused mainly towards your Good Growth Fund, which is your regeneration programme, which I very much welcome. Certainly it is clearly progress from the former Mayor in terms of this Fund's focus on empowering people, employment and crucially inclusivity, as you have mentioned, and community participation, which is so important in identifying those goals and pushing bottom-up regeneration forward.

How can the fund be used to encourage further innovation in participation so that this not only delivers better designed places, but it strengthens communities in the process as a result of the whole programme?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Firstly, you have to be very careful criticising the former Mayor because the Deputy Chair made that point: it is a personal explanation and you cannot respond to it.

Let me just deal with the point that you make there, which is the phrase 'regeneration' has become a euphemism for bad things happening across London, and that is because regeneration tends to be imposed on communities across London. The good thing about the Good Growth Fund, I hope, is residents feeling involved in good regeneration. The Good Growth Fund is to deliver the best regeneration project, and that includes involving local communities in relation to them coming forward with plans. It is also part and parcel of the crowd-funding scheme we have announced. What I want to do is turn Londoners into active citizens, them being involved in regeneration in their communities, so they benefit from the fruits of that regeneration. That is what 'good growth' should be.

Navin Shah AM: You are absolutely right that participation and ownership of the communities in terms of what happens in that patch in terms of regeneration is so important. In the years the Regeneration Committee has followed the GLA's regeneration funding, as I have mentioned, in evolving forms, there is a danger that those communities in most need of regeneration lack the capacity to develop bids, either in terms of local authorities or community organisations. How is the Good Growth Fund designed to work with communities lacking those resources to develop that capacity to bid for the funds?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): This is really important because the communities that could most benefit from regeneration often do not have the skillset - I am not being unkind towards those communities - to apply for --

Navin Shah AM: Those are the real concerns, yes.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Exactly right. What we are going to do is we are going to go out into the communities, whether it is workshops. We cannot just rely upon the internet because some people are not literate with computers or do not have the skillset and so we have to go out into communities to get them involved. Part of it is working with councils of all persuasions because councillors know their communities better than we do in City Hall and so we work with councils where we can. We work with people coming forward with plans, but we have got to involve residents when it comes to regenerating areas.

One of the reasons why I was keen to work on a guide in relation to estate regeneration is to get the practice out there, what is good practice and stuff, and those are transferable. How do we involve residents when it comes regenerating an area? That is why we will have workshops, we will go out into communities to give them the tools to bid for this money.

Navin Shah AM: Thank you.

2017/2868 - Drought Preparedness

[Leonie Cooper AM](#)

The London Sustainable Drainage Action Plan (2016) rightly recognises that London should be resilient to drought especially in the face of climate change. What plans do you have to ensure London is prepared for a drought?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Can I thank you for this question as well? There is no doubt that London is in a water-stressed part of the country and has experienced drought in the past. Indeed, London came very close to a drought in spring 2012. This was fortunately avoided by a very wet summer.

The economic, social and environmental impacts of a severe drought would have an extremely detrimental impact on London. We only need two dry winters to put us at risk of drought. We have now had one dry winter and the prolonged dry spell continues.

Water companies all have statutory drought plans. Although I have no statutory powers in this area, I have asked officers to look at the issues affecting those water companies that supply London. My officers are also working closely with the Environment Agency, the statutory body responsible for regulating and monitoring measures along with water companies to ensure Londoners' interests are met. The drought plans set out what water companies must do to respond to increasingly severe levels of drought. Measures start with increased communication and water efficiency messaging. This progresses to more stringent measures as drought worsens. This may include temporary use bans and in extreme cases imposing restrictions on all but essential use.

Through London Resilience, there is a drought response framework already in place. The framework sets out specific London Resilience activities according to the drought level enforced. These activities include co-ordinating incident response partners and developing response strategies. Working with Thames Water, my officers have recently held a workshop to improve understanding of how an extreme drought could be handled. In these circumstances

options include rationing water to the most pressing needs, such as hospitals, or reducing water pressures to enable more water to go around. The outputs of the workshop will further inform and improve drought preparedness in London.

The upcoming draft Environmental Strategy will set up the improvements in water supply and efficiency that I think will be required. This will ensure that as London grows we have a set, secure and resilient water supply in future.

Leonie Cooper AM: Thank you very much for that, Mr Mayor. Thames Water has made it clear in its assessment that there is growing demand, partly as London gets hotter but also partly as London grows. It has expressed some concern particularly during heat wave periods that there is an overall deficit of up to 418 litres in those periods. It has come up with a series of possibilities, potentially a new reservoir, transferring water from the River Severn and desalination plants, as well as smart metering. I just wondered if those are also areas along with the other preparedness and resilience areas that your team have been talking about with Thames Water.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Yes. One of things we are looking at is a long-term response to this issue. The gap, as you say, between available water supply and demand is predicted to grow in the future as London grows and our climate changes. By 2040, in fact, the gap will be 400 million litres a day. This gap cannot be closed simply by increased water efficiency alone. Although we have to reduce water waste, London does need to think about a new or indeed several new sources of water to meet future needs.

You have given some examples of the things that Thames Water are talking about. We are working closely with them, in more of an overview role, in relation to seeing what the best solution is going forward. You know I have been frustrated in the past about the regulator. I have been frustrated in the past about Thames Water in relation to water inefficiency and its general lack of planning for the future. We have to make sure we work closely with it to get a sustainable solution to the demand. The facts speak for themselves in relation to our needs today, supply versus demand, but also our needs as our population grows.

Leonie Cooper AM: Thank you very much, Mr Mayor.

2017/2986 - Brexit negotiations

[Fiona Twycross AM](#)

What is your view of the how the Brexit negotiations have got underway and what the potential impact is on London?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thank you, Deputy Chairman. When she called the general election, the Prime Minister explicitly sought a mandate from the British people for her version of a hard Brexit. The electorate registered its opposition to that outcome across the country, here in London most clearly of all, and it is time, frankly speaking, she heeded the message.

I am now hoping to see a more pragmatic and flexible approach from the Government now that the negotiations have begun. The goalposts had been moved. Theresa May [Prime Minister] and her Government must now listen to the will of the people by putting aside their rejected hard Brexit approach and instead seeking to negotiate a sensible Brexit.

Continued membership of the single market is our best chance to protect the ability of London's key business sectors, finance, professional services, tax, creative, life sciences, higher education. Within the single market they can continue to trade free from tariff or non-tariff barriers without our single largest export market. Signalling that Britain aims to stay in the single market would also give the many new citizens who make London their home, they are Londoners and they contribute to our economy, the security that I have previously called on the government to offer them.

I am pleased to finally see proposals from both sides on how to address the rights of Europeans living in the United Kingdom (UK) and UK citizens in Europe. Given the referendum was over a year ago, I am frustrated that 1 million Londoners who are European Union (EU) citizens still do not have the certainty they deserve. This needs to be resolved as soon as possible.

Come what may, businesses need certainty to plan ahead and invest. It is also vital that the Government seeks to negotiate a transitional deal with the EU so that we have a fall-back option if, as expected, it is possible to seek a trade alongside during the next two years. By doing so, we will reduce the real risk of crashing out of the EU and falling back on basic World Trade Organisation (WTO) rules, creating tariffs on British goods sold in the EU and putting up hugely damaging barriers for services. Unless such a deal is agreed soon, businesses will take their own measures to avoid the cliff edge and that could be costly to them and to Londoners and UK as an economy.

Fiona Twycross AM: Thank you. From where I sit, it looks like the Government's approach has continued to be completely shambolic. How confident are you that it will actually get its act together and get a Brexit deal that does indeed work for London and Londoners as you outline and does not damage London's economy, by default Londoners' livelihoods and indeed, as you point out, their right to remain?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thank you. I spent a couple of days in Brussels a few weeks ago talking to President Tajani [President of the European Parliament], meeting with the key negotiator, Guy [Guy Verhofstadt, Member of the European Parliament], meeting with President Juncker [President of the European Commission] and speaking to President Tusk [President of the European Council]. There is no intention on the part of the EU to punish us. They are heartbroken we are leaving.

What does not help - and they are going to jump up and down now when I say this or ask for a personal explanation - is when the previous Mayor says they are whistling in the wind. That is not the way to behave for the Foreign Secretary. That is not the way to conduct negotiations. Somebody should take a cool, calm look at themselves and how they are behaving and what is in the best interests of our city and our country. The way to negotiate responsibly as an adult is

to treat the other side with respect, do your homework and know who your team are, including which of them are women, when it comes to negotiating with the EU.

I am afraid the evidence I have - and I am not part of the negotiating team - is that our advance sherpa team is ill-prepared. The evidence I have so far is that there are no plans for what happens in two years one day. We have wasted a year already from the referendum vote. Article 50 was served in March when it did not need to be; posturing to the EU.

I hope, now that the Prime Minister has been humbled by the verdict of the British public who said "no" quite clearly to a Tory hard, extreme Brexit, that she will be sensible as a Prime Minister and move forward in a constructive way. There is nothing stopping the Prime Minister giving a cast-iron guarantee today to all Londoners who are EU citizens and all those across the country who are from the EU that they have a right to remain here, with good rights, even after we have left the EU. Do not use people as bargaining chips.

Fiona Twycross AM: Yes, I agree. Actually, you pre-empted my comments. I have the quote written down from Boris Johnson [MP, former Mayor of London] because it is incredibly important that we do not write him out of history here or on his national stage. How damaging do you think his comments and those of other prominent Conservatives --

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Can I just say something? I have been cleaning up this year for the best part of eight years. What is astonishing is their embarrassment that for eight years they supported this guy and had the audacity to criticise us for cleaning up his mess. They are embarrassed. We get that. What we have to recognise is that this guy is now the Foreign Secretary. He is in an extremely important position. Posturing and posing does not lead to good results for our country and those who need a good deal with the EU. They may not like the fact that he is a Foreign Secretary, but he is.

We have to make sure that we as City Hall - and we are proud patriots and understand the importance of having a good deal with our European neighbours - put pressure on the Prime Minister and put pressure on the Government to get a good deal with the EU.

I chaired yesterday a business advisory board meeting with some of the leading business people in our country and across the world from Bloomberg to Facebook, leading companies who are here in London. Frankly speaking, unless the Government changes course, unless senior members of the Government reflect on their behaviour, some of these will have no choice but to think about making plans to go elsewhere in the EU. That is heart-breaking for me, as someone who wants to be a pro-business Mayor, but also it should be heart-breaking for all of us who want London to carry on being a great city.

Fiona Twycross AM: Absolutely. Thank you.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): Assembly Member Kurten?

David Kurten AM: Thank you, Chair. It was very interesting that you say you have been to Brussels and you have met Tajani, Verhofstadt and other chief negotiators. My understanding is

that they are asking this country, which we are the capital city of, for €100 billion or £85 billion just to get negotiations going. Do you not think it would be absolutely ludicrous to pay that amount of money just to be able to negotiate?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Firstly, I should have said before that I wish you well in the bid to be the leader of the UK Independence Party (UKIP).

David Kurten AM: I take that as a compliment.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I should also say that I wish Peter well in his bid to be the leader of UKIP. I wish you both well and I wish you prosperity, whoever wins the outcome of that election.

The idea that a negotiation is conducted via the medium of the media or via questions from the dispatch box in Parliament or the idea that the first offering from the other side is the final offering is nonsense. Anybody who has conducted a negotiation knows that is not the way to conduct negotiations. What happens and what should happen is that your advance sherpa team is having conversations behind the scenes. A relationship of mutually trust and confidence is built up. You treat each other with respect. You recognise that it is in nobody's interest for this deal to go pear-shaped. Also, you recognise that no deal does not mean status quo; no deal means WTO terms. That means a 10% tariff on goods being exported to our single biggest export market. That means non-tariff barriers on services, which, by the way, is crucial to London. For senior members of the Government and negotiators not to understand that beggars belief.

2017/2918 - Night time economy

[Andrew Dismore AM](#)

In developing the night time economy, how will you ensure that the interests of local residents in such areas are fully protected?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thank you, Deputy Chairman. Protecting the interests of London's residents, workers and visitors is vital when developing London as a 24-hour city. One in eight jobs in the capital are at night. This is said to grow in the coming years. However, a balance must be struck between work, play and sleep for London's 8.8 million residents.

To support this, I am aiming to support a standalone agent-of-change policy in my new London Plan. This policy will require borrowers to consider refusing development proposals that have not clearly demonstrated how noise impacts will be mitigated and managed. We are also listening to the views of local residents. TfL is working to mitigate the impact of Night Tube services, guaranteeing a response to any complaints they may receive. Amy Lamé, my Night Czar, is holding night surgeries in boroughs and town centres across the capital. We are working with local authorities and local councillors, for example, on our Night Time Borough Champions Network, which includes one councillor and one officer from every local authority, through Talk London, which has over 40,000 users.

The safety of London is also a top priority. This includes ensuring that antisocial behaviour and crime are dealt with. Neighbourhood policing is key to this. It is usually important that local councils, the police and industry all come together to devise creative solutions that support a safe night-time economy. I want business crime reduction partnerships to help devise local solutions and for the police to have more consistent licence and guidance.

We have never planned for London at night in the same way we do for London in the daytime. I want to change that. I will publish my vision for London as a 24-hour city in the coming weeks. Amy Lamé and Philip Kolvin QC, the Chair of my Night Time Commission, are attending a session with the Economy Committee later in July to outline the vision. By planning positively for a 24-hour city, I believe we can make London a safer, healthier, fairer and more accessible city for all Londoners.

Andrew Dismore AM: Thank you, Mr Mayor. Last week the Economy Committee held a workshop with residents, night-workers and councillors. One of the issues that came out was the need for a more diverse evening economy which worked with the wider community, the NHS, the police, the Mayor and councillors developing best practice.

One concern is that the evening and night-time economies are lumped together as one when in fact they are very different, with the evening economy worth roughly four times the night-time economy. The evening economy is restaurants, theatres, cinemas and so forth. The night-time economy is more about bars and clubbing.

Would you recognise the distinction between the evening and night economies? In speaking about it, looking at their important contribution to the economy on the one hand and the downside for residents on the other, will you reflect this difference?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): I am not sure if I would, actually. How you define 'night' can be when it is dusk or when it is evening. One of the problems in relation to night-life and evening-life has been, for example, public transport accessibility; for example, concerns around public safety; for example, legitimate concerns from residents about antisocial behaviour, about difficulties people have getting to and from places of work in the evenings when public transport is less good. What we are trying to do is understand the concerns people have in all sorts of issues from the evening going through the night.

I am very excited because we will have the night Overground later on this year, which will help the east of London. That will help porters, cleaners, doctors and nurses get to and from work. Is that evening? Is that night-time? Some restaurants will be able to open later. Some theatres may change the time they put on performances from early evening to later evening. I am not sure if I necessarily agree with the distinction that you refer to.

Andrew Dismore AM: Night-time workers' main concerns were over pay conditions and inadequacy of night-time transport, particularly safety on the night buses. I have received many complaints from residents, particularly in Camden, about antisocial behaviour and uncontrolled drug dealing and taking with inadequate and unresponsive policing.

What can you do to reassure and protect residents, in particular increase the police presence, to deal with the worst excesses of the night-time economy and to support the local authorities who do not have the funds to manage the night-time economy with street cleaning, environmental officers and so forth due to the cuts from central Government?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Yes. It is a really important point you raise. The business crime reduction partnerships and the work the Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) are doing across London is really important here. One of the reasons why we are so keen to restore real neighbourhood policing was the importance police officers have in their local community. By the end of this year, every ward in London will have two dedicated police officers, plus a community support officer, who will know their wards, know their businesses and be able to work with them to address antisocial behaviour.

My job is made much harder by the fact that I have coming around the corner £400 million worth of cuts I have to make and there could be a change in the police funding formula and we are still getting the NICC money. I am working incredibly hard not to lose frontline police officers. As it is, we could be losing half of the police front-office counters. We may have to make other cuts in the police budget. We are doing our best, working with businesses, working with residents and working with councils. Our police officers are working incredibly hard.

You are right that unless there is an injection of resources from central Government it makes our life much harder. The reason why I ask for support from central Government is not simply the obvious point around safety, but one in eight jobs in London is now from the night-time economy. It is in the economic interest of the country for London to do well. London does well, but London does well because of the night-time economy.

2017/2019 - Cuts plan for North Central London NHS

[Andrew Dismore AM](#)

A 31 page internal NHS cuts plan to plug the £183.1m budget gap in North Central London NHS uncovered by The Guardian would mean patients in Barnet and Camden, as well as Haringey, Enfield and Islington, waiting even longer for operations, patients being denied access to an increased number of treatments, cuts to financial support for patients with serious, long term conditions including brain damage, downgrading or closure of hospital units and doctors spending less on drugs. Clinicians and NHS staff have expressed deep concern, with the Royal College of Surgeons calling the changes "devastating" to healthcare provision. Will you join me in calling for an immediate halt to the implementation of these plans until a full consultation can take place and residents' views can be heard and the plans can be properly scrutinised and debated in public?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thank you for your question. Further NHS service cuts to North Central London are very concerning, especially the potential impact this will have on access to global health services. I am advised by the NHS that the capped expenditure programme process - that is what it is called - is about improving the NHS financial position this year. The proposals do not appear to provide a comprehensive health service for the local area.

I know that many of the financial pressures the NHS is experiencing at present result from political choices made by the current Government.

Your question asks about public consultation and service changes. The NHS has very clear duties in this respect. Public consultation is required for any major service changes. Furthermore, before any public consultation takes place, proposals must have full support of the clinicians who make the decisions about service provision, have clear clinical evidence that supports them and have been the subject of robust patient and public engagement.

I propose to take this up with NHS England initially to seek assurance about this process, especially with regard to openness and transparency and the running of the local government health, overview and scrutiny committee to demand proper consultation on these proposals. It is important to examine whether these planned changes provide a comprehensive health service in North Central London as per the statutory duty. Additionally, I will be seeking assurance about how these changes will impact health and equalities before any implementation can proceed.

Andrew Dismore AM: Thank you, Mr Mayor. Would you agree that the secrecy surrounding NHS cuts project is designed to surreptitiously sneak through improper and dangerous cuts and that such a lack of transparency can only undermine public trust? The proposals include cuts such as patients having to wait longer than the maximum 18 weeks for planned operations, rationing of care through patients being denied some surgical treatments, and hospital units being downgraded or shut as a result of 'service consolidation'.

I do not know if you have seen the document yourself but, if you have, would you agree that the Government has ordered the NHS, including the Royal Free and University College London, to implement draconian cost-cutting measures and to 'think the unthinkable' in its demand for savings? The document says:

"We recognise that these choices may be difficult for a number of reasons [because they include] ... options that impact on quality of care [and] options that would be difficult to implement."

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Local residents in that part of London have seen for themselves the consequences of changes made over the last seven years, which are impacting the service they receive as patients and potential patients from the NHS. To argue that because these changes are not major service changes no consultation is required is missing the point. Any public service that is meaningful should be consulted before changes that affect users of that service. The NHS needs to do a far better job. As a result of your question and the points you have raised and brought to my attention, I will certainly be making those representations to the NHS. They need to do far better.

Andrew Dismore AM: The fact is, is it not, Mr Mayor, that all of this is the product of the Conservatives starving the NHS of the money it needs to do the job properly and putting finances ahead of the interests of patients?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Without a doubt, these are the direct consequences of decisions made in central Government. A top-down reorganisation was not needed. Cuts in real terms to NHS budgets, decisions being made as consequences of those cuts and local health providers who work incredibly hard are very conscientious, retrofitting the service they provide as a consequence of decisions made by central Government.

2017/2962 - Ealing Broadway

[Dr Onkar Sahota](#)

Will the Mayor confirm why works at Ealing Broadway station appear to have stalled, and confirmed what delay this will have to the successful upgrade of the station?

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): Thank you for your question. The Crossrail programme is 85% complete. The new tunnels and stations through central London and Docklands are on schedule to open as planned in December 2018 as the Elizabeth line. Network Rail is a key partner in delivering the Crossrail project and as a consequence we remain heavily reliant on it to upgrade the existing railway in west London in preparation for the Elizabeth line services. Network Rail has assured Crossrail that the works at Ealing Broadway will be finished by December 2019 when the Elizabeth line through services start from Reading, Maidenhead and Heathrow.

I am concerned about these Network Rail delays to the Crossrail programme as well as those of the Gospel Oak-to-Barking electrification programme we have experienced. It really is not good enough. My office is urgently seeking a meeting with Mark Carne, Chief Executive of Network Rail, to discuss the issues. Val Shawcross [Valerie Shawcross CBE], my Deputy Mayor for Transport, will be seeking assurance from Mark Carne that Network Rail is doing everything it can to get this project back on track.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: Thank you, Mr Mayor, for that very helpful reply. Of course, I am concerned about my constituents, particularly at Ealing Broadway where there is no step-free access and they are going to be put back by about two years to make these changes. I want to raise this concern to you. I am really sure that you will take this matter up with Network Rail and also with Crossrail.

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London): One of the frustrations about the way these things work is that we are a partnership and we have to work with Network Rail and we rely upon it to do things.

In answer to your question earlier on about funding for a 25-year project, we know it is a nonsensical question. The reason why it even more difficult is because we rely upon other partners, Network Rail and others. The local Council there, which you know very well, with the residents and you and the MPs, were given assurances and promises and I share your frustration. As I said to you, it is not acceptable and we are saying to Network Rail, "You have to make sure that the promises and reassurances given are addressed".

Part of that, I am told, is a discussion between Network Rail and central Government. What we do not want to happen is, because of the mess the Government has made in relation to budgeting generally as an economic policy, projects like Network Rail, which has to make sure that Crossrail has good stations, are missing out. That is why it is important we make sure Network Rail knows our views and that Network Rail does right by Londoners in Ealing and elsewhere to have the stations that we were promised.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: Good. Thank you very much, Mr Mayor.

Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman in the Chair): Thank you, Mr Mayor, for your answers this morning.