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MINUTES

Meeting:  London Recovery Board
Date:    Tuesday 28 July 2020
Time:    2.00pm
Place:   Virtual meeting

The webcast of this meeting will be available for six months at:  https://www.london.gov.uk/london-recovery-board-2020-07-28. These minutes incorporate points raised via the virtual meeting written chat function, which is not visible on the recording.
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Board Members
Sadiq Khan, Mayor of London (Co-Chair, in the chair)
Councillor Peter John OBE, Chair of London Councils (Co-Chair)
Julia Buckingham, President, Universities UK
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Sam Gurney, London Regional Secretary, Trades Union Congress
Rowena Howie, London Policy Representative, Federation of Small Businesses
David Hughes, CEO, Association of Colleges
Catherine McGuinness, Vice Chair of London Councils
Bharat Mehta, CEO, Trust for London
Father Luke Miller, Chair, London Resilience Faith Sector Panel
Sir Bob Neill MP, Co-Chair, APPG on London
Councillor Teresa O’Neill OBE, Vice Chair of London Councils
Nita Patel, Founder and CEO, Planet Communications
Sir David Sloman, London Regional Director, NHS England
Angela Spence, CEO, Kensington and Chelsea Social Council
Professor Tony Travers, Director, LSE London
Lord Simon Woolley, Director, Operation Black Vote

Also in attendance
Jeanette Bain-Burnett, Head of Community Engagement, GLA (presenting item 5)
Dr Nick Bowes, Mayoral Director, Policy, GLA
Natan Doron, Senior Adviser to the Mayoral Director, Policy, GLA
John Dickie, Director of Strategy and Policy, London First (for Jasmine Whitbread)
Welcome and Chair’s announcements (Item 1)

1.1 The meeting was chaired by Sadiq Khan, Mayor of London and Co-Chair of the London Recovery Board.

1.2 The Chair welcomed those present, including Andy Byford, London’s new Transport Commissioner, and outlined protocols for the virtual meeting. Apologies had been received from Laura Citron, for whom Allen Simpson would substitute; the Minister for London, for whom Robyn Thackara would substitute; Beccy Speight, for whom Shaun Spiers would substitute; and Jasmine Whitbread, for whom John Dickie would substitute.

1.3 The Chair reminded members of the high-level principles and outcomes agreed at the Board’s first meeting and highlighted the outstanding collaborative work being undertaken between the GLA and London Councils, among others, to develop these. He also outlined some of the economic impacts of Covid-19 already being felt by Londoners, noting that these would be impacting already-disadvantaged areas and communities the hardest.

1.4 Councillor Peter John, Co-Chair of the Board, also emphasised the close collaborative working and the opportunities this presented to deliver real change. Without significant central Government investment, however, it was possible that the opportunity created by this collective drive and goodwill may be lost, and with it London’s ability to continue generating surplus income for the rest of the UK. The Board would need to be a strong voice in support of investment in the capital. Members were particularly supportive of the need for long-term, sustainable funding for London’s transport systems and infrastructure and for Transport for London in particular.

1.5 The Board then heard from Father Luke Miller on the willingness of the faith and belief sector, like many others represented on the Board, to work cross-sectorally and outside those areas with which it may most commonly be associated. Examples were provided of the sector’s activities and influence in matters of homelessness, arts and culture, education,
green spaces and commercial activities, noting that faith organisations could operate across many levels, from national through to community level and down to individual households.

2 Declarations of interest (Item 2)

2.1 Councillor Teresa O’Neill declared an interest in Item 7 as a Board member of Homes England. The interest was non-pecuniary and noted only in the interests of transparency.¹

3 Minutes of the previous meeting (Item 3)

3.1 DECISION: That the minutes of the meeting held on 4 June 2020 be agreed as a correct record.

4 London Recovery Taskforce Terms of Reference (Item 4)

4.1 DECISION: That the Terms of Reference of the London Recovery Taskforce be approved.

5 Public and stakeholder engagement update (Item 5)

[Rowena Howie joined the meeting during this item]

5.1 Jeanette Bain-Burnett, GLA Head of Community Engagement, shared a presentation on the work undertaken to date to consult with Londoners on the city’s recovery from Covid-19 and the ambition for London’s diverse communities and individuals to influence, shape and participate fully through a far-reaching and inclusive engagement process. The collaborative approach would extend beyond consultation into genuine co-design of London’s recovery, ensuring that London’s less-heard voices, and those disproportionately affected by Covid-19, were brought to the fore. Recommendations from the ongoing work would help shape the Board’s final missions, to be developed for the next meeting, where an action plan for collaborative engagement would also be presented. The presentation is attached to these minutes at Appendix 1.

5.2 Members were extremely supportive of the proposed approach and of the level of ambition, offering to use their networks to promote and extend the planned engagement work to inform the draft missions. It was agreed that having multiple points of entry into the conversation would be important, as would linking with separate but relevant work such as the Centre for London’s London 2050 project.

5.3 To ensure Londoners felt the recovery process was being developed with them, efforts would need to be made to reach those traditionally least likely to engage with such processes and ensure the genuine participation of their communities, particularly where there was crossover with digitally-excluded groups. To be empowered to participate effectively, Londoners would

¹ This declaration was made via the virtual meeting chat function.
need to be well-informed, as well as being able to contribute their views to what measures may be used to assess the success of the recovery work.

5.4 Members acknowledged the tensions between the desire for a cleaner, greener city and the need to resume economic activity, particularly for those who had lost employment during the crisis. Assuring London’s status as a global capital would also need to be balanced carefully with supporting its citizens. It would be important, however, to challenge the perception that such trade-offs were inevitable and to ensure direct citizen involvement in analysing the options and selecting solutions. Identifying the new ways that individuals and businesses wanted to work and how people’s leisure activities may change in the long term as a result of Covid-19 may also help neutralise some of the anticipated trade-offs.

5.5 DECISION:
That, taking into account the points raised in the discussion, the proposed approach to engagement be endorsed.

6 Recovery missions (Item 6)

6.1 Dr Nick Bowes, Chair of the London Recovery Taskforce, introduced the item and speakers, thanking all who had been involved in the development of the proposals to date and in particular the Chairs and co-Chairs of the two workstrands. The missions-based approach was introduced. The draft missions were not exhaustive and would work across different timescales. To succeed, Board members’ organisations would need to participate in their delivery, both via direct commitments and via other levers, as well as advising on their development. Not all outcomes sought would require direct investment; some would be achievable by redoubling efforts to better coordinate organisations’ respective activities; or by advocacy to encourage changes to law or regulatory frameworks. Members were asked to put forward their thoughts on how to refine the draft missions, and what the tangible outcomes might be.

[Shaun Spiers left the meeting during this item]

6a Social Recovery

6.2 Councillor Ruth Dombey, co-Chair of the social recovery workstrand, outlined the draft missions proposed to aid London’s social recovery from Covid-19. The crisis had further exposed the deep-seated inequalities from which many of London’s communities suffered and it would be crucial to articulate clearly what the recovery work would mean for those groups most seriously affected, as well as ensuring their direct participation. Slides for the entirety of item 6 are attached to these minutes at Appendix 2. The proposed social recovery missions were as follows:

- **Mission 1: A Strong Civil Society** - All Londoners, especially those who suffered unequal impact of Covid 19 are served by a thriving, diverse and sustainable Civil Society and Faith sector.

- **Mission 2: A robust safety net, a good standard of living and the tools to thrive** - All Londoners receive the support they need to avoid or be lifted out of poverty, and to relieve hardship.
• **Mission 3: No one’s health suffers because of who they are, where they live, or if, how and where they work** - To address the disproportionate impact of Covid-19 on certain groups, and take steps to ensure that the rebuilding of London reduces the gap in healthy life expectancy.

• **Mission 4: A new deal for young people** - Every young Londoner to have the best start in life; to be happy, safe, fulfilled & ambitious – focussing on those facing the greatest barriers to realising their potential.

6.3 The Board expressed strong approval for the draft missions, praising the extensive work involved in their development and the scale of their ambition. It was noted that London’s greatest strength was its diversity and the ability of its communities to live and work together harmoniously. Social distancing had led in some cases to social isolation and a partial fracturing of communities, who mixed less with others than they had previously. To regain this unique quality, a thread of reintegration must run throughout the recovery work.

6.4 Members stressed that civil society bodies provided the best support as they were often small, local and worked with individuals. Considerable inequalities existed within civil society itself, where funding processes often favoured larger organisations over the grassroots. Existing, sometimes informal safety nets within communities should be supported to thrive and grow, capitalising on the impetus created by Covid-19 in increasing volunteering and improvements in local relationships.

6.5 Bold commitments to improve the lives and prospects of young Londoners drew universal support. Members highlighted the educational inequalities that had arisen as a result of Covid-19 and backed the clear-calling out of other, existing inequalities for young people. The risk posed to young Londoners by any loss of free transport would be significant. Past and recent programmes to support young people into work were discussed. Some members stressed that those initiatives that most empowered the individual to build their own skills, networks and confidence had been the most effective.

6.6 Other initial views included whether it may be beneficial to place greater emphasis on a recovery that helped older people, who were particularly vulnerable to social isolation, and if outcomes should explicitly address how those with disabilities would benefit from the work.

6b **Economic Recovery**

* [David Lunts joined and Lord Simon Woolley left the meeting during this item]*

6.7 Councillor Georgia Gould, Chair of the economic recovery workstrand, outlined four further draft missions around which it was hoped citizens, government, business and other institutions could coalesce. London faced the dual challenges of revitalising its economy while addressing head-on the stark inequalities highlighted by Covid-19; and must set out to achieve both in ways that would also help tackle the climate crisis.

• **Mission 5: Good Work for All Londoners** - No Londoner, particularly those people disproportionately affected by the pandemic or BREXIT, is left without access to education, training or a job opportunity.
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- **Mission 6: Green New Deal** - *Increase [by %TBD] the size of London’s green economy by 2030, to accelerate job creation and to drive a fair and inclusive recovery from Covid-19 that tackles the climate emergency, eradicates air pollution and builds long-term, community-led resilience.*

- **Mission 7: Digital Access for all** - *Every Londoner to have access to connectivity, basic digital, skills and digital employment opportunities and support by 2025.*

- **Mission 8: ‘15 minute cities – the city on your doorstep’** - *Thriving, inclusive and resilient high streets and town centres in every London Borough with culture, diverse retail and jobs within walking distance of all Londoners.*

6.8 Members again praised the draft missions and put forward a range of offers of collaboration. It would be crucial to ensure all new jobs created through the recovery work were *good* jobs. Some of London’s biggest employers were represented on the Board, with the NHS alone employing 230,000 people. There would be significant opportunities to design skills and training interventions that would provide solutions to these organisations’ skills shortages.

6.9 It was felt that a clear focus by skills providers on specific sectors could deliver the greatest benefits, sometimes with relatively modest investment. Training initiatives similar to the Mayor’s Construction Academy Scheme could be devised in collaboration with the health and care and transport sectors; and to serve the growing digital and green economies. The development of green skills and innovation by London’s universities, businesses and colleges could provide an international showcase for the city.

6.10 While retaining the long-term focus on those furthest from the labour market, immediate action must also be taken to prevent those newly unemployed from remaining jobless in the longer-term. Recovery efforts must encompass adult skills initiatives as well as providing for young people. This point would need to be pressed with Government.

6.11 Genuine partnership working between organisations in the skills and employment landscape would be critical to ensure a system that made the best of available resources and was coherent to Londoners. This must include Jobcentre Plus. This partnership would need to remain agile to react to the demands of the coming months.

6.12 Members heard that SMEs were keen to participate fully in London’s recovery and that for them to do so, relevant schemes would need to be designed to be accessible. Many companies were now burdened with excessive debt and Government action would be required, with interventions to be targeted at those businesses which would remain viable with assistance, rather than those in maximum need.

6.13 There was broad support for a dual focus on encouraging the economic revitalisation of both local centres and central London. The revival of high streets must be achieved in a way that promoted improvements to public health.

6.14 The Board felt that the restoration of central London to something approaching previous levels of activity would be fundamental to the recovery and would prevent unwanted change to the overall character of the city. The huge impacts of Covid-19 on central London footfall, and associated financial consequences, could only be mitigated by restoring full confidence in public transport usage. Effective linking of new businesses to newly-empty retail and office space could also provide an unprecedented opportunity to breathe new life into the
area. This would be considered in the development of the missions and members were also informed of work being undertaken by structures other than the Board to support the economic recovery of central London.

6.15 As at the Board’s first meeting, there was strong consensus that Government must be pressed for a long-term, sustainable funding settlement for Transport for London, as well as for capital investment to build out related infrastructure. This would deliver on outcomes across the full range of mission areas, particularly when aligned with appropriate skills provision, and it would be important not to allow current, reduced transport usage to justify a lack of future investment.

6.16 The Board provided a clear steer that, alongside continued advocacy for investment in London, the draft missions would need to be both refined and prioritised in light of current resourcing challenges. Teams would need to focus down on those outcomes that could be achieved via improved collaboration and new partnership working, as well as considering scalability of those outcomes that would require significant new investment. There was room to enhance the coherence of the set of missions as a whole.

6.17 Even with the development of an effective vaccine, the Board was reminded that London was likely to be living with the presence of Covid-19 for some time to come and that the path between transition and recovery was unlikely to be linear. A challenge was issued, to ensure that each mission contained a minimum of one core activity that could be initiated and continued while the virus persisted.

6.18 Londoners would want to see immediate action, and the Board heard details of a forthcoming announcement in collaboration with utilities companies to bring forward over £1bn of investment to upgrade networks and improve resilience. The work would support the ambitions of many of the missions. The press release would be shared with members alongside the slides from the presentations. [Action: Secretariat]

6.19 DECISION: That, taking into account the points raised in the discussion, the draft missions be endorsed for further development.

7 Update on other workstrands - Housing (Item 7)

[Sir David Sloman left the meeting during this item]

7.1 David Lunts, GLA Executive Director for Housing and Land, outlined the work undertaken by the Covid-19 London Housing Delivery Taskforce (HDT), that had recently published its final report on supporting the housing sector to recover from Covid-19. A collaborative exercise across the London housing sector, the HDT had identified actions that could be taken by the parties involved and others which would need Government intervention. Its recommendations included: actions to de-risk development and build the pipeline of projects; co-ordination of training and the establishment of a workforce visa system; promotion of precision manufacturing; land assembly reforms; and flexibilities in the planning system. The full report would be recirculated to members. [Action: Secretariat]

7.2 DECISION: That the report of the Covid-19 Housing Delivery Taskforce be noted.
8 Next steps (Item 8)

8.1 Dr Nick Bowes thanked members for their input and explained that their comments would be taken forward in the period before the next Board meeting on 15 September, alongside feedback from the public engagement exercise, and used to refine and prioritise the draft missions for approval.

8.2 The Board featured many powerful voices, representing a range of London’s anchor institutions, and it had been acknowledged that the role of those organisations in the recovery could be better defined. It was proposed that ahead of the Board’s next meeting, thought would be given to proposals for a set of short-, medium- and longer-term actions that Board members’ organisations may be able to commit to in support of the agreed missions.

8.3 Councillor Peter John closed the meeting by thanking those present for the discussion and reiterating that to achieve the Board’s ambitions, public funds would need to work harder than ever before and institutions would need to integrate their work in new ways. It had been suggested that to move forward with many of the issues discussed at the meeting, London needed a clear vision of how it would look when the Covid-19 crisis was over. This, alongside the major infrastructure investments needed, was linked intrinsically to London’s autonomy and the types of fiscal devolution that had been recommended by the London Finance Commission.

9 Any other business (Item 9)

9.1 There was no other business. The meeting closed at 3:58pm.

Contact Officer: Eleanor Lloyd | Greater London Authority
eleanor.lloyd@london.gov.uk | 020 7983 5633
Overview and mitigation of Impacts of Covid-19

Briefing for Recovery Board
Weekly cases are increasing as lockdown has eased & have tripled since end June

- Over 6,000 new cases/week at April peak
- Down to 300/week by end June
- Steady increase since start July and now over 900 new cases/week
- The highest concentrations of new cases have been in Brent and Hackney
Recent COVID-19 deaths remain low

- Weekly deaths now around **10**
  - down from peak of over **2,000** in April
- Total toll in London – **8,560***
- By location:
  - Hospital - **6,290**
  - Care homes – **1,393**
  - Home – **683**
  - Other – **194**

*Deaths occurring up to 14 August

Source: ONS weekly deaths
After reaching historic low levels between March and April, economic indicators began to recover in May. Some indicators such as PMI Business Activity and PMI New Business reached pre-crisis levels in July.
International economic forecasts and scenarios seem to be leaning towards a longer global recession.

As at August 2020, the balance of economic forecasts and scenarios leaned towards a longer recession. A partial recovery is expected in 2021, with annual GDP growth turning positive.

Risks, however, remain on the downside, with the possibility of a second wave of infections this year or negative impacts resulting from Brexit in January 2021.

Compared to earlier scenarios, assumptions around the control of the virus spread and an effective public-health response have become more pessimistic. Scenarios have generally moved from the top right to the centre right of the matrix. A U-shaped or delayed V-shaped recovery is now seen as more likely than a V-shaped recovery.

Source: GLA Economics analysis based on McKinsey scenarios matrix
The updated BoE reference scenario assumes a less deep but longer recession in the UK than initially projected, with output and employment not returning to pre-crisis levels before 2023.

**Chart 1.1** GDP projection based on market interest rate expectations, other policy measures as announced

**Chart 1.2** Unemployment projection based on market interest rate expectations, other policy measures as announced

Source: BoE – Monetary Policy Report August 2020
The latest macroeconomic scenarios for London by GLA Economics (September 2020) are in line with recent BoE and OBR projections...

Source: GLA Economics estimates
…they point to a less deep but longer recession for London compared to earlier projections, with government support (especially CJRS) pushing most of the employment impacts into 2021.

Source: GLA Economics estimates
Based on GLA Economics estimates, most London sectors will experience historic downturns, especially Accommodation and Food; Arts, Entertainment & Recreation; Education and Construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Real GVA annual growth rate in 2020</th>
<th>Workforce jobs annual growth rate in 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry and fishing</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry and fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and quarrying</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
<td>Mining and quarrying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>-10.6%</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, gas, steam and air-conditioning supply</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
<td>Electricity, gas, steam and air-conditioning supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supply, sewerage and waste management</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>Water supply, sewerage and waste management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>-19.0%</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade, repair of motor vehicles</td>
<td>-14.0%</td>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade, repair of motor vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and storage</td>
<td>-14.2%</td>
<td>Transportation and storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and food service activities</td>
<td>-30.1%</td>
<td>Accommodation and food service activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and communication</td>
<td>-7.8%</td>
<td>Information and communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and insurance activities</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
<td>Financial and insurance activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate activities</td>
<td>-8.5%</td>
<td>Real estate activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific and technical activities</td>
<td>-10.5%</td>
<td>Professional, scientific and technical activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and support service activities</td>
<td>-9.6%</td>
<td>Administrative and support service activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration and defence; compulsory social security</td>
<td>-10.1%</td>
<td>Public administration and defence; compulsory social security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-24.7%</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human health and social work activities</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>Human health and social work activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment and recreation</td>
<td>-25.3%</td>
<td>Arts, entertainment and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other service activities</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>Other service activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities of households</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
<td>Activities of households</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GLA Economics estimates – 'Gradual return to economic growth' Scenario (September 2020)
Surveys continue to indicate a slower housing market recovery in London than in the rest of the country, but despite falling rents many renters are still struggling.

- RICS report that surveyors expect prices to recover more slowly in London than in the rest of the country.
- The number of sale and rental listings added to property portals has however rebounded strongly after lockdown.
- This has led to falling rents for new tenancies, as reported by Homelet, Rightmove and Zoopla.
- Despite falling rents, a quarter of private renters in London say they have either fallen behind on their rent since the outbreak started or expect to fall behind soon.

Data from RICS
Housebuilding has recovered but we have yet to make up for 'lost' completions, while the emergency rough sleeping response is focused on moving people from hotels into sustainable accommodation

**New supply**

- New data shows that the number of new homes completed in London fell from around 3,000 a month before lockdown to around 1,000 a month during April and May, before recovering to its previous level in July. Compared to the pre-lockdown trend there was a loss of around 5,000 completions in London between late March and mid-June.

- Around 3,300 new homes were started on large (20+ homes) market-led schemes in London in Q2 2020, which is below trend but not by as much as expected under the circumstances.

**Rough sleeping**

- Between April and June 2020 outreach teams recorded 2,680 people sleeping rough in London for the first time, a 77% increase from the same period in 2019. Of these, 2,158 (81%) spent just one night sleeping rough, while 39 were subsequently seen enough to be considered living on the streets.

- By contrast, the number of people considered to be living on the streets fell by a third between 2019 and 2020, largely as a result of efforts to get people into Covid-19 emergency accommodation.

- The number of homeless people in emergency hotel accommodation procured by the GLA is now falling as the focus moves to finding them appropriate and sustainable accommodation. As of mid-August there were around 750 people accommodated in hotels, down from a peak of around 1,350 in mid-May.
Employment rate in London continues to be high by historical standards

Headline labour market indicators still do not show the full impact of the crisis:

- In the three months to June 2020, London’s 16-64 employment rate was estimated at 76.5%. This was down by 0.4pp on the previous quarter but up 1.9pp on the year.
- Women made up 41% of the quarterly fall, down 23,600 for women, and 33,500 for men.)
- The unemployment rate in the capital was 4.6% in the three months to June 2020, unchanged on the quarter and on the year. The UK unemployment rate was estimated at 3.9%, also unchanged compared against the previous quarter and the previous year.
- The number of people unemployed in London fell by 4,100, with 8,500 fewer men unemployed but 4,400 more women unemployed.

Source: ONS Labour Force Survey 2020
The employment rate is supported by the furlough scheme - London had a total of 1.39 million furlough employments in August, a 7% increase on July.

- For the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme (CJRS) London had total of 1.39 million furloughed employments and 9.6 million across the UK. Both London and UK had a take up of 32%.

- For London, accommodation and food has the highest take up rate (75%), followed by Arts and entertainment (69%) and Construction (57%).

- There were also a total of 498,000 Londoners on the Self-Employed Income Support Scheme (SEISS) claims in London and 2.5 million for the UK as a whole. Transport and Storage (89%) and Construction (82%) were the sectors with the highest SEISS take up rate for London.

- The number of CJRS claims in the capital, rose by 7% (94,000 furloughed employments) over the course of July. Whereas SEISS claims rose by 12%(14,000) over July.
The number of Londoners claiming Universal Credit rose a further 25,000 between June and July 2020, though the pace of growth has slowed

- 890,000 Londoners were claiming Universal Credit in July 2020, an increase of 461,000 since March 2020, and 25,000 since the previous month.

- The numbers of claimants from every age group under 55 have doubled since March, but tripled among men aged 25-29.

- Most new claimants were searching for work – 330,000 of the 461,000 were searching for work/more work, but 90,000 were new claims for those working but on low earnings*

** Notes: June figures have now been revised and July figures are provisional. "Looking for more work" refers to the working with requirements Universal Credit conditionality regime and "working but on low earnings" refers to the working with no requirements conditionality regime
Civil society organisations are providing more support around job loss, employment and low income

- The proportion of civil society organisations reporting an increase in the number of people seeking support increased in July and August.
- Organisations are reporting more clients seeking support on the loss of jobs, lack of employment opportunities and low income.
- The biggest issue facing civil society organisations themselves continues to be sustainable funding. Other pertinent issues are planning and delivering services as lockdown is eased.

Source: GLA (2020) London Community Response Survey
16 per cent of Londoners received a charity food delivery in July and 24 per cent cut down/skipped meals. Delayed benefit payments are the main reason for food deliveries.

- In July, around one in six (16 per cent) of Londoners have had food delivered to their house through a food charity or food bank in the last month vs. 9 per cent nationally.

- Of these Londoners, 34 per cent said it was because there was a delay or problems with benefits payments, and 31 per cent because someone in the household had lost their job.

- In July, around a quarter (24 per cent) of Londoners aged 16-75 reported they had cut down on the size of meals or skipped meals in the last month because they did not have enough money to buy food vs. 16 per cent nationally.

Proportion who cut down the size of their meals or skipped meals in the last month because they did not have enough money to buy food

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No, never</th>
<th>DK/PNS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All adults aged 16-75 in England, Wales and Northern Ireland: 2,068; London: 305
The proportion of Londoners who have fallen behind with their household bills has increased during Covid-19

- Eleven per cent of 16+ Londoners were behind with some or all of their other household bills in May 2020 (compared to around 7 per cent in 2017-19)
- Eight per cent of 16+ Londoners were not up to date with their rent or mortgage in May 2020
- Ten per cent of 16+ Londoners living in rented accommodation had a rent holiday during May 2020
- Ten per cent of 16+ Londoners with a mortgage applied for a mortgage holiday since the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic
- Five per cent of 16+ Londoners had applied for a credit holiday on consumer credit between March and May 2020

Proportion behind with some/all household bills (16+ Londoners, May 2020)

The proportion of Londoners who have poorer mental health has increased during Covid-19

- The General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12) helps to identify minor psychiatric disorders in the general population.
- In June 2020, around three in ten (30 per cent) 16+ Londoners reported a GHQ-12 score of 4 or more, indicative of poorer mental health, an increase of 11 percentage points compared with the pre-pandemic estimate in 2017-19 of 19 per cent.
- Younger Londoners aged 16-29 were more likely to report a high GHQ-12 score, compared with older age groups.
- Londoners not living with a partner were more likely than those living with a partner to report a high score.
- Female Londoners were more likely than male Londoners to report a high score.

London has seen a slight increase in the population with full ‘Essential Digital Skills for Life’, but 18% lack these and 4% are offline

- In London the proportion of people with full Essential Digital Skills (EDS) for Life has increased from 78 per cent in 2019 to 82 per cent in 2020
- The proportion of people who are offline has fallen to 4%
- Londoners are more likely to be online and have full digital skills than the UK average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of people who are offline</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of people who have the Foundation Skill</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of people with full Essential Digital Skills for Life</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: fieldwork was conducted in January 2019 and 2020 and included those aged 15+ years in Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

* Measured by the annual Lloyds Bank ‘UK Consumer Digital Index’
Female Londoners within couples with children have taken on the majority of domestic tasks compared with male Londoners within couples

• In June 2020, around half (51 per cent) of 16+ female Londoners in a couple with children reported that they are mainly responsible for looking after their children. This compares with four per cent of male Londoners.

• Around half (54 per cent) of 16+ female Londoners in a couple with children reported that they are mainly responsible for home schooling their children. This compares with eight per cent of male Londoners in a couple.

• Twice as many female Londoners in a couple than male Londoners regard the way additional housework and caring responsibilities are shared these days as somewhat or not at all fair (24 per cent and 12 per cent respectively).

Total crime has returned to pre-Covid-19 levels, but domestic abuse, and hate crime are still higher. Racist and Religious hate crime reached record levels in June 2020.
Overall mobility is increasing, with a marked increase in visits to restaurants and social venues in August (Eat Out to Help Out)
The ‘donut effect’ of reduced travel to central London is evident, and intention to visit is low.

- Just a quarter of Londoners say they are likely to go to central London in the next week (24%) (GLA/YouGov survey)

Source: aggregated and anonymised O2 data, Tfl Travel in London Update, August 2020
Face covering usage has plateaued at 87% after a steady increase over the last month. This takes the London’s facemask usage rate to near the top of the international comparison. Usage in the UK generally has increased significantly since the start of July, doubling from around 36% - but has also plateaued in August.

Source: GLA/GovGov surveys, multiple dates for London results. YouGov International COVID-19 tracker for international results. Note question wording slightly different, results show % who say they are wearing a face mask when in public places.
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1 Executive summary

1.1 This paper updates the Board on the extensive public, community and stakeholder engagement process undertaken on London’s recovery since its last meeting. At the 15 September 2020 Board meeting officers will present the findings of the first phase of the recovery engagement exercise, outline how this has been used in the refinement of the missions and seek feedback from the Board on how the findings may impact the content and delivery of the missions, as well as the wider recovery programme.

2 Recommendations

2.1 That the Board:

a) notes the report and the further information to be presented at the meeting; and

b) considers and discusses how the findings of the engagement exercise may impact the individual recovery missions and wider recovery programme.

3 Introduction and objectives

3.1 At its first meeting the Board agreed that the engagement, involvement and inclusion of citizens should be at the heart of London’s social and economic recovery. It is crucial that all Londoners can influence, shape and participate fully in our capital’s recovery from Covid-19.

3.2 The last Board meeting on 28 July endorsed an approach to engagement that set out to involve as wide a range of Londoners as possible in the conversation on London’s recovery, especially those from communities most severely impacted by Covid-19.

3.3 This would be achieved by engaging Londoners in a variety of ways to ensure all key demographics are engaged.
4 **London recovery engagement process**

4.1 The recovery engagement process has spanned: public engagement on the Talk London online platform; focus groups and opinion polling; community engagement; borough-led engagement; surveys of the business community and other sector-specific stakeholder engagement.

4.2 Over the course of three weeks, over 1,100 submissions on the draft mission areas were made on the Talk London conversation platform. The Talk London website itself got over 68,000 site visits, and over 40% of commenters had already engaged with previous discussions on recovery on Talk London.

4.3 Over 60 organisations attended “community conversations” sessions, with 26 grants made to community organisations to be able to run forums for discussions with their members.

4.4 Before the 15 September Board meeting, all of these insights are being brought together in a “sense-making” process, to pull out key themes and insights gleaned from the public, communities and other stakeholders. This will be presented to policy leads who will be able to further refine their thinking around the mission areas before presentation of the missions to the Board.

5 **Key risks and issues**

5.1 The primary risk during the engagement process was the short lead-up time to being able to carry it out, as well as having to do so over August when typically many stakeholders are away. Despite this challenge, we received the most engagement on Talk London for any discussion since its inception. We were also able to cover a number of diverse community organisations as well as stakeholders from every relevant sector.

6 **Equality comments**

6.1 Grants of up to £500 were made available to community organisations that work with the least heard and most disadvantaged Londoners, for them to carry out conversations on recovery and feed those back to the GLA. Twenty-six organisations were awarded these grants, with over 60 community organisations attending GLA-led community conversations.

6.2 Our polling and opinion research took into account all demographics of Londoners, to ensure we captured an accurate picture of public sentiment.

**Appendices:**

None
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1 Executive summary

1.1 This paper updates the Board on the work undertaken since its last meeting to refine and develop the draft recovery missions. At the 15 September 2020 Board meeting, the social and economic workstrand leads will present proposed final missions for the Board’s feedback, amendment and endorsement.

2 Recommendations

2.1 That the Board:
   a) notes the report and the social and economic recovery missions presented at the meeting;
   b) discusses and provides feedback on each proposed final mission, including modifications where needed;
   c) taking into account the discussion, endorses final missions against which teams can begin to explore options for delivery; and
   d) considers how members’ own organisations can contribute to the fulfilment of the missions.

3 Introduction and background

3.1 One overarching grand challenge has been identified for the recovery programme: **Restore confidence in the city, minimise the impact on London’s most vulnerable communities and rebuild the city’s economy and society.** The Board has agreed that meeting this grand challenge will require focusing on achieving the following outcomes:

- Reverse the pattern of rising unemployment and lost economic growth caused by the economic scarring of Covid-19.
- Support our communities, including those most impacted by the virus.
• Help young people to flourish with access to support and opportunities.
• Narrow social, economic and health inequalities.
• Deliver a cleaner, greener London.

3.2 The Board also agreed to work with these principles in mind:
• Recognising and addressing structural inequalities, promoting a fairer, more inclusive London and focusing on supporting the most vulnerable.
• Prioritising sustainability, mitigating climate change and improving the resilience of our city.
• Improving the health and wellbeing of all Londoners.
• Collaborating with and involving London’s diverse communities.
• Innovating and using digital technology and data to meet emerging needs.
• Ensuring affordability of measures and providing value for money.

3.3 At its last meeting on 28 July 2020, the Board was informed of the London Recovery Taskforce’s proposal to take a missions-based approach to attempting to meet the grand challenge and recovery outcomes. This approach is based on the work of the Institute for Innovation and Public Purpose at University College London.

3.4 The Board reviewed a draft set of missions in eight specific areas. The emerging proposals were endorsed, but it was also agreed that prioritisation and refinement was needed to develop a coherent and realistic set of missions that could be easily understood, were clearly and directly linked to Covid-19 and could be translated into a deliverable work programme. A need for refinement was also one of the early findings of the public engagement process.

4 Objectives and expected outcomes

4.1 The Taskforce and social and economic workstrands have worked on developing a refined set of missions to meet the grand challenge. These missions are time-bound and specific. It should be clear whether or not the mission has been achieved by a certain point.

4.2 The aim is to design missions that are bold, ambitious and realistic enough that they can gather wide support for delivery. Missions are not designed to solve all the problems facing a certain sector or to encompass all existing GLA or London Councils work in a given policy area. The missions should be initiatives that are additional to work that is currently happening or provide a real ‘shot in the arm’ for work that partner organisations are trying to collaborate on. These sorts of initiatives should lend themselves well to city-wide collaboration across different sectors.

4.3 Part of the missions-based approach is being honest that we cannot do everything and are choosing to focus on a few key areas where our interventions can have maximum impact. Missions may change and adapt in response to emerging evidence and issues. Similarly, new missions may be developed when and where appropriate.
5 Missions refinement process

5.1 Since the last Board meeting, the process of refining the missions has included a series of workshops and challenge sessions featuring mission leads and senior staff from the GLA and London Councils. Board members have also been engaged where appropriate.

5.2 The public and community engagement process has also fed into the refinement of the missions, with teams consulting the Talk London discussion boards on an almost daily basis.

5.3 On 3 September the missions were reviewed by the Taskforce, including ensuring that missions reflect the cross-cutting principles identified by the Board. The feedback from the Taskforce is being acted on at the time of writing.

6 Key risks and issues

6.1 The key issue is ensuring that the missions are focused on the areas that can deliver the greatest impact in terms of meeting the grand challenge set out by the Board. The significant risks include taking on missions that are not sufficiently defined and end up contributing little towards meeting the grand challenge. The buy-in of the public and wider stakeholders is also key to consider.

6.2 Ensuring that stakeholder and public engagement has been thorough and that it feeds into the missions refinement process is the most important route to mitigating these risks.

7 Equality comments

7.1 The grand challenge, outcomes and cross-cutting principles identified by the Board ensure that equalities concerns are central to the work of the recovery programme. There are Taskforce members who have been appointed with the specific brief to challenge the work of the programme in line with equalities duties at every possible opportunity.

8 Financial comments

8.1 Work is underway to explore mechanisms to fund the activity of the recovery programme and wherever possible partners will be sought to help in the delivery of recovery activity so that the responsibility for identifying funding streams does not solely lie with GLA and London Councils.

9 Next steps

9.1 The next steps are summarised below:

- Consider the presentation of the engagement process and what implications this might have for mission design.
- Agree the missions subject to any edits that are needed.
• Board members are encouraged to consider how their own organisations can contribute to the fulfilment of the missions.
• An update on mission delivery plans will be brought to the next Board meeting.
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