

# MINUTES

**Meeting: London Assembly (Plenary)**  
**Date: Wednesday 15 January 2014**  
**Time: 10.00 am**  
**Place: Chamber, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA**

Copies of the minutes may be found at: <http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/whole-assembly>

**Present:**

|                               |                          |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Darren Johnson AM (Chair)     | Jenny Jones AM           |
| Roger Evans AM (Deputy Chair) | Stephen Knight AM        |
| Tony Arbour AM                | Kit Malthouse AM         |
| Jennette Arnold OBE AM        | Joanne McCartney AM      |
| Gareth Bacon AM               | Steve O'Connell AM       |
| John Biggs AM                 | Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM  |
| Andrew Boff AM                | Murad Qureshi AM         |
| James Cleverly AM             | Dr Onkar Sahota AM       |
| Tom Copley AM                 | Valerie Shawcross CBE AM |
| Andrew Dismore AM             | Richard Tracey AM        |
| Len Duvall AM                 | Fiona Twycross AM        |
| Nicky Gavron AM               |                          |

## **1 Apologies for Absence and Chair's Announcements (Item 1)**

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Victoria Borwick AM and Navin Shah AM.
- 1.2 The Chair placed on record the Assembly's congratulations to those who had received Honours in the New Year's Honours list, in particular those Londoners and GLA Group colleagues who had received honours.

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

- 2.1 The Assembly received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.
- 2.2 **Resolved:**
- (a) That the list of Assembly Members' offices, as set out in the table at Agenda Item 2, be noted as disclosable pecuniary interests; and**
  - (b) That Tom Copley AM's declarations of gifts and hospitality, namely that he had attended a lunch hosted by the Westminster Property Association and had received two tickets for a play, be noted as non-pecuniary interests.**

## **3 Minutes (Item 3)**

- 3.1 **Resolved:**
- That the minutes of the London Assembly (Plenary) meeting held on 4 December 2013 and the London Assembly (Mayor's Question Time) meeting held on 18 December 2013 be signed by the Chair as correct records.**

## **4 Question and Answer Session - London Legacy Development Corporation (Item 4)**

### **Part A:**

- 4.1 The Assembly put question to: Boris Johnson, Mayor of London in his capacity as Chairman of the London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC); Neale Coleman CBE, Deputy Chairman of the LLDC and the Mayor's Adviser on Olympic and Paralympic Legacy; and Dennis Hone CBE, Chief Executive, LLDC, on the policies and work of the LLDC.
- 4.2 The record of the questions put by Assembly Members and the answers are set out at **Appendix 1** and the answers to the written questions are set out at **Appendix 2**.

**Part B:**

4.3 The Chair formally moved the motion on the agenda, namely:

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

4.4 **Resolved:**

**The answers to the questions asked be noted.**

**5 Question and Answer Session - CLG (Select) Committee Report on the London Assembly (Item 5)**

5.1 The Assembly received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat as background to putting questions to Clive Betts MP, Chair, House of Commons’ Communities and Local Government (CLG) (Select) Committee, on its report *Post-legislative scrutiny of the Greater London Authority Act 2007 and the London Assembly*.

5.2 Clive Betts MP made a short opening statement.

5.3 During the course of the subsequent discussion, Mr Betts stated that the London Assembly would be welcome to write to the Communities and Local Government Select Committee with its comments on the report *Post-legislative scrutiny of the Greater London Authority Act 2007 and the London Assembly* and to raise any further issues for consideration as it deemed necessary.

5.4 The record of the questions put by Assembly Members and the answers given is attached at **Appendix 3**.

5.5 **Resolved:**

**That the discussion, and the CLG (Select) Committee report *Post-legislative scrutiny of the Greater London Authority Act 2007 and the London Assembly*, be noted.**

5.6 The Chair agreed, in accordance with section 100(B)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), to admit a motion as an item of urgent business, in order that the issues set out in the motion could be discussed by the London Assembly at this meeting, which was the most appropriate one to do so.

5.7 In accordance with Standing Order 3.12, the Chair asked the Assembly to decide whether to permit consideration of the motion in his name.

**Greater London Authority  
London Assembly (Plenary)  
Wednesday 15 January 2014**

5.8 Upon being put to vote, the Assembly agreed to consider the urgent motion in the name of the Chair.

5.9 The Chair moved, and the Deputy Chairman seconded, the following motion:

“That this Assembly:

- A. Broadly welcomes the Fourth Report of the House of Commons’ Communities and Local Government Select Committee on the Greater London Authority Act 2007 and the London Assembly and looks forward to further public debate and proposals for the enhancement of London government’s powers and responsibilities; and
- B. Agrees that:
  - i. As stated by the Select Committee, the Mayor has to be held to account for the substantial powers he or she exercises and that an Assembly composed of Members able to focus on the same issues as the Mayor is the correct vehicle and that the corollary of a ‘strong’ Mayor must be a scrutiny body located at the same, in this case London-wide, level;
  - ii. A balance therefore has to be maintained between a strong Mayor who is able to implement his or her manifesto commitments and an Assembly with the potential to make the Mayor rethink any ill-considered decisions. As such, the Assembly should be provided with additional powers, such as those set out below, to ensure both that a Mayor is generally always able to govern effectively but also that genuinely problematic proposals have a realistic chance of being capable of amendment by the Assembly or further consideration;
  - iii. As stated by the Select Committee, the duty upon the Mayor to publish a forward plan of key decisions and the power for the Assembly to then be able to call-in mayoral decisions before they are implemented would simply make the Assembly’s powers consistent with those of local councils that have directly elected mayors. This power represents an important means of scrutiny but one that should and probably would be used sparingly. The Assembly would be willing to consider options under which this power would be applied only to agreed categories of mayoral decisions (noting, for example, that it already has powers to amend the annual revenue budget proposals and to reject draft strategies). The Assembly is of the view that being provided with a power to call-in certain mayoral decisions would ‘improve the overall efficiency of GLA decision making, and to ensure full scrutiny of important decisions before they are implemented’;
  - iv. As stated by the Select Committee, the Assembly should, in order to be able to exercise effective scrutiny oversight of an area of mayoral responsibility that has grown significantly in recent years without a commensurate increase in associated Assembly

**Greater London Authority  
London Assembly (Plenary)  
Wednesday 15 January 2014**

powers, be able to amend the Mayor's capital spending proposals, as it can his current spending, as well as prudential borrowing limits and grants and transfers among the GLA and functional bodies. This would enable the Assembly to exert a formal influence over significant capital spending on housing and key transport infrastructure projects such as the Underground and Crossrail as well as the Mayor's revenue budget. It would provide a sanction in the event of a Mayor proposing irresponsible or unaffordable prudential borrowing or capital spending plans;

- v. As stated by the Select Committee, the Government's response to the report of the London Finance Commission on the Mayor's tax and spending powers should include a review of the tools available to the Assembly to hold the Mayor to account. The review should include an assessment of additional and separate resources and expertise to enhance the Assembly's financial scrutiny role;
- vi. As stated by the Select Committee, the Assembly should be granted the power to reject the Mayor's Police and Crime Plan on the same basis that it can all other mayoral statutory strategies;
- vii. In order to ensure that the office of the statutory Deputy Mayor of London continues to be filled by persons who have been elected to office (noting the potential powers that this office-holder could exercise in certain circumstances) and in order to ensure that some of the other persons (noting the increased scope of mayoral powers in recent times) within the executive arm of the GLA Group have been elected to office the Assembly agrees that its Members should continue to be able to serve concurrently as Assembly Members and/or, following a decision by the Mayor, on the boards of the bodies within the GLA Group in order to provide a complementary balance to those who have been appointed as officials by the Mayor;
- viii. In order to ensure that the perspectives of the public can be represented in decisions and debates at board level, all boards appointed by the Mayor should include elected representatives;
- ix. The Assembly should have the ability to decide to convene a non-binding Confirmation Hearing with the Mayor's nominee for the office of statutory Deputy Mayor of London (as is the case for when the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime is a Member of the London Assembly) but, for the reasons given above, the Member appointed to this office should not be required to resign from the London Assembly upon appointment;
- x. The Assembly should have the power to summons the Mayor, all his or her board appointees and people and information from organisations outside the GLA Group [*other than the MPS*] that have a significant role in delivering or facilitating mayoral strategies and related policies and services; and

**Greater London Authority  
London Assembly (Plenary)  
Wednesday 15 January 2014**

- xi. Noting the use of the Mayor’s statutory power of direction over the Fire Authority in 2013, a review of future governance arrangements for the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority should be undertaken by the Government, with the GLA, LFEPA and London Councils playing a lead role in any such process.”

5.10 Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM proposed and the following amendment was seconded to paragraph B(x) of the proposed motion:

“The Assembly should have the power to summons the Mayor, all his or her board appointees and people and information from organisations outside the GLA Group [~~other than the MPS~~] that have a significant role in delivering or facilitating mayoral strategies and related policies and services;”.

5.11 In accordance with Standing Order 2.6A(2) and with the consent of the seconder and the meeting, the Chair indicated that he would accept the amendment. The debate therefore proceeded on the basis of the revised motion.

5.12 Upon being put to the vote, the revised motion in the name of Darren Johnson AM (Chair), namely:

**“That this Assembly:**

- A. Broadly welcomes the Fourth Report of the House of Commons’ Communities and Local Government Select Committee on the Greater London Authority Act 2007 and the London Assembly and looks forward to further public debate and proposals for the enhancement of London government’s powers and responsibilities; and**
- B. Agrees that:**
  - i. As stated by the Select Committee, the Mayor has to be held to account for the substantial powers he or she exercises and that an Assembly composed of Members able to focus on the same issues as the Mayor is the correct vehicle and that the corollary of a ‘strong’ Mayor must be a scrutiny body located at the same, in this case London-wide, level;**
  - ii. A balance therefore has to be maintained between a strong Mayor who is able to implement his or her manifesto commitments and an Assembly with the potential to make the Mayor rethink any ill-considered decisions. As such, the Assembly should be provided with additional powers, such as those set out below, to ensure both that a Mayor is generally always able to govern effectively but also that genuinely problematic proposals have a realistic**

chance of being capable of amendment by the Assembly or further consideration;

- iii. **As stated by the Select Committee, the duty upon the Mayor to publish a forward plan of key decisions and the power for the Assembly to then be able to call-in mayoral decisions before they are implemented would simply make the Assembly's powers consistent with those of local councils that have directly elected mayors. This power represents an important means of scrutiny but one that should and probably would be used sparingly. The Assembly would be willing to consider options under which this power would be applied only to agreed categories of mayoral decisions (noting, for example, that it already has powers to amend the annual revenue budget proposals and to reject draft strategies). The Assembly is of the view that being provided with a power to call-in certain mayoral decisions would 'improve the overall efficiency of GLA decision making, and to ensure full scrutiny of important decisions before they are implemented';**
- iv. **As stated by the Select Committee, the Assembly should, in order to be able to exercise effective scrutiny oversight of an area of mayoral responsibility that has grown significantly in recent years without a commensurate increase in associated Assembly powers, be able to amend the Mayor's capital spending proposals, as it can his current spending, as well as prudential borrowing limits and grants and transfers among the GLA and functional bodies. This would enable the Assembly to exert a formal influence over significant capital spending on housing and key transport infrastructure projects such as the Underground and Crossrail as well as the Mayor's revenue budget. It would provide a sanction in the event of a Mayor proposing irresponsible or unaffordable prudential borrowing or capital spending plans;**
- v. **As stated by the Select Committee, the Government's response to the report of the London Finance Commission on the Mayor's tax and spending powers should include a review of the tools available to the Assembly to hold the Mayor to account. The review should include an assessment of additional and separate resources and expertise to enhance the Assembly's financial scrutiny role;**
- vi. **As stated by the Select Committee, the Assembly should be granted the power to reject the Mayor's Police and Crime Plan on the same basis that it can all other mayoral statutory strategies;**
- vii. **In order to ensure that the office of the statutory Deputy Mayor of London continues to be filled by persons who have been elected to office (noting the potential powers that this office-holder could exercise in certain**

**circumstances) and in order to ensure that some of the other persons (noting the increased scope of mayoral powers in recent times) within the executive arm of the GLA Group have been elected to office the Assembly agrees that its Members should continue to be able to serve concurrently as Assembly Members and/or, following a decision by the Mayor, on the boards of the bodies within the GLA Group in order to provide a complementary balance to those who have been appointed as officials by the Mayor;**

- viii. In order to ensure that the perspectives of the public can be represented in decisions and debates at board level, all boards appointed by the Mayor should include elected representatives;**
- ix. The Assembly should have the ability to decide to convene a non-binding Confirmation Hearing with the Mayor's nominee for the office of statutory Deputy Mayor of London (as is the case for when the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime is a Member of the London Assembly) but, for the reasons given above, the Member appointed to this office should not be required to resign from the London Assembly upon appointment;**
- x. The Assembly should have the power to summons the Mayor, all his or her board appointees and people and information from organisations outside the GLA Group that have a significant role in delivering or facilitating mayoral strategies and related policies and services; and**
- xi. Noting the use of the Mayor's statutory power of direction over the Fire Authority in 2013, a review of future governance arrangements for the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority should be undertaken by the Government, with the GLA, LFEPA and London Councils playing a lead role in any such process."**

was unanimously agreed.

- 5.13 The Chair stated that, in accordance with section 100(B)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), he had agreed to admit a motion in the name of Andrew Dismore AM as an item of urgent business, as this meeting was the most appropriate meeting to consider the motion.
- 5.14 In accordance with Standing Order 3.12B(1), the Chair invited Andrew Dismore AM to make an oral statement of up to one minute in length as to why the Assembly should consider the motion, which he duly did.
- 5.15 In accordance with Standing Order 3.12, the Chair then invited the Assembly to decide whether to permit consideration of the motion in the name of Andrew Dismore AM. Upon



being put to vote, the Assembly agreed to consider the urgent motion in the name of Andrew Dismore AM.

5.16 Andrew Dismore AM moved and Tom Copley AM seconded the following motion:

“This Assembly believes that a balance has to be maintained between a strong Mayor who is able to implement his or her manifesto and an Assembly with the potential to make the Mayor rethink any ill-considered decisions.

However, the current requirement for there to be a two-thirds majority in the Assembly in favour of revising or rejecting key decisions by the Mayor has meant that this vital check-and-balance power provided to the Assembly has never been exercised.

The London Assembly therefore believes that a 60% threshold – replacing the current requirement of a two-thirds majority – for revising or rejecting key decisions by the Mayor, including the Mayor’s budget and statutory strategies, should be provided for within statute at the earliest opportunity.”

5.17 At 12.30 p.m. in accordance with Standing Order 2.9(A) and with general consensus, the Assembly agreed to extend the length of the meeting in order to complete the business set out on the agenda for the meeting.

5.18 Upon being put to the vote, the motion in the name of Andrew Dismore AM, namely:

**“This Assembly believes that a balance has to be maintained between a strong Mayor who is able to implement his or her manifesto and an Assembly with the potential to make the Mayor rethink any ill-considered decisions.**

**However, the current requirement for there to be a two-thirds majority in the Assembly in favour of revising or rejecting key decisions by the Mayor has meant that this vital check-and-balance power provided to the Assembly has never been exercised.**

**The London Assembly therefore believes that a 60% threshold – replacing the current requirement of a two-thirds majority – for revising or rejecting key decisions by the Mayor, including the Mayor’s budget and statutory strategies, should be provided for within statute at the earliest opportunity.”**

was agreed (with 15 votes cast in favour and 8 against).

5.19 The Chair proposed and it was:

5.20 **Resolved:**

**That the London Assembly's further submission to the Communities and Local Government (Select) Committee present both of the above motions in a single document (making clear which elements had been agreed either unanimously or by a majority), together with all relevant background information, including the transcript of the discussion on the Communities and Local Government (Select) Committee's report *Post-legislative scrutiny of the Greater London Authority Act 29007 and the London Assembly*.**

## **6 Future Plenary Meetings (Item 6)**

### **6.1 Resolved:**

**That an additional Plenary meeting of the London Assembly be held (if necessary to do so) on 2 April 2014 at 10.00am to consider the Mayor's draft Housing Strategy, subject to the publication of that strategy in mid-March 2014.**

## **7 Mayoral Commitments (Item 7)**

7.1 The Assembly received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

### **7.2 Resolved:**

**That the commitments made by the Mayor, Boris Johnson, during London Assembly Mayor's Question Time meetings held between January 2013 and December 2013 be noted.**

## **8 Action Taken by the Chair Under Delegated Authority (Item 8)**

8.1 The Assembly received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

### **8.2 Resolved:**

**That the recent action taken by the Chair of the London Assembly, Darren Johnson AM, in accordance with the authority delegated to him, namely to agree that the joint letter (attached to the report to the London Assembly) signed by the Mayor of London, Chair of the Assembly and the Chair of London Councils, sent to The Rt Hon Francis Maude MP, Minister for the Cabinet Office and Paymaster General, to provide a summary response to the *ONS Beyond 2011 Consultation* be noted.**

## **9 Petitions (Item 9)**

9.1 The Assembly received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

9.2 Murad Qureshi AM presented a petition with the following prayer:

“We residents and workers of London petition Transport for London and the City to install pedestrian traffic lights at the junction of Charterhouse Street and the A201 Farringdon Road / Farringdon Street. This junction lies on a major East - West pedestrian route. Pedestrians are crossing here at all times of day, but the lack of a pedestrian phase in the existing traffic lights means that the junction becomes dangerous for all road users.”

9.3 **Resolved:**

**That the petition be forwarded to the Mayor of London, as Chairman of Transport for London, and the Town Clerk and Chief Executive of the City of London Corporation for responses.**

9.4 Steve O’Connell AM presented a petition with the following prayer:

“We the undersigned call on the London Mayor, Boris Johnson, to include Worcester Park as a station stop on the planned Cross Rail 2 line. Worcester Park is an important and growing retail, residential, business and transport hub in outer South West London and a stop at Worcester Park would also form part of a strategic transport link with the proposed Sutton Tram. The current plan to run trains express through Worcester Park without stopping is a missed opportunity.”

9.5 **Resolved:**

**That the petition be forwarded to the Mayor of London for a response.**

## **10 Petition Update (Item 10)**

10.1 The Assembly received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

10.2 **Resolved:**

**That the responses received to petitions presented at recent London Assembly (Plenary) meetings be noted.**

## **11 Motions (Item 11)**

11.1 The Assembly received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

- 11.2 Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM moved, and Valerie Shawcross CBE AM seconded, the following motion:

“This Assembly notes the interim report published by Sir Howard Davies’ Airports Commission and the options proposed for expanding Heathrow and Gatwick. The Assembly also notes that the Estuary Airport options have not made the shortlist, though more work will be done before a final decision on shortlisting is made in the New Year.

The Assembly recalls its recent Transport Committee report “Airport Capacity in London” which ruled out expansion of Heathrow and identified significant spare capacity at other airports in the South East.

The Assembly reaffirms its opposition to Heathrow expansion and calls on the Airports Commission to rethink its approach targeting the use of spare capacity at airports serving the South East.”

- 11.3 The following amendment to the motion was moved by Valerie Shawcross CBE AM and Len Duvall AM:

“This Assembly notes the interim report published by Sir Howard Davies’ Airports Commission and the options proposed for expanding Heathrow and Gatwick. The Assembly also notes that the Estuary Airport options have not made the shortlist, though more work will be done before a final decision on shortlisting is made in the New Year.

***In particular, we welcome Sir Howard Davies’ recommendations on increasing surface access at our existing airports and we note that a number of projects are now contained within the National Infrastructure Plan, namely:***

- ***committing £50 million towards a full redevelopment of the railway station at Gatwick;***
- ***setting up a new study into southern rail access to Heathrow;***
- ***accelerating a Network Rail study into the Brighton Mainline;***
- ***extending the scope of the East Anglian Mainline study to include access to Stansted;***
- ***including the Gatwick to London route on a planned trial of smart ticketing; and***
- ***Including access to Gatwick in the Highways Agency study on local motorways.***

The London Assembly also urges the Mayor to support Sir Howard Davies’ recommendation of the establishment of an independent noise regulator for London.

The Assembly recalls its recent Transport Committee report “Airport Capacity in London” which ruled out expansion of Heathrow and identified significant spare capacity at other airports in the South East.

The Assembly reaffirms its opposition to Heathrow expansion *plans* and calls on the Airports Commission to rethink its approach targeting the use of spare capacity at airports serving the South East.”

11.4 In accordance with Standing Order 2.6A(2) and with the consent of the seconder and the meeting, Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM indicated that she would accept the amendment. The debate therefore proceeded on the basis of the revised motion.

11.5 The following amendment to the revised motion was moved by Tony Arbour AM and seconded by Richard Tracey AM:

“This Assembly notes the interim report published by Sir Howard Davies’ Airports Commission and the options proposed for expanding Heathrow and Gatwick. The Assembly also notes that the Estuary Airport options have not made the shortlist, though more work will be done before a final decision on shortlisting is made in the New Year.

In particular, we welcome Sir Howard Davies’ recommendations on increasing surface access at our existing airports and we note that a number of projects are now contained within the National Infrastructure Plan, namely:

- committing £50 million towards a full redevelopment of the railway station at Gatwick;
- setting up a new study into southern rail access to Heathrow;
- accelerating a Network Rail study into the Brighton Mainline;
- extending the scope of the East Anglian Mainline study to include access to Stansted;
- including the Gatwick to London route on a planned trial of smart ticketing; and
- Including access to Gatwick in the Highways Agency study on local motorways.

The London Assembly also urges the Mayor to support Sir Howard Davies’ recommendation of the establishment of an independent noise regulator for London.

The Assembly recalls its recent Transport Committee report “Airport Capacity in London” which ruled out expansion of Heathrow and identified significant spare capacity at other airports in the South East.

The Assembly ~~reaffirms its opposition to Heathrow expansion plans and calls on the Airports Commission to rethink its approach targeting the use of spare capacity at airports serving the South East~~ ***categorically states its opposition to any additional flights from Heathrow***”.

11.6 Upon being put to the vote the amendment in the name of Tony Arbour AM was lost (with 9 votes cast in favour and 11 against).

11.7 Upon being put to the vote, the revised motion in the name of Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, namely:

**“This Assembly notes the interim report published by Sir Howard Davies’ Airports Commission and the options proposed for expanding Heathrow and Gatwick. The Assembly also notes that the Estuary Airport options have not made the shortlist, though more work will be done before a final decision on shortlisting is made in the New Year.**

**In particular, we welcome Sir Howard Davies’ recommendations on increasing surface access at our existing airports and we note that a number of projects are now contained within the National Infrastructure Plan, namely:**

- **committing £50 million towards a full redevelopment of the railway station at Gatwick;**
- **setting up a new study into southern rail access to Heathrow;**
- **accelerating a Network Rail study into the Brighton Mainline;**
- **extending the scope of the East Anglian Mainline study to include access to Stansted;**
- **including the Gatwick to London route on a planned trial of smart ticketing; and**
- **Including access to Gatwick in the Highways Agency study on local motorways.**

**The London Assembly also urges the Mayor to support Sir Howard Davies’ recommendation of the establishment of an independent noise regulator for London.**

**The Assembly recalls its recent Transport Committee report “Airport Capacity in London” which ruled out expansion of Heathrow and identified significant spare capacity at other airports in the South East.**

**The Assembly reaffirms its opposition to Heathrow expansion plans and calls on the Airports Commission to rethink its approach targeting the use of spare capacity at airports serving the South East.”**

was agreed (with 13 votes cast in favour and 7 against).

11.8 At this point in the proceedings, Roger Evans AM, Deputy Chairman, took the Chair.

11.9 Darren Johnson AM moved and Valerie Shawcross AM seconded the following motion:

“This Assembly notes recent evidence from University College London, which revealed that 76% of men and 85% of women over the age of 65 have a walking speed which is slower than the 1.2 metres per second assumed by Transport for London when setting the timings on pedestrian crossings. On an average road width, applying a slower walking speed of 0.8 metres per second would increase the pedestrian crossing time by around three seconds, enabling older Londoners to safely cross the road.

This Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor of London, as Chair of Transport for London, and Transport for London to:

- amend guidance for pedestrian crossing timings to assume a walking speed of 0.8 metres per second,
- immediately start trialling extended crossing times at specific times of the day at TfL controlled crossings, and
- bring forward plans to ensure all TfL controlled crossings at least meet the DfT minimum standard relating to blind and partially sighted people, so that they are able to safely cross TfL roads.”

11.10 Upon being put to the vote, the motion in the name of Darren Johnson AM, namely:

**“This Assembly notes recent evidence from University College London, which revealed that 76% of men and 85% of women over the age of 65 have a walking speed which is slower than the 1.2 metres per second assumed by Transport for London when setting the timings on pedestrian crossings. On an average road width, applying a slower walking speed of 0.8 metres per second would increase the pedestrian crossing time by around three seconds, enabling older Londoners to safely cross the road.**

**This Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor of London, as Chair of Transport for London, and Transport for London to:**

- **amend guidance for pedestrian crossing timings to assume a walking speed of 0.8 metres per second,**
- **immediately start trialling extended crossing times at specific times of the day at TfL controlled crossings, and**
- **bring forward plans to ensure all TfL controlled crossings at least meet the DfT minimum standard relating to blind and partially sighted people, so that they are able to safely cross TfL roads.”**

was agreed (13 votes cast in favour and 7 against).

**Greater London Authority  
London Assembly (Plenary)  
Wednesday 15 January 2014**

11.11 The Chair then resumed presiding over the meeting.

11.12 Jenny Jones AM moved, and Joanne McCartney AM seconded, the following motion:

“This Assembly welcomes the commitment by the Government to ban the use of animals to test household products, and supports Cruelty Free International in its campaigning to end such testing.

This Assembly calls on the Greater London Authority, the Metropolitan Police Service, the London Fire Brigade and Transport for London to only purchase cleaning products which have been certified by Cruelty Free International as not tested on animals under the Humane Standards for use in all buildings for which they are directly responsible for cleaning. Where cleaning is conducted on their behalf by an outside contractor, this condition should be added to the next tender specification when it is published.”

11.13 The following amendment to the motion was moved by Andrew Boff AM and seconded by Steve O’Connell AM:

“This Assembly welcomes the commitment by the Government to ban the use of animals to test household products, and supports Cruelty Free International in its campaigning to end such testing.

This Assembly calls on the Greater London Authority, the Metropolitan Police Service, the London Fire Brigade and Transport for London to purchase cleaning products, *where suitable products are available and subject to best value considerations*, which have been certified by Cruelty Free International as not tested on animals under the Humane Standards for use in all buildings for which they are directly responsible for cleaning. Where cleaning is conducted on their behalf by an outside contractor, this condition should be added to the next tender specification when it is published.”

11.14 In accordance with Standing Order 2.6A(2) and with the consent of the seconder and the meeting, Jenny Jones AM indicated that she would accept the amendment. The debate therefore proceeded on the basis of the revised motion.

11.15 Upon being put to the vote, the revised motion in the name of Jenny Jones AM, namely:

**“This Assembly welcomes the commitment by the Government to ban the use of animals to test household products, and supports Cruelty Free International in its campaigning to end such testing.**

**This Assembly calls on the Greater London Authority, the Metropolitan Police Service, the London Fire Brigade and Transport for London to purchase cleaning products, where suitable products are available and subject to best value**



**considerations, which have been certified by Cruelty Free International as not tested on animals under the Humane Standards for use in all buildings for which they are directly responsible for cleaning. Where cleaning is conducted on their behalf by an outside contractor, this condition should be added to the next tender specification when it is published.”**

was agreed unanimously.

11.16 Fiona Twycross AM moved, and Tom Copley AM seconded, the following motion:

“This Assembly calls on the Mayor to take a strong stand against the inappropriate use of zero hours contracts in London and to lead by example by ending the use of zero hours contracts by contractors and subcontractors employed by the GLA and its functional bodies.

This Assembly believes the Mayor is wrong to praise zero hours contracts and rejects his view that their use prevents “rigidity in the labour market”. In reality, the use of zero hours contracts represents a ‘race to the bottom’ on pay and working conditions. For example, by eroding employee rights to sick leave and annual leave and by tying increasing numbers of low paid employees to places of employment, but without guaranteed hours and therefore a guaranteed income from one week to the next. This erosion of employment rights comes at a time when more people in London are now paid less than the London Living Wage compared to when the Mayor took office in 2008, despite significant increases in costs of living over this period.

That 40 members of staff at City Hall have been employed on zero hours is an embarrassment for the GLA and the Office of Mayor of London and fundamentally undermines the GLA’s status as a London Living Wage employer. To reassure Londoners of the GLA’s belief in a fair day’s pay for a fair day’s work, we call on the Mayor to root out the unjustifiable use of zero hours contracts at the GLA and to draw up a code of practice on the use of zero hours contracts within the GLA Group.”

11.17 Upon being put to the vote, the motion in the name of Fiona Twycross AM, namely:

**“This Assembly calls on the Mayor to take a strong stand against the inappropriate use of zero hours contracts in London and to lead by example by ending the use of zero hours contracts by contractors and subcontractors employed by the GLA and its functional bodies.**

**This Assembly believes the Mayor is wrong to praise zero hours contracts and rejects his view that their use prevents “rigidity in the labour market”. In reality, the use of zero hours contracts represents a ‘race to the bottom’ on pay and working conditions. For example, by eroding employee rights to sick leave and annual leave**

**and by tying increasing numbers of low paid employees to places of employment, but without guaranteed hours and therefore a guaranteed income from one week to the next. This erosion of employment rights comes at a time when more people in London are now paid less than the London Living Wage compared to when the Mayor took office in 2008, despite significant increases in costs of living over this period.**

**That 40 members of staff at City Hall have been employed on zero hours is an embarrassment for the GLA and the Office of Mayor of London and fundamentally undermines the GLA's status as a London Living Wage employer. To reassure Londoners of the GLA's belief in a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, we call on the Mayor to root out the unjustifiable use of zero hours contracts at the GLA and to draw up a code of practice on the use of zero hours contracts within the GLA Group."**

was agreed (13 votes cast in favour and 6 against).

11.18 Murad Qureshi AM moved, and Fiona Twycross AM seconded, the following motion:

"This Assembly welcomes the fact that London is home to six football teams in the Premier League which is the most prestigious and well recognised football league in the world. The Assembly notes that some footballers at these football clubs can earn up to £180,000 a week.

These football clubs have annual turnovers of between £261m (Chelsea) and £15m (Crystal Palace).

This Assembly recognises the success that these football clubs have and the role they provide to our city in establishing London as a giant of cities in the football world, however we are concerned by the disparity between the highest earners and the lowest earners at these clubs.

We note that the Mayor is a supporter of the London Living Wage campaign.

We call on the Mayor to write to London's six Premier League football clubs – Arsenal FC, Chelsea FC, Queens Park Rangers, West Ham United FC, Tottenham Hotspur and Crystal Palace – emphasising both the reputational benefits and the business case for the payment of the London Living Wage to their staff."

11.19 In accordance with Standing Order 3.6A (1) Murad Qureshi AM, with the consent of the meeting, confirmed that he had amended his motion (as originally published with the agenda for the meeting) in order to substitute West Ham United FC for Queens Park Rangers in the final paragraph of the motion. The debate therefore proceeded on the basis of the revised motion.

- 11.20 During the debate that followed in accordance with Standing Order 4.5A Jenny Jones AM moved “that the question be now put to a vote”. The Chair noted that one Member had indicated that they still wished to speak and so indicated that he was minded to conclude that the matter had not been sufficiently debated at that point. Upon being told by the Member concerned that the Member did not intend to speak in opposition to the motion, the Chair then confirmed that, as no Member had indicated that they wished to oppose the proposal, he did consider that the matter had been sufficiently debated and proceeded to put the procedural motion to the vote.
- 11.21 On being put to the vote the procedural motion “that the question be now put to a vote” was agreed (13 votes cast in favour and 4 votes against).
- 11.22 Upon being put to the vote, the revised motion in the name of Murad Qureshi AM, namely:

**“This Assembly welcomes the fact that London is home to six football teams in the Premier League which is the most prestigious and well recognised football league in the world. The Assembly notes that some footballers at these football clubs can earn up to £180,000 a week.**

**These football clubs have annual turnovers of between £261m (Chelsea) and £15m (Crystal Palace).**

**This Assembly recognises the success that these football clubs have and the role they provide to our city in establishing London as a giant of cities in the football world, however we are concerned by the disparity between the highest earners and the lowest earners at these clubs.**

**We note that the Mayor is a supporter of the London Living Wage campaign.**

**We call on the Mayor to write to London’s six Premier League football clubs – Arsenal FC, Chelsea FC, Fulham FC, West Ham United FC, Tottenham Hotspur and Crystal Palace – emphasising both the reputational benefits and the business case for the payment of the London Living Wage to their staff.”**

was agreed (17 votes cast in favour and one abstention).

- 11.23 Valerie Shawcross AM moved, and Caroline Pidgeon AM seconded, the following motion:

“This Assembly notes the decision to re-let the signalling contract currently operated by Bombardier on London Underground.

This Assembly further notes that the press release was sent out in the afternoon of New Year’s Eve.

The Assembly calls on the Mayor to explain:

- When the decision to re-let the contract was actually made?
- Why the press release was sent out on New Year's Eve?
- Why it has taken two and a half years to work out that Bombardier would be unable to fulfil the original contract.
- How is the timescale for the completion of the sub surface tube signal upgrade affected?
- What is the net financial impact on TfL of re-letting the contract?"

11.24 Upon being put to vote, the motion in the name of Valerie Shawcross AM, namely:

**"This Assembly notes the decision to re-let the signalling contract currently operated by Bombardier on London Underground.**

**This Assembly further notes that the press release was sent out in the afternoon of New Year's Eve.**

**The Assembly calls on the Mayor to explain:**

- **When the decision to re-let the contract was actually made?**
- **Why the press release was sent out on New Year's Eve?**
- **Why it has taken two and a half years to work out that Bombardier would be unable to fulfil the original contract.**
- **How is the timescale for the completion of the sub surface tube signal upgrade affected?**
- **What is the net financial impact on TfL of re-letting the contract?"**

was agreed unanimously.

## **12 Date of Next Meeting (Item 12)**

12.1 The next scheduled meeting of the London Assembly was the Mayor's Question Time meeting due to take place at 10.00am on Wednesday, 29 January 2014 in the Chamber, City Hall. The Chair stated that the meeting would take place all day as the London Assembly would consider the Mayor's draft consolidated budget for the GLA Group.

## **13 Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent (Item 13)**

13.1 There were no items of urgent business.

## 14 Close of Meeting (Item )

14.1 The meeting ended at 1.46 p.m.

---

Chair

---

Date

**Contact Officers:** Joanna Brown/ Teresa Young  
Senior Committee Officers  
GLA Secretariat, City Hall  
The Queen's Walk, London SE1 2AA

**Telephone:** 020 7983 6559

**Email:** [Joanna.brown@london.gov.uk](mailto:Joanna.brown@london.gov.uk)/ [teresa.young@london.gov.uk](mailto:teresa.young@london.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank