

Subject: Motions

Report to: London Assembly (Plenary)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 15 January 2014

This report will be considered in public

1. Summary

- 1.1 The Assembly is asked to consider the motions set out which have been submitted by Assembly Members.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Assembly considers the motions set out below.**

3. Issues for Consideration

- 3.1 The following motion has been proposed in the name of **Caroline Pidgeon AM** and will be seconded at the meeting:

“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.”

- 3.2 The following motion has been proposed in the name of **Darren Johnson AM** and will be seconded by **Valerie Shawcross AM**:

“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.”

3.3 The following motion has been proposed in the name of **Jenny Jones AM** and will be seconded by **Joanne McCartney 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 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.”

3.4 The following motion has been proposed in the name of **Fiona Twycross AM** and will be seconded at the meeting:

“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.”

3.5 The following motion has been proposed in the name of **Murad Qureshi AM** and will be seconded at the meeting:

“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, Queens Park Rangers, 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.”

3.6 The following motion has been proposed in the name of **Valerie Shawcross AM** and will be seconded at the meeting:

“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 reletting the contract?”

List of appendices to this report: None.

| |
|--|
| Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 |
|--|

| |
|----------------------------------|
| List of Background Papers: None. |
|----------------------------------|

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Contact Officer: | Joanna Brown and Teresa Young, Senior Committee Officers |
|------------------|--|

| | |
|------------|---------------|
| Telephone: | 020 7983 6559 |
|------------|---------------|

| | |
|--------|---|
| Email: | joanna.brown@london.gov.uk ; and teresa.young@london.gov.uk |
|--------|---|