

MINUTES

Meeting: London Assembly (Plenary)
Date: Wednesday 3 June 2015
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:

Jennette Arnold OBE AM (Chair)	Kit Malthouse AM MP
Tony Arbour AM (Deputy Chairman)	Joanne McCartney AM
Gareth Bacon AM	Steve O'Connell AM
Andrew Boff AM	Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM
Victoria Borwick AM MP	Murad Qureshi AM
James Cleverly AM MP	Dr Onkar Sahota AM
Andrew Dismore AM	Navin Shah AM
Darren Johnson AM	Valerie Shawcross CBE AM
Jenny Jones AM	Richard Tracey AM
Stephen Knight AM	

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

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from John Biggs AM, Tom Copley AM, Len Duvall AM, Roger Evans AM, Nicky Gavron AM and Fiona Twycross AM.

2 Declarations of Interests (Item 2)

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

2.2 **Resolved:**

That the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table at Item 2, be noted as disclosable pecuniary interests.

3 Minutes (Item 3)

3.1 **Resolved:**

That the minutes of the London Assembly Annual Meeting, held on 13 May 2015, be signed by the Chair as a correct record.

4 Question and Answer Session - Policing in London (Item 4)

Part A:

- 4.1 The Assembly put questions to Boris Johnson MP, Mayor of London, and Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe QPM, Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis, on the issue of policing in London. At 11.12am, the Deputy Chairman, Tony Arbour AM, assumed the Chair in order that the Chair, Jennette Arnold OBE AM, could put questions herself to the invited guests. The Chair resumed the Chair at 12.02pm.
- 4.2 The record of the questions put by Assembly Members and the answers given is attached as **Appendix 1**. The written answers provided following the meeting are attached as **Appendix 2**.
- 4.3 During the course of the discussion, the Mayor undertook to provide the Assembly with details of how many Accident and Emergency departments in London hospitals share non-confidential data with the police to help reduce violent crime.

Part B:

4.4 The Chair formally moved the motion set out on the agenda in her name, namely:

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

4.5 **Resolved:**

The answers to the questions asked be noted.

5 Action Taken by the Chair Under Delegated Authority and Outcome of Confirmation Hearing (Item 5)

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

5.2 **Resolved:**

- (a) **That the action taken by the then Chairman of the Assembly, Roger Evans AM, in accordance with the authority delegated to him, namely to agree to hold a Confirmation Hearing in relation to the proposed appointment of:**
- **Neale Coleman CBE to the office of Chairman of the London Legacy Development Corporation; and**
 - **Sir Edward Lister to the office of Chairman of the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation,**

and to ask both candidates to provide a CV and supporting statement, be noted;

- (b) **That the action taken by the Chair of the Assembly, Jennette Arnold OBE AM, in accordance with the authority delegated to her, namely to agree not to hold a Confirmation Hearing in relation to the proposed appointment of Gareth Bacon AM as Chairman of the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority, be noted; and**

- (c) **That the decision of the Confirmation Hearings Committee, further to its meeting held on 20 May 2015 and as set out at Appendix 5, to recommend that the Mayor should proceed with his proposed appointments to the office of Chairman of the London Legacy Development Corporation and to the office of Chairman of Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation, be noted.**

6 Petition (Item 6)

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

6.2 Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM presented a petition with the following prayer:

'Let's make Tooting Bec Road safe for all!

**Greater London Authority
London Assembly (Plenary)
Wednesday 3 June 2015**

Tooting Bec Road is an 'A' Road, and as such is an important route for people moving both within, and passing through the area. The width of the road, not including the pavement, is at least 10.5m for a significant stretch from the Tube to Tooting Lido.

Crossing this road on foot, on travelling along it by bicycle is not straightforward. We believe space exists for high quality segregated cycle routes to be placed on the road ensuring that people of whatever age or ability can chose to cycle locally. These tracks could be on either side of the road or a two-way cycle track could be provided on one side.

This narrowing of the carriageway should result in lower speeds by motorists, and make it easier for pedestrians and the less able to cross the road.'

6.3 Resolved:

That the petition be forwarded to the Mayor, as Chairman of Transport for London, for response.

7 Petitions Update (Item 7)

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

7.2 Resolved:

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

8 Motions (Item 8)

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

8.2 During the course of discussion on this item the Chair proposed, and it was agreed, that Standing Order 2.9B be suspended to extend the meeting in order to allow the remaining items of business on the agenda to be considered.

8.3 Andrew Boff AM moved and Richard Tracey AM seconded the following motion:

"This Assembly believes that Nominee Passes, those passes offered up for free to nominees of TfL staff that live in the same residence, should be scrapped at the earliest possible opportunity. TfL's Nominee Passes scheme will cost the taxpayer £111.2 million in lost fare revenues over the next five years up to 2020. The additional revenues accrued from the scrapping of these passes should be used to provide free travel for firefighters in-line with police officers, which would cost £24.8 million in the lead up to 2020.

**Greater London Authority
London Assembly (Plenary)
Wednesday 3 June 2015**

This Assembly therefore calls for the following:

1. TfL ensure that all existing Nominee Passes expire by 31 December 2015;
2. TfL immediately stop issuing any new or replacement Nominee Passes; and
3. The Mayor earmarks the additional revenues for free travel for London's firefighters."

8.4 Upon being put to the vote, the motion in the name of Andrew Boff AM, namely:

"This Assembly believes that Nominee Passes, those passes offered up for free to nominees of TfL staff that live in the same residence, should be scrapped at the earliest possible opportunity. TfL's Nominee Passes scheme will cost the taxpayer £111.2 million in lost fare revenues over the next five years up to 2020. The additional revenues accrued from the scrapping of these passes should be used to provide free travel for firefighters in-line with police officers, which would cost £24.8 million in the lead up to 2020.

This Assembly therefore calls for the following:

- 1. TfL ensure that all existing Nominee Passes expire by 31 December 2015;**
- 2. TfL immediately stop issuing any new or replacement Nominee Passes; and**
- 3. The Mayor earmarks the additional revenues for free travel for London's firefighters."**

was not carried (with 5 votes cast in favour and 11 votes cast against).

8.5 Jenny Jones AM moved and Darren Johnson AM seconded the following motion:

"This Assembly celebrates the huge natural diversity in London, a city that more than 8 million people share with over 13,000 other species. We believe that millions of Londoners share our commitment to nurturing and enhancing our natural wonders, from London's small urban gardens to its national nature reserves.

This Assembly therefore welcomes the Greater London National Park City initiative, which aims to 'inspire us to create a more liveable, fair and healthy London'. The proposed organisation would bring together public, private and third sector organisations to enhance our natural and cultural heritage, encourage a better understanding and enjoyment of the city, foster wellbeing and inspire others to share these purposes.

This Assembly notes that, despite the ambitious proposals for the Park, it would be unlike other UK National Parks, and would not control development or prepare local planning policies. These powers would remain with the Greater London Authority, the 32 London boroughs and the City of London Corporation.

**Greater London Authority
London Assembly (Plenary)
Wednesday 3 June 2015**

We therefore call on the Mayor to support the organisation in developing its vision, in particular by setting out how the Greater London Authority and the wider GLA Group could contribute towards its aims.”

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

“This Assembly celebrates the huge natural diversity in London, a city that more than 8 million people share with over 13,000 other species. We believe that millions of Londoners share our commitment to nurturing and enhancing our natural wonders, from London’s small urban gardens to its national nature reserves.

This Assembly therefore welcomes the Greater London National Park City initiative, which aims to ‘inspire us to create a more liveable, fair and healthy London’. The proposed organisation would bring together public, private and third sector organisations to enhance our natural and cultural heritage, encourage a better understanding and enjoyment of the city, foster wellbeing and inspire others to share these purposes.

This Assembly notes that, despite the ambitious proposals for the Park, it would be unlike other UK National Parks, and would not control development or prepare local planning policies. These powers would remain with the Greater London Authority, the 32 London boroughs and the City of London Corporation.

We therefore call on the Mayor to support the organisation in developing its vision, in particular by setting out how the Greater London Authority and the wider GLA Group could contribute towards its aims.”

was agreed (unanimously).

8.7 Darren Johnson AM moved and Jenny Jones AM seconded the following motion, altered with the consent of the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 3.6:

“This Assembly notes the recent General Election results in London and the ensuing debate about electoral reform. This Assembly believes that electoral reform for the House of Commons should be debated.

This Assembly notes the Mayor’s inaccurate statement on LBC on the 12th May that ‘we have had a referendum on PR’, and calls on him to support a full debate on electoral reform.”

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

“This Assembly notes the recent General Election results in London and the ensuing debate about electoral reform. This Assembly believes that electoral reform for the House of Commons should be debated.

This Assembly notes the Mayor’s inaccurate statement on LBC on the 12th May that ‘we have had a referendum on PR’, and calls on him to support a full debate on electoral reform.”

was agreed (with 11 votes cast in favour and 5 votes cast against).

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

“This Assembly notes with concern the many objections to the proposed Garden Bridge from a wide variety of individuals and organisations, from the Taxpayers’ Alliance to the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds. Objections have been raised over: the proximity to other crossings, the blocking of historic views of the Thames, the procurement process, the lack of cycling provision, the lack of a guaranteed right of way or step free access, the loss of over 30 mature trees on the South Bank, and the GLA underwriting ongoing maintenance costs running into millions.

This Assembly believes that, with no cycling provision or guaranteed public right of way and given the proximity to other bridges, the project serves no transport function, and it is therefore inappropriate that £30 million of Transport for London money has been committed to it.

This Assembly further believes that the public money earmarked for the project would be much better allocated to pedestrian/cycle river crossings where there is a genuine transport need, such as the proposed Brunel Bridge at Rotherhithe/Canary Wharf, or spent creating and improving green public spaces in other parts of the city.

This Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor to agree to a full, independent audit of the procurement process, and to withdraw TfL funds from the project.”

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

“This Assembly notes with concern the many objections to the proposed Garden Bridge from a wide variety of individuals and organisations, from the Taxpayers’ Alliance to the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds. Objections have been raised over: the proximity to other crossings, the blocking of historic views of the Thames, the procurement process, the lack of cycling provision, the lack of a guaranteed right of way or step free access, the loss of over 30 mature trees on the South Bank, and the GLA underwriting ongoing maintenance costs running into millions.

This Assembly believes that, with no cycling provision or guaranteed public right of way and given the proximity to other bridges, the project serves no transport function, and it is therefore inappropriate that £30 million of Transport for London money has been committed to it.

This Assembly further believes that the public money earmarked for the project would be much better allocated to pedestrian/cycle river crossings where there is a genuine transport need, such as the proposed Brunel Bridge at Rotherhithe/Canary Wharf, or spent creating and improving green public spaces in other parts of the city.

This Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor to agree to a full, independent audit of the procurement process, and to withdraw TfL funds from the project.”

was agreed (with 11 votes cast in favour and 3 votes cast against).

- 8.11 Murad Qureshi AM moved and Gareth Bacon AM seconded the following motion, altered with the consent of the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 3.6:

“Low pay is an increasingly critical issue in London, with average pay rates continuing to fall in the capital. Office for National Statistics data shows that in 2013, average weekly pay was £613 compared to £700 in real-terms (adjusted for RPI) in 2009¹. The most recent London Poverty Profile shows the number of jobs paying less than the London Living Wage has also increased sharply since 2007 in both absolute terms (from 420,000 to 600,000) and as a proportion of all jobs in the capital (from 13% to 17%)².

Few industries highlight the income disparities that characterise modern London better than the highest levels of professional football. This was highlighted by the London Assembly’s January 2014 motion, which denounced the wage inequality between the highest and lowest earners at Premier League football clubs.

Since that motion was passed, this Assembly notes the positive decision by some Premier League clubs to pay their staff the London Living Wage. Nevertheless, two-thirds of Premier League clubs in London are currently failing to pay their employees enough to live on in the capital. Whilst star players can earn up to £180,000 per week, some contract staff employed by the same club earn the minimum wage of £6.50 per hour.

This Assembly therefore welcomes the Premier League’s recent announcement that its clubs will pay the London Living Wage to full-time staff from the start of the 2016-17 season³. However, this commitment should be extended to include those employees who work part-

¹ Figures for pay regional pay rates and Retail Price Index inflation taken from the Office for National Statistics

² London Poverty Profile 2013, Trust for London & New Policy Institute, 2013, p.63

³ Owen Gibson, Premier League living wage pledge must go further, says campaign leader, *Guardian*, 26.03.15

time. These employees make up much of the workforce employed by football clubs and are typically amongst their lowest paid.

The Mayor has supported, and been actively involved in, stadium-led regeneration to create job opportunities and improve facilities for local people. With several Premier League clubs benefiting from the Mayor's support in building new, or expanding existing, stadiums, it is essential that he urges clubs to pay the London Living Wage.

Furthermore, this Assembly calls upon the Mayor to use his influence during stadium-led development schemes to advance the case for the London Living Wage and to urge London's other non-Living Wage employers to pay their workers a fair wage."

8.12 Upon being put to the vote, the motion in the name of Murad Qureshi AM, namely:

"Low pay is an increasingly critical issue in London, with average pay rates continuing to fall in the capital. Office for National Statistics data shows that in 2013, average weekly pay was £613 compared to £700 in real-terms (adjusted for RPI) in 2009⁴. The most recent London Poverty Profile shows the number of jobs paying less than the London Living Wage has also increased sharply since 2007 in both absolute terms (from 420,000 to 600,000) and as a proportion of all jobs in the capital (from 13% to 17%)⁵.

Few industries highlight the income disparities that characterise modern London better than the highest levels of professional football. This was highlighted by the London Assembly's January 2014 motion, which denounced the wage inequality between the highest and lowest earners at Premier League football clubs.

Since that motion was passed, this Assembly notes the positive decision by some Premier League clubs to pay their staff the London Living Wage. Nevertheless, two-thirds of Premier League clubs in London are currently failing to pay their employees enough to live on in the capital. Whilst star players can earn up to £180,000 per week, some contract staff employed by the same club earn the minimum wage of £6.50 per hour.

This Assembly therefore welcomes the Premier League's recent announcement that its clubs will pay the London Living Wage to full-time staff from the start of the 2016-17 season⁶. However, this commitment should be extended to include those employees who work part-time. These employees make up much of the workforce employed by football clubs and are typically amongst their lowest paid.

⁴ Figures for pay regional pay rates and Retail Price Index inflation taken from the Office for National Statistics

⁵ London Poverty Profile 2013, Trust for London & New Policy Institute, 2013, p.63

⁶ Owen Gibson, Premier League living wage pledge must go further, says campaign leader, *Guardian*, 26.03.15

The Mayor has supported, and been actively involved in, stadium-led regeneration to create job opportunities and improve facilities for local people. With several Premier League clubs benefiting from the Mayor's support in building new, or expanding existing, stadiums, it is essential that he urges clubs to pay the London Living Wage.

Furthermore, this Assembly calls upon the Mayor to use his influence during stadium-led development schemes to advance the case for the London Living Wage and to urge London's other non-Living Wage employers to pay their workers a fair wage."

was agreed (unanimously).

- 8.13 Stephen Knight AM moved and Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM seconded the following motion, altered with the consent of the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 3.6:

"This Assembly welcomes the recent unanimous judgement from the Supreme Court ordering the government to submit new air quality plans to the European Commission no later than 31 December 2015.

This Assembly notes that large sections of the Capital continue to exceed both the annual mean and hourly legal limits for nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and are currently projected to continue doing so until after 2030, over twenty years after the original compliance date.

This Assembly further notes that the Mayor has a duty – under the Greater London Authority Act (1999) – to bring forward policies and proposals to support the achievement of legal air quality standards in London.

This Assembly believes that further measures are needed urgently if London is to achieve compliance with health-based, legal limits and avoid the prospect of substantial fines being passed down to the Greater London Authority (GLA) under the terms of the Localism Act (2011).

This Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor of London to take additional steps to ensure that the period of exceedance of air quality limits in London is kept as short as possible, and investigate potential policies that could be enacted in advance of the launch of the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ). Such policies should enable Transport for London (TfL) to influence purchasing and driving behaviour far sooner than currently planned while delivering a measurable benefit to the health and quality of life of Londoners."

- 8.14 Upon being put to the vote, the motion in the name of Stephen Knight AM, namely:

“This Assembly welcomes the recent unanimous judgement from the Supreme Court ordering the government to submit new air quality plans to the European Commission no later than 31 December 2015.

This Assembly notes that large sections of the Capital continue to exceed both the annual mean and hourly legal limits for nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and are currently projected to continue doing so until after 2030, over twenty years after the original compliance date.

This Assembly further notes that the Mayor has a duty – under the Greater London Authority Act (1999) – to bring forward policies and proposals to support the achievement of legal air quality standards in London.

This Assembly believes that further measures are needed urgently if London is to achieve compliance with health-based, legal limits and avoid the prospect of substantial fines being passed down to the Greater London Authority (GLA) under the terms of the Localism Act (2011).

This Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor of London to take additional steps to ensure that the period of exceedance of air quality limits in London is kept as short as possible, and investigate potential policies that could be enacted in advance of the launch of the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ). Such policies should enable Transport for London (TfL) to influence purchasing and driving behaviour far sooner than currently planned while delivering a measurable benefit to the health and quality of life of Londoners.”

was agreed (with 11 votes cast in favour and 4 votes cast against).

9 Future Meetings of the Assembly (Item 9)

9.1 Resolved:

That authority be delegated to Jennette Arnold OBE AM, as Chair of the London Assembly, to determine the subject matter and detailed arrangements for the London Assembly (Plenary) meeting on 1 July 2015, in consultation with the Deputy Chairman and party Group Leaders.

10 Date of Next Meeting (Item 10)

- 10.1 The next scheduled meeting of the London Assembly would be the Mayor’s Question Time meeting which was scheduled to take place at 10.00am on Wednesday 17 June 2015 in the Chamber, City Hall.

11 Any Other Business the Chairman Considers Urgent (Item 11)

11.1 There were no items of urgent business.

12 Close of Meeting

12.1 The meeting ended at 1.34pm.

Chair

Date

Contact Officer: John Barry
Principal Committee Manager
GLA Secretariat, City Hall
The Queen's Walk, London SE1 2AA

Telephone: 020 7983 4425

Email: john.barry@london.gov.uk