

Subject: Motions

Report to: London Assembly (Plenary)

Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat

Date: 1 July 2015

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 **Andrew Dismore AM** and will be seconded at the meeting:

“This Assembly condemns the decision of a number of fringe extreme right wing groups to hold a rally in Golders Green on 4th July. This is highly provocative and is intended to insult and incite hatred against the Jewish community.

2014 saw a significant rise in antisemitic attacks in London including in Barnet where the rally is to be held, and after the deadly events in Paris and Copenhagen targeting Jews and others, London’s Jewish community is understandably apprehensive about its security. This event is designed to play on those fears and the risk of violence against Jewish residents and businesses is clearly present.

Whilst the demonstration cannot be banned, this Assembly calls upon the Mayor to support a peaceful, community-led counter protest, including permitting TfL street furniture to be decorated with green and gold as part of the community’s response; and calls upon the Metropolitan Police Commissioner to ensure that the most stringent conditions possible are imposed on the far right rally, so as to avoid serious disorder and serious disruption to the local community.”

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

“This Assembly notes the GLA’s recent projects for Crystal Palace Park, including: the collapsed deal with the ZhongRong Group to build a major commercial development on the hill top of Crystal Palace Park, which the Mayor secretly brokered following the London 2012 Games without the involvement of local stakeholder groups¹; its draft plans to radically redevelop the National Sports Centre and grounds with a significant loss of sporting facilities, which only involved the local sporting community after significant protest²; and the park’s designation, without a clear rationale, in the London Plan as an Outer London Development Centre.

This Assembly notes that the Mayor is continuing to pursue secretive discussions with companies regarding building on the park’s hill top³, and believes he risks repeating the mistakes of the ZhongRong Group proposals, which resulted in the loss of £4.5 million from the Heritage Lottery Fund⁴ and eighteen wasted months during which community projects were suspended.

This Assembly also welcomes that the local community is progressing plans for a Crystal Palace Neighbourhood Forum⁵, and that Bromley Council is working with local stakeholders to establish a community trust to govern Crystal Palace Park⁶.

This Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor to end any private discussions about proposals for development on the park, and engage openly and transparently with the emerging community trust and Neighbourhood Forum in developing any future projects for the park and wider area.”

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

“Following International Justice Day for Cleaners (15 June 2015), this Assembly would like to put on record its support for employees in this sector.

Across Greater London, 85 per cent of cleaning jobs are low paid.⁷ The cleaning sector is indicative of a wider lack of progress in increasing the number of jobs paying the London Living Wage in London’s low-pay sectors since 2008. In June 2009, the Mayor addressed the British Hospitality Association annual lunch, during which he encouraged the sector to adopt the London Living Wage. Since then, no London-based employers in this sector have become accredited.

This Assembly is deeply concerned by the growth of low pay in Greater London. Real wages are now £2,097 a year lower than they were in 2008⁸, while the proportion of jobs paying less than the London Living Wage has increased from 13.2 per cent to 19.4 per cent since the Mayor took office,

¹ The Mayor met Mr Ni Zhaoxing at the Games, and officers first held meetings in February 2013. Plans were not made public until October of that year. http://questions.london.gov.uk/QuestionSearch/searchclient/questions/question_275672

² See, for example, <https://crystalpalacesp.files.wordpress.com/2014/11/press-statement-11-11-14.pdf>

³ http://questions.london.gov.uk/QuestionSearch/searchclient/questions/question_282130

⁴ <http://www.crystalpalacepark.org.uk/2014/heritage-lottery-fund-application-fails/>

⁵ http://questions.london.gov.uk/QuestionSearch/searchclient/questions/question_275673

⁶ http://www.bromley.gov.uk/press/article/984/improving_crystal_palace_park_taking_shape

⁷ ‘Fair pay: Making the London Living Wage the norm’, London Assembly Economy Committee, February 2014, p.8

⁸ Written question No: 2015/0380, January 2015

dragging an additional 348,000 workers further into poverty pay.⁹ In London, 917,000 jobs now pay less than the London Living Wage.¹⁰

This Assembly supports the Mayor's vision for the London Living Wage to be the norm by 2020; but we recognise that the city is moving further away from achieving this objective. In his final year in office, we call on the Mayor to refocus his attentions on reversing this trend. We particularly call on him to focus on London's low pay sectors and to increase the Greater London Authority resources available for engaging with employers in these sectors."¹¹

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

"This Assembly notes Mayoral Direction 1516 – *LFEPA 2016-17 Budget Options* – instructing the Authority to 'not redeploy'¹² thirteen fire engines, which are used to support the contingency arrangements during periods of industrial action.

This Assembly is deeply concerned that, despite repeated calls at LFEPA for the thirteen appliances to be returned, the Mayor has proceeded with this combative course of action; especially at the point at which LFB and the FBU had reached agreement on the terms of their return.

Furthermore, this Assembly regrets that the Mayor appears intent on the permanent removal of the 13 appliances, despite the fact that alternative budget options have not yet been formally considered by LFEPA, and while considerable work is being undertaken by officers and board members on finding alternatives to additional frontline cuts to meet the Mayor's £11m reduction in the 2016/17 fire service budget.

This Assembly regards the Mayor's Direction as unnecessary, and believes that it demonstrates that the Mayor is not committed to protecting frontline emergency services in the capital. Furthermore, the Assembly believes that the premise upon which the decision appears to have been made is not sufficiently strong to demonstrate that the safety of Londoners will not be jeopardised by his Decision; especially were that Decision the first step towards permanent removal of the thirteen appliances.

This Assembly calls on the Mayor to withdraw MD 1516 and to allow the re-introduction of the 13 appliances to London's streets immediately, returning fire cover to the levels committed to within the fifth London Safety Plan (LSP5)."

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

"The London Assembly is concerned that the quality of London's universal postal service is under threat following the Chancellor Exchequer's recent announcement that the Government is to sell its

⁹ Written question No: 2014/5918, December 2014

¹⁰ Written question No: 2014/5918, December 2014

¹¹ 'Fair pay: Making the London Living Wage the norm', London Assembly Economy Committee, February 2014, p.8

¹² Mayoral Direction 1516: <http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/mayor/mayoral-decisions/MD1516>

remaining stake in Royal Mail¹³. Shortly after this announcement the Government sold half of its remaining 30 per cent share¹⁴.

When the government began the privatisation of the Royal Mail in 2013 it was poorly managed, rushed, and cost the UK tax payer £180 million¹⁵. This Assembly believes that the move to fully privatise the service not only represents a bad deal for tax payers but will also potentially reduce scrutiny and transparency in an organisation that has been serving the public interest since the early 1500s¹⁶. These concerns are not merely limited to the delivery of the Royal Mail's core services, but are also relevant in respect of the availability of affordable housing in London, as the Royal Mail seeks to divest itself of land assets capable of delivering thousands of homes in the capital¹⁷.

The London Assembly calls on the Mayor to defend London's postal service and ensure Royal Mail's land assets are used to deliver housing across all tenures in the capital by lobbying the government to conduct an open and transparent cost-benefit analysis of selling the remaining 15% stake in the Royal Mail."

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

"This Assembly notes the Mayor's recent statement that the proposal to extend the Right to Buy to housing associations tenants "will only work for London if it delivers more homes – and more low-cost homes – [and] makes sure that the cash from the sale of any council homes stays firmly in London and is used to build more homes for Londoners" adding that he did not want to see London's "great mixture of socioeconomic groups" displaced as a result of the policy.¹⁸

This Assembly further notes that the rate of replacement for council homes sold under the Right to Buy scheme since the the maximum discount was increased in 2012 has been closer to one in ten, despite a commitment to ensure that the receipts from every additional home sold would be used to fund its replacement on a one for one basis.¹⁹

This Assembly is furthered concerned that the way the policy is to be funded – through forcing local councils to sell off their most valuable properties – may result in many new council properties being sold off almost as soon as they are built, instead of being let to local residents in housing need.

This Assembly believes that the proposal to extend the Right to Buy to housing associations tenants in London risks undermining other efforts to increase the supply of new affordable homes across the capital.

This Assembly is concerned by the Mayor's failure to respond to its motion – agreed at Mayor's Question Time on 21 May 2015 – calling on him to commission an assessment of the implications of an extended Right to Buy for housing associations in London.²⁰

¹³ <http://www.ftadviser.com/2015/06/04/investments/economic-indicators/royal-mail-privatisation-top-of-chancellor-s-debt-reduction-sUX0WX8FU59Trlh4OYhmPL/article.html>

¹⁴ <http://news.sky.com/story/1499747/govt-sells-its-15-percent-stake-in-royal-mail>

¹⁵ <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-30527392>

¹⁶ <http://www.royalmailgroup.com/Timeline>

¹⁷ Julia Kollewe, Royal Mail may reap £662m from planned sale of London sorting office, *The Guardian*, 11.11.14

¹⁸ See transcript of Mayor speaking in response to MQ2015/1210 [‘Right to buy’ for housing association tenants in London]: <http://www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/documents/s46961/Minutes%20-%20Appendix%20%20-%20Transcript%20of%20Item%204%20-%20Questions%20to%20the%20Mayor.pdf>

¹⁹ Institute of Fiscal Studies (IFS) Briefing Note BN171: <http://www.ifs.org.uk/uploads/publications/bns/BN171.pdf>

²⁰ See the minutes of the meeting of the London Assembly held on 21 May 2015: <http://www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/mgAi.aspx?ID=18095>

This Assembly therefore calls on the Mayor to provide an oral update to the Assembly at the earliest opportunity confirming whether or not he intends to commission an assessment of the implications of extending Right to Buy to Housing Association tenants in London, and if not, to provide a list of reasons for his decision. “

List of appendices to this report: None.

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

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

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Contact Officer: | John Barry, Principal Committee Manager |
| Telephone: | 020 7983 4425 |
| Email: | John.barry@london.gov.uk |