



Policy and Resources Committee

Date: THURSDAY, 24 SEPTEMBER 2015
Time: 1.45 pm
Venue: COMMITTEE ROOMS, 2ND FLOOR, WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members:

Mark Boleat (Chairman)	Deputy Robert Howard (Ex-Officio Member)
Jeremy Mayhew (Deputy Chairman)	Wendy Hyde
Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Deputy Chairman)	Vivienne Littlechild (Ex-Officio Member)
Hugh Morris (Deputy Chairman)	Edward Lord
Deputy Douglas Barrow	Wendy Mead
Deputy John Bennett	Deputy Alastair Moss (Ex-Officio Member)
Alderman Charles Bowman	Deputy Joyce Nash
Roger Chadwick (Ex-Officio Member)	Dhruv Patel (Ex-Officio Member)
Henry Colthurst	Deputy Henry Pollard (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Alex Deane	Alderman Baroness Scotland (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Billy Dove (Ex-Officio Member)	Deputy Dr Giles Shilson
Simon Duckworth	Jeremy Simons
Alderman The Lord Mountevans	Sir Michael Snyder
Stuart Fraser	Deputy John Tomlinson
Marianne Fredericks	Michael Welbank (Ex-Officio Member)
George Gillon	Alderman Sir David Wootton
Deputy the Revd Stephen Haines (Ex-Officio Member)	The Rt Hon the Lord Mayor, Alderman Alan Yarrow
Alderman Sir David Howard	

Enquiries: Angela Roach
tel. no.: 020 7332 3685
angela.roach@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Lunch will be served in Guildhall Club at 1pm
NB: Part of this meeting could be the subject of audio visual recording

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

Part 1 - Public Agenda

1. **APOLOGIES**
2. **MEMBERS DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**
3. **MINUTES**
To consider minutes as follows:-
 - a) To agree the public minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2015.
For Decision
(Pages 1 - 6)
 - b) To note the draft public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 16 July 2015.
For Information
(Pages 7 - 10)
 - c) To note the draft public minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 21 July 2015.
For Information
(Pages 11 - 20)
 - d) To note the draft public minutes of the Public Relations and Economic Development Sub-Committee meeting held on 16 July 2015.
For Information
(Pages 21 - 24)
4. **PROCEDURE FOR CONDUCTING BALLOTS AT THE COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL**
Report of the Town Clerk.
For Decision
(Pages 25 - 30)
5. **CEREMONIALS WORKING PARTY**
Report of the Town Clerk.
For Decision
(Pages 31 - 34)
6. **PENSIONS BOARD - REVISION TO APPOINTMENT PROCESS**
Report of the Town Clerk.
For Decision
(Pages 35 - 40)

7. **INCREASING THE SUPPLY OF HOMES - ROLE OF THE CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION**
Joint report of the Director of Community and Children's Services and the City Surveyor.

For Decision
(Pages 41 - 50)

8. **HOUSING AND FINANCE INSTITUTE**
Report of the Town Clerk.

For Decision
(Pages 51 - 54)

9. **CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION AVIATION POLICY**
Report of the Town Clerk.

NB: This was also considered by the Planning and Transportation Committee

For Decision
(Pages 55 - 60)

10. **LONDON DEVOLUTION SETTLEMENT**
Joint report of the Town Clerk and the Remembrancer.

NB: The non-public appendix to this report has been circulated as a separately bound document.

For Decision
(Pages 61 - 66)

11. **HEART OF THE CITY - FUNDING RENEWAL**
Report of the Director of Economic Development.

For Decision
(Pages 67 - 76)

12. **CITY OF LONDON BUSINESS TRAINEESHIP PROGRAMME**
Report of the Director of Economic Development.

For Decision
(Pages 77 - 80)

13. **ADDITIONAL EVENTS AND TOPICAL ISSUES PROGRAMME**
Joint report of the Director of Public Relations and the Director of Economic Development.

For Decision
(Pages 81 - 84)

14. **CENTRE FOR EUROPEAN REFORM: SPONSORSHIP OF ANNUAL 'DITCHLEY PARK' CONFERENCE**
Report of the Director of Public Relations.

For Decision
(Pages 85 - 88)

15. **CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION THINK TANK SUBSCRIPTIONS**
Report of the Director of Public Relations.
For Decision
(Pages 89 - 94)
16. **LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION**
Report of the Town Clerk.
For Information
(Pages 95 - 98)
17. **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES**
Report of the Director of Economic Development.
For Information
(Pages 99 - 106)
18. **POLICY INITIATIVES FUND AND COMMITTEE CONTINGENCY**
Report of the Chamberlain.
For Information
(Pages 107 - 118)
19. **DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY OR URGENCY POWERS**
Report of the Town Clerk.
For Information
(Pages 119 - 122)
20. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
21. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
22. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**
MOTION - That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda

23. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**
To consider non-public minutes of meetings as follows:-
- a) To agree the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2015.
For Decision
(Pages 123 - 124)
- b) To note the draft non-public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 16 July 2015 and agree the recommendations in relation to the feasibility study for investing in the Barbican Centre and the Superfast City Broadband project.

NB: With the exception of the Barbican Centre and Guildhall School Capital Cap Replacement, the remaining recommendations were considered and approved under the urgency procedures.

For Decision
(Pages 125 - 130)

- c) To note the non-public minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 21 July 2015.

For Information
(Pages 131 - 136)

24. **BARBICAN CENTRE AND GUILDHALL SCHOOL CAPITAL CAP REPLACEMENT**
Report of the Town Clerk together with a report of the Chamberlain.

NB: This item has been considered by the Barbican Centre Board, the Board of Governors of the Guildhall School and the Corporate Asset and Resource Allocation Sub-Committees.

For Decision
(Pages 137 - 156)

25. **DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY OR URGENCY POWERS**
Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information
(Pages 157 - 160)

26. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

27. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED.**

This page is intentionally left blank

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE **Thursday, 16 July 2015**

Minutes of the meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee held at Committee Rooms,
2nd Floor, West Wing, Guildhall on Thursday, 16 July 2015 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Mark Boleat (Chairman)
Jeremy Mayhew (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Deputy Chairman)
Hugh Morris (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Douglas Barrow
Deputy John Bennett
Alderman Charles Bowman
Roger Chadwick (Ex-Officio Member)
Henry Colthurst
Simon Duckworth
Alderman The Lord Mountevans
Stuart Fraser
Marianne Fredericks
George Gillon
Deputy the Revd Stephen Haines (Ex-Officio Member)
Alderman Sir David Howard
Wendy Hyde
Vivienne Littlechild (Ex-Officio Member)
Edward Lord
Wendy Mead
Deputy Joyce Nash
Dhruv Patel (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Dr Giles Shilson
Jeremy Simons
Sir Michael Snyder
Deputy John Tomlinson
Michael Welbank (Ex-Officio Member)

Officers:

John Barradell	Town Clerk and Chief Executive
Simon Murrells	Assistant Town Clerk
Tony Halmos	Director of Public Relations
Damian Nussbaum	Director of Economic Development
Alistair MacLellan	Town Clerk's Department
Emma Sawers	Town Clerk's Department
Peter Kane	The Chamberlain
Caroline al-Beyerty	Financial Services Director
Michael Cogher	Comptroller and City Solicitor
Paul Double	City Remembrancer
Nigel Lefton	Office of the City Remembrancer
Peter Bennett	City Surveyor
William Chapman	Private Secretary and Chief of Staff to the Lord Mayor

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Deputy Alex Deane, Deputy Billy Dove and Deputy Alastair Moss.

2. **MEMBERS DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

3a. The minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2015 were approved as a correct record.

3b. The minutes of the meeting of the Projects Sub Committee held on 16 June 2015 were received.

3c. The minutes of the meeting of the Review of Outside Bodies Working Party were received. In response to a question from a member about appointments by the Court of Aldermen, the Chairman noted that the working party was conducting an information gathering exercise and that any decision on the City Corporation's outside bodies would be made by the appropriate committee in the usual way.

4. **KING'S COLLEGE SPONSORSHIP OF THE KING'S COMMISSION ON LONDON**

The Director of Public Relations withdrew from the room for this item.

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk on sponsorship of the King's Commission on London.

RESOLVED, that

- Sponsorship of £50,000 per annum for two years be approved to the *King's Commission on London*, at King's College London, from the Policy Initiatives Fund for 2015/16 and 2016/17 respectively, allocated to the *Research* section of the Fund, and charged to City's Cash.

5. **PROMOTION OF A CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION (OPEN SPACES) BILL**

The Committee considered a report of the Remembrancer on the promotion of a City of London Corporation (Open Spaces) Bill.

RESOLVED, that

- It be recommended to the Court of Common Council that authority be given to promote a City of London Corporation (Open Spaces) Bill in order to seek the legislative changes set out in the report.

6. **CHARGES FOR FILMING IN THE CITY**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Public Relations regarding charges for filming in the City. In response to comments from members, the Director of Public Relations confirmed that staff sought to manage filming as closely as possible and that the proposed charges were intended to be competitive with the City's peers.

RESOLVED, that

The increases in administration charges by the Film Team for managing filming requests, as set out in the report, be approved.

7. MEMBERS DECLARATIONS - CO-OPTED MEMBERS

The Committee received a joint report of the Town Clerk and the Comptroller & City Solicitor regarding co-opted members' declarations.

RECEIVED

8. TOWN CLERK'S BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE

The Committee received an update report of the Town Clerk on the Town Clerk's Business Plan.

RECEIVED

9. REVENUE OUTTURN 2014/15

The Committee received a joint report of the Town Clerk, Chamberlain and Remembrancer on the revenue outturn for 2014/15.

RECEIVED

10. POLICY INITIATIVES FUND

The Committee received a report of the Chamberlain on the Policy Initiatives Fund.

RECEIVED

11. FINTECH SECTOR UPDATE AND SPONSORSHIP OF INNOVATE FINANCE

The Committee received a report of the Director of Economic Development on the Fintech sector and sponsorship for Innovate Finance. In response to a question from a member the Chairman replied that fintech sector development was low key but encouraging, noting that it had been the subject of a recent high profile event at Guildhall.

RECEIVED

12. PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICE ACTIVITIES

The Committee received a report of the Director of Public Relations on recent Public Relations Office activities.

RECEIVED

13. APPOINTMENT OF CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION GOVERNOR TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE MUSEUM OF LONDON

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk on the appointment of a City of London Corporation Governor to the Museum of London.

RESOLVED, that

- Sir Steve Bullock be appointed to the Board of Governors of the Museum of London for a two-year term expiring 15 July 2017.

14. **BARRIERS TO STANDING FOR COMMON COUNCIL - INFORMAL MEETING OF RESOURCE ALLOCATION SUB-COMMITTEE DISCUSSION PAPER**

The Committee received a discussion paper regarding standing for election to Common Council that had been submitted to the informal meetings of the Resource Allocation Sub Committee on 19 and 20 June 2015.

A member noted that the time commitment for attending committee meetings of 40 hours per year was an underestimate. Moreover he felt that the City Corporation was falling short in terms of the diversity of the Court of Common Council, an issue that could be addressed by communicating more information more clearly into local communities. Another member agreed that the Common Council needed to reflect its electorate and therefore more outreach should be conducted with City businesses.

RECEIVED

15. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

16. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

Policy Dinner 15 July 2015

Members provided feedback on the Policy Committee Dinner held on 15 July. Given the attendance of two European Commissioners the dinner was considered to have been very successful. A range of views were given on the dress code of lounge suits but generally this was thought to be appropriate given the 'policy' nature of the dinner.

17. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED, that under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Act.

18. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

18a. The non-public minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2015 were approved as a correct record.

18b. The non-public minutes of the meeting of the Projects Sub Committee held on 16 June 2015 were received.

18c. The draft non-public minutes of the meeting of the Hospitality Working Party held on 17 June 2015 were received.

19. **INFORMAL RESOURCE ALLOCATION SUB-COMMITTEE**

The Committee considered the draft notes, discussion papers and recommendations of the informal Resource Allocation Sub Committee meetings held on 19 and 20 June 2015.

20. **LORD MAYOR'S STATE COACH**

The Committee considered some public relations implications around the restoration of the Lord Mayor's State Coach, to mark the 800th Lord Mayor's Show.

21. **ACADEMY EXPANSION PROGRAMME**

The Committee considered a resolution of the Education Board regarding the City of London Corporation's interim policy for assessing opportunities for academy expansion.

22. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

23. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED.**

There was no other business.

The meeting ended at 2.40 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Alistair MacLellan / alistair.maclellan@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

RESOURCE ALLOCATION SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Thursday, 16 July 2015

Minutes of the meeting of the Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee held at Committee Rooms, 2nd Floor, West Wing, Guildhall on Thursday, 16 July 2015 at 2.45 pm

Present

Members:

Mark Boleat (Chairman)	Deputy Catherine McGuinness
Roger Chadwick (Deputy Chairman)	Edward Lord
Stuart Fraser	Hugh Morris
Marianne Fredericks	Deputy Joyce Nash
George Gillon	Sir Michael Snyder
Deputy the Revd Stephen Haines	Deputy John Tomlinson
Jeremy Mayhew	Alderman Sir David Wootton

Officers:

John Barradell	Town Clerk and Chief Executive
Simon Murrells	Assistant Town Clerk
Alistair MacLellan	Town Clerk's Department
Emma Sawers	Town Clerk's Department
Tony Halmos	Director of Public Relations
Damian Nussbaum	Director of Economic Development
Peter Kane	Chamberlain
Caroline Al-Beyerty	Financial Services Director
Christopher Bell	Chamberlain's Department
Paul Nagle	Chamberlain's Department
Graham Bell	Chief Information Officer
Peter Bennett	City Surveyor

- 1. APOLOGIES**
There were no apologies.
- 2. MEMBERS DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**
There were no declarations.
- 3. MINUTES**
The minutes of the meeting held on 28 May 2015 were approved as a correct record.
- 4. OPERATIONAL PROPERTY REVIEW**
The Sub Committee received a joint report of the Chamberlain and the City Surveyor on the Operational Property Review.

RECEIVED

5. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**
There were no questions.
6. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
There was no other business.
7. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**
RESOLVED, that under section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.
8. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**
The non-public minutes of the meeting held on 28 May 2015 were approved as a correct record.
9. **BARBICAN CENTRE AND GSMD CAPITAL CAP REPLACEMENT**
The Sub Committee considered a report of the Chamberlain on the Barbican Centre and GSMD Capital Cap Replacement.
10. **PROJECT FUNDING UPDATE**
The Sub Committee considered a report of the Chamberlain regarding Project Funding.
11. **POLICE ACCOMMODATION PROJECT - GATEWAY 3 UPDATE**
The Sub Committee considered a joint report of the Chamberlain, City Surveyor and City of London Police Commissioner regarding the Police Accommodation Project – Gateway 3.
12. **BARBICAN EXHIBITION HALL 1 - ENABLING WORKS**
The Sub Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor regarding Barbican Exhibition Hall 1 Enabling Works.
13. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**
There were no questions.
14. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB-COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
Action Fraud
Members received an update from the Assistant Commissioner of City Police regarding funding for the National Fraud Intelligence Bureau's Action Fraud system.

The meeting ended at 3.35 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer:

Alistair MacLellan

020 7332 1416

alistair.maclellan@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

PROJECTS SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 21 July 2015

Minutes of the meeting of the Projects Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 10.00 am

Present

Members:

Sir Michael Snyder (Chairman)
Nigel Challis
Deputy Catherine McGuinness
Graham Packham
Deputy John Tomlinson

Officers:

Jacqui Daniels	Town Clerk's Department
Arshi Zaman	Town Clerk's Department
Caroline Al-Beyerty	Chamberlain's Department
Christopher Bell	Chamberlain's Department
Graham Bell	Chamberlain's Department
Huw Rhys Lewis	City Surveyor's Department
Victor Callister	Department of the Built Environment
Steve Presland	Department of the Built Environment
Iain Simmons	Department of the Built Environment
Karen Tarbox	Community and Children's Services Department
Paul Monaghan	Department of the Built Environment
Doug Wilkinson	Department of the Built Environment
David Pearson	Director of Culture, Heritage and Libraries
Jackie Boughton	Barbican Centre
Lee Dobson	Barbican Centre
Adrian Leppard	Commissioner of the City of London Police
Martin O'Regan	City of London Police
David Drane	City of London Police
Pete O'Doherty	City of London Police
Tony Cairney	City of London Police

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Mark Boleat, Roger Chadwick, Henry Colthurst, Christopher Hayward, Hugh Morris and Michael Welbank.

2. DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

Deputy Catherine McGuinness declared an interest in Item 14 as the owner of a flat in Bartholomew Close.

3. **MINUTES**

The public minutes and summary of the meeting held on 16 June 2015 were approved as a correct record.

4. **GATEWAY APPROVAL PROCESS**

The Sub-Committee noted the Gateway Approval Process which had been included in the pack for Members' information and reference.

5. **FREDERICK'S PLACE ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENTS - GATEWAY 2**

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 2, project proposal, report of the Director of the Built Environment concerning environmental enhancements at Fredericks Place.

RESOLVED – That the project proceed to Gateway 3/4, options appraisal, via the Regular approval track.

6. **1 ANGEL COURT ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENTS - GATEWAY 3 OUTLINE OPTIONS APPRAISAL**

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 3, outline options appraisal, report of the Director of the Built Environment concerning the environmental enhancement of 1 Angel Court.

RESOLVED – That approval be given to:-

- 1) the streets identified for enhancement, as shown on the plan in Appendix 1 to the report, and the design objectives for Angel Court as detailed at Appendix 4 to the report;
- 2) the development of detailed options to reach Gateway 4, at an estimated cost of £35,000; and
- 3) the Comptroller & City Solicitor being authorised to enter into any necessary legal agreements with the developer to fulfil the requirements of the Section 278 remedial instructions in line with the Section 106 Agreement.

7. **MAYOR'S VISION FOR CYCLING - QUIETWAYS - GATEWAY 3/4 OPTIONS APPRAISAL**

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 3/4, options appraisal, report of the Director of the Built Environment concerning the London Mayor's vision for cycling - Quietways.

The Director confirmed that he understood that there would be no physical separation of the highway and no impact on the traffic capacity of the City streets and he undertook to ensure that signage would be adequate for both cyclists and pedestrians. He added that the City would be consulting with neighbouring boroughs on proposals for a Quietway to the north of the City. In answer to a question by the Chairman, he also undertook to talk with the London Borough of Islington to discover whether progress had been made concerning a pelican crossing near to the City University in Chiswick Street and to inform the Chairman of the current situation.

RESOLVED – That:-

- 1) the report be noted and approval be given to the changes to the Quietways network as shown in Appendix 1 to the report;
- 2) approval be given to progress with the recommended measures and allow a wider public consultation and detail design to be undertaken; and
- 3) approval be given to implement a trial of an experimental closure of the northern end of Moor Lane.

8. **HARMAN CLOSE, ISLEDEN HOUSE, CITY OF LONDON AND GRESHAM ALMSHOUSES BUILDINGS - OPTIONS FOR REFURBISHMENT, GATEWAY 2 PROJECT PROPOSAL:**

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 2, project proposal, report of the Director of Community and Children's Services concerning options for the refurbishment of Harman Close, Isleden House and the City of London and Gresham Almshouses.

In answer to Members' questions the Director confirmed that the proposal was to undertake a standard condition survey of the properties at an estimated cost of £15,000 and the future usage of the properties would then be considered. In the meantime however, the properties would need to be in a reasonable condition for the residents.

RESOLVED – That the project proceed to Gateway 3/4 via the Regular approval track.

9. **MAIS HOUSE - FUTURE USAGE OF BUILDINGS AND SITE - GATEWAY 2 PROJECT PROPOSAL**

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 2, project proposal, report of the Director of Community and Children's Services concerning the future usage of the buildings and site at Mais House.

The Director stated that whilst the HRA currently funded the sheltered housing provision at Mais House, if that use was to be discontinued, the cost of the redevelopment would need to be funded by Section 106 or similar resources.

RESOLVED – That the project proceed to Gateway 3/4 via the Regular approval track.

10. **GOLDEN LANE ESTATE - HEATING AND HOT WATER EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT - GATEWAY 3/4 - OPTIONS APPRAISAL**

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 3/4, options appraisal, report of the Director of Community and Children's Services concerning the replacement of the heating and hot water equipment at Golden Lane Estate.

The Director amended the current budget estimate in the recommendation to read '£1,071,563 - £1,279,688' and confirmed that consideration had been given to the provision of Combined Heat and Power on the estate although this had been disregarded due to the uncertainty regarding its long term cost effectiveness and the Corporation's inability to ensure that leaseholders would take up the system.

RESOLVED – That approval be given:-

- 1) for £6,330 for the report and recommendations (retrospectively);
- 2) to proceed with Option 2; and
- 3) to the current budget estimate of £1,071,563 - £1,279,688.

11. **PROVISION OF WORKS RELATING TO ADAPTATIONS, REDECORATION WORKS AND CONDENSATION REDUCTION. GATEWAY 3/4, OPTIONS APPRAISAL**

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 3/4, options appraisal, report of the Director of Community and Children's Services concerning the provision of works relating to adaptations, redecorations and condensation reduction.

The Director amended the report and stated that £1,000 was required to reach the next Gateway.

RESOLVED – That approval be given to go out to tender to seek new contracts and that £1,000 be approved to reach the next Gateway.

12. **CITY OF LONDON PRIMARY ACADEMY - ISLINGTON - REQUEST FOR GATEWAY 4C REPORT TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY**

The Sub Committee considered a joint report of the Director of Community and Children's Services and the City Surveyor requesting the authorisation of delegated authority to consider the Gateway 4C report concerning the establishment of a two form entry Primary Academy on the site of the old Richard Cloudsley School in Golden Lane, Islington.

The Town Clerk reported that it was no longer considered necessary for the Policy and Resources Committee to consider the report.

RESOLVED – That:-

- 1) the progress made to date with respect of discussion with DfE / EFA and the results of the design team procurement be noted; and
- 2) the approval of the Gateway 4C report be delegated to the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Projects Sub-Committee and the Community and Children's Services Committee.

13. **CITY OF LONDON PRIMARY ACADEMY - SOUTHWARK - REQUEST FOR GATEWAY 4C REPORT TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY**

The Sub Committee considered a joint report of the Director of Community and Children's Services and the City Surveyor requesting the authorisation of delegated authority to consider the Gateway 4C report concerning the establishment of a two form entry Primary Academy on the site of the old Galleywall School in Bermondsey, Southwark.

The Town Clerk reported that it was no longer considered necessary for the Policy and Resources Committee to consider the report.

RESOLVED – That:-

1) the progress made to date with respect of discussion with DfE / EFA and the results of the design team procurement be noted; and
2) the approval of the Gateway 4C report be delegated to the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Projects Sub-Committee and the Community and Children's Services Committee.

14. **BART'S CLOSE ENHANCEMENTS - REQUEST FOR A GATEWAY 4 REPORT TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY**

A report of the Director of the Built Environment requesting that the Gateway 4 report concerning Bart's Close Enhancements be considered under delegated authority in order to progress the project.

RESOLVED – That authority be delegated to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Streets and Walkways and Projects Sub Committees to determine the Gateway 4 (Detailed Options Appraisal) report for enhancements to Bart's Close.

15. **PLOUGH PLACE ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENTS - GATEWAY 4/5, DETAILED OPTIONS APPRAISAL & AUTHORITY TO START WORK**

Members considered a Gateway 4/5, detailed options appraisal & authority to start work, report of the Director of the Built Environment concerning environmental enhancements to Plough Place.

RESOLVED – That approval be given to:-

- 1) the design as detailed in the main body of the report and set out in Appendices 2, 3 and 4 of the report;
- 2) the commencement of the project at a cost of £694,791, in line with the outline programme as detailed in section 3 of the report;
- 3) the budget as set out in section 5 and Appendix 6 of the report; and
- 4) any underspend from the evaluation stage be spent on implementation.

16. **HAMPSTEAD HEATH PONDS PROJECT - UPDATE REPORT**

Members considered a report of the Superintendent of Hampstead Heath providing an update on the Hampstead Heath Ponds project.

In answer to a question from the Chairman, the Director of the Built Environment reported that he would be submitting a further report to the September meeting of the Sub Committee on value engineering savings which had been achieved and he confirmed that he would be referring to these banked savings in the report.

A Member, also the Chairman of the Hampstead Heath, Highgate Wood and Queen's Park Committee, paid tribute to the work of the Officers involved with the project.

RECEIVED.

17. **ALDGATE HIGHWAY CHANGES AND PUBLIC REALM ENHANCEMENT - GATEWAY 6 PROGRESS REPORT**

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 6, progress, report of the Director of the Built Environment concerning highway changes and public realm enhancements in Aldgate.

The Director reported that he would be submitting a report to the October round of Committees on the outcome of negotiations concerning Section 106 monies and he confirmed that they were currently where they anticipated being at this stage.

RECEIVED.

18. **INSTALLATION OF BARRIERS TO ROYAL EXCHANGE AND EASTCHEAP PUBLIC CONVENIENCES - GATEWAY 7 OUTCOME REPORT**

A Gateway 7, outcome, report of the Director of the Built Environment concerning the installation of barriers to the Royal Exchange and Eastcheap public conveniences, was considered.

RESOLVED - That the report be noted and the project be formally closed.

19. **BARBICAN SEATING - GATEWAY 7, OUTCOME REPORT**

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 7, outcome, report of the Director of the Built Environment concerning Barbican seating.

RESOLVED – That:-

1) the lessons learnt be noted and the closure of the project be authorised; and
2) the return of the remaining project funding of £121,725.34 be authorised to the allocated pot of On-Street Parking reserve committed for the delivery of projects from the Barbican Area Enhancement Strategy.

20. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

21. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

The Chairman raised an urgent item for consideration

EU Procurement Regulations – Interpretation

The Chairman reported the receipt of an email from the Deputy Chairman concerning a recent meeting that had referred to differences in the way that EU countries interpreted EU procurement regulations, with the UK interpreting the requirements in a more onerous way than other member states. He suggested that a review of the issue be undertaken, drawing on whatever research has been undertaken and the practices of other public bodies.

RESOLVED – That the City Procurement Officer be requested work with other Officers, as appropriate, to look into the above matter and to submit a report to the Sub Committee thereon.

22. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED - That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act as follows:-

Item no.	Paragraph no.
23 - 42	3

23. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The non-public minutes of the meeting held 16 June 2015 were approved as a correct record.

24. **21 WHITEFRIARS STREET - REFURBISHMENT OF 3RD FLOOR AND RECEPTION AREA - GATEWAY 2 PROJECT PROPOSAL**

The Sub Committee considered and approved a Gateway 2, project proposal report, of the City Surveyor concerning the refurbishment of parts of 21 Whitefriars Street.

25. **FUTURE ACCOMMODATION PLANNING: LONDON METROPOLITAN ARCHIVES - GATEWAY 2, PROJECT PROPOSAL**

The Sub Committee considered and approved a Gateway 2, project proposal report, of the Director of Culture, Heritage and Libraries concerning the planning of the future accommodation for the London Metropolitan Archives.

26. **LIBRARIES & LMA IT AND INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT - GATEWAYS 2/4 PROJECT PROPOSAL**

Members considered a Gateway 2/4 project proposal report concerning an IT and Infrastructure project for the Libraries and the LMA.

27. **EMERGENCY SERVICES MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAMME (ESMCP) - GATEWAY 2, PROJECT PROPOSAL**

The Sub Committee considered and approved a Gateway 2, project proposal, report of the Commissioner of the City of London Police concerning the Emergency Services Mobile Communications Programme (ESMCP).

28. **POLICE ACCOMMODATION PROJECT - GATEWAY 3, ISSUE REPORT**

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 3 Issue report of the Chamberlain, the City Surveyor and the Commissioner of the City of London Police concerning the Police Accommodation Project.

29. **END USER DEVICE RENEWAL - GATEWAY 2, AUTHORITY TO START DESIGN AND PREPARATORY WORK**

The Members considered and approved a Gateway 2 project proposal report of the Chamberlain concerning the renewal of End User Devices.

30. **JOINT NETWORK REFRESH PROGRAMME FOR THE CORPORATION AND CITY OF LONDON POLICE - GATEWAY 3, OUTLINE OPTIONS APPRAISAL**
The Sub Committee considered and approved a Gateway 3, outline options appraisal, report of the Chamberlain concerning the joint network refresh programme for the Corporation and the City of London Police.
31. **POULTRY MARKET - GATEWAY 3 ISSUES AND ADDITIONAL OPTIONS REPORT**
The Sub Committee considered and approved a Gateway 3, issue and options appraisal, report of the City Surveyor concerning the Poultry Market, Smithfield.
32. **PROPOSED INVESTMENT, BARBICAN CENTRE - FROBISHER LEVEL 4 - GATEWAY 2, PROJECT PROPOSAL**
The Sub Committee considered and approved a Gateway 2, project proposal, report of the Managing Director of the Barbican Centre proposing investment works to Level 4 of Frobisher Crescent, Barbican Centre.
33. **ENABLING WORKS FOR THE LONDON FILM SCHOOL TENANCY AT THE BARBICAN EXHIBITION HALL 1 - GATEWAY 5 - AUTHORITY TO START WORK**
Members considered and approved a Gateway 5, authority to start work, report of the City Surveyor concerning enabling works for the London Film School tenancy at the Barbican Exhibition Hall 1.
34. **SUPERFAST CITY PROGRAMME - IMPLEMENTATION PHASE - GATEWAY 5**
Members considered and approved a Gateway 5, authority to start work, report of the Chamberlain concerning a proposal for funding to support the implementation phase of the Superfast City Programme.
35. **ACTION AND KNOW FRAUD PROCUREMENT - GATEWAY 5, AUTHORITY TO START WORK**
Members considered a Gateway 5, authority to start work, report of the Commissioner of the City of London Police concerning Action and Know Fraud Procurement.
36. **42 NORTH ROAD, LONDON, N7 - GATEWAY 7 OUTCOME REPORT**
The Sub Committee considered and approved a Gateway 7, outcome, report of the City Surveyor concerning 42 North Road, London N7.
37. **BARBICAN CAMPUS PROGRAMME: AMBER AND RED PROJECTS**
The Sub Committee noted an update report of the Managing Director of the Barbican Centre concerning their red and amber projects.
38. **IS PROGRAMMES RED AND AMBER PROJECTS**
The Sub Committee noted an update report of the Chamberlain concerning the IT Division's red and amber projects.

39. TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC REALM PROGRAMME: AMBER AND RED PROJECTS

The Sub Committee noted an update report of the Director of the Built Environment concerning the Transportation and Public Realm Programme's red and amber projects.

40. ACTION TAKEN UNDER URGENCY AND DELEGATED AUTHORITY PROCEDURES

The Sub Committee received a report of the Town Clerk detailing action taken under urgency procedures and delegated authority since the last meeting.

41. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE

There were no questions.

42. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED

There were no non-public urgent items.

The meeting closed at 11.15 am

Chairman

**Contact Officer: Jacqui Daniels
tel.no.: 020 7332 1480
jacqui.daniels@cityoflondon.gov.uk**

This page is intentionally left blank

PUBLIC RELATIONS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SUB (POLICY & RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Thursday, 16 July 2015

Minutes of the meeting of the Public Relations and Economic Development Sub (Policy & Resources) Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 4.00 pm

Present

Members:

Mark Boleat (Chairman)	Jeremy Mayhew
Sophie Fernandes	Deputy Catherine McGuinness
Stuart Fraser	Alderman The Lord Mountevans
Wendy Hyde	Ian Seaton
Oliver Lodge	Alderman Sir David Wootton
Edward Lord	

Officers:

John Barradell	Town Clerk and Chief Executive
Alistair MacLellan	Town Clerk's Department
Emma Sawers	Town Clerk's Department
Simon Latham	Town Clerk's Department
Tony Halmos	Director of Public Relations
Maja Erceg	Public Relations Office
Damian Nussbaum	Director of Economic Development
Isabelle Almeida	Economic Development Office
Paul Double	City Remembrancer
Nigel Lefton	Remembrancer's Department

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Roger Chadwick, Hugh Morris, Tom Sleigh, Sir Michael Snyder and The Rt Hon the Lord Mayor, Alderman Alan Yarrow.

2. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 May 2015 were approved as a correct record.

4. UPDATE AND FORWARD LOOK ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE INTERNATIONAL REGULATORY STEERING GROUP (IRSG)

The Sub Committee received an update and forward look report of the Director of Economic Development regarding the International Regulatory Strategy Group (IRSG). Members made the following comments:

- Cybersecurity and resilience should feature in the IRSG work plan.

- The Corporation should be clear that the IRSG's role was advisory and that it did not speak 'for' the City Corporation, to which the Chairman replied that the output of the IRSG reflected the views of the City financial and therefore the City Corporation should respect those views. The Chairman agreed that the terminology of the IRSG being "an advisory body to the City of London and TheCityUK" did not adequately reflect the reality of the position,
- The expertise and skills of the IRSG membership, its qualitative output and the figures it attracted from the financial services presented a net benefit for the Corporation.
- The Director of Economic Development agreed that future papers could provide more iterative detail on the work of the IRSG as well as examples of its output.
- The Chairman noted that the Corporation would shortly be reviewing its service level agreement with The CityUK. The recent appointment of the City's Special Representative would have an effect on the relationship. This would provide the opportunity to review the status of the IRSG

RECEIVED

5. ENGAGEMENT WITH EU POLICY MAKERS

The Sub Committee received a report of the Director of Economic Development on engagement with EU policy makers.

In response to comments from Members, the Director agreed to review the format and content of future engagement reports to maximise their value for Members.

RECEIVED

6. CURRENT ISSUES

The Director of Public Relations was heard on current issues relevant to the City of London Corporation.

Heathrow

The Chairman noted that City of London Corporation's support for a third runway at Heathrow arose from the fact it had endorsed the Airports Commission since its inception. The key issue was capacity and given that the Commission's recommendation for Heathrow was so emphatic it logically followed that the Corporation would endorse the Commission's conclusion.

Devolution

The Chairman noted that greater devolution to London was an emerging issue and that a paper would be submitted to a future meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee. He noted that at present 'devolution' was interpreted by central government as devolution to the Mayor rather than to the London boroughs.

Mayoral Candidates

The Director of Public Relations noted that Zac Goldsmith (Conservative) and Tessa Jowell (Labour) were the likely candidates.

Party Conferences 2015

The Director of Public Relations noted that a strong programme of party conference fringe events had been drawn up, including an event at the SNP Conference in Aberdeen in October 2015.

Tim Farron

Members noted that Tim Farron had been elected as the new Liberal Democrat Party Leader.

7. **POLITICAL AND BUSINESS CONTACT PROGRAMME - EVENTS REPORT**
The Sub Committee received a report of the Director of Public Relations on the City Corporation's political and business contact programme events. The Chairman noted that it did not feature TheCityUK events which could be incorporated into future versions.

RECEIVED

8. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**
There were no questions.
9. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
There were no urgent items.
10. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**
RESOLVED – That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.
11. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**
There were no questions.
12. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
There were no items of urgent business.
13. **CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES**
The Town Clerk noted that the formerly confidential minutes of the meeting held on 28 May 2015 were now non-public given the reason for their confidentiality had now passed.

The non-public minutes of the meeting held on 28 May 2015 were approved.

The meeting closed at 4.50 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Alistair MacLellan/ alistair.maclellan@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Agenda Item 4

Committee(s): Policy & Resources	Date(s): 24 September 2015
Subject: Procedure for conducting ballots at the Court of Common Council	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Decision
<u>Summary</u>	
<p>At its June meeting, your Committee considered a report setting out some potential alternative arrangements for conducting ballots at the Court of Common Council. Your Committee was supportive of considering the implementation of an Alternative Vote (AV) system and sought further information as to how this might be employed. This report sets this information out and seeks to provide clarity as to how such voting would be managed.</p> <p>The use of AV is a relatively straightforward concept, although it is difficult to articulate its use when electing to multiple vacancies in a written format to those unfamiliar with the system.</p> <p>Recommendation: That consideration be given to the introduction of an alternative vote system at the Court of Common Council for elections to Committees.</p>	

Main Report

Background

1. At the 30 May 2015 meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee, reference was made to the results of the various ballots for places on Committees undertaken at the 23 April meeting of the Court of Common Council.
2. It was suggested that alternative voting arrangements should be explored, with a view to achieving a fairer and more open democratic process and one that would ensure that those elected had a significant proportion of support from the Court as well.
3. The Town Clerk was consequently asked to examine potential alternative systems for Members' consideration and a report was produced for the June meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee. Members considered the information set out and consequently requested further clarification as to how the Alternative Vote (AV) system might be implemented.

Alternative Vote (or Instant Run-off Voting)

4. As your Committee previously noted, this method allows for ranked or preferential voting, where Members number against the candidates the order in which they would like to see them returned. The voter puts a '1' by their first choice a '2' by their second choice, and so on, until they no longer wish to express any further preferences or run out of candidates.
5. Candidates are elected outright if they gain the support of half of those voting. If the number of candidates reaching the threshold does not equal the number of

vacancies then the candidate who received the fewest first preference votes is eliminated from the contest and their votes are redistributed according to the second (or next available) preference marked on the ballot paper. This process continues until sufficient candidates are returned.

6. This system is widely used, including in the House of Lords (for electing Hereditary Peers), the House of Commons (for electing Select Committee Chairmen), for Australian State Government and House of Representative elections, the London Mayoral elections, and for the Presidential elections in Ireland and India. As set out in the previous report, the broad advantages and disadvantages are as follows:

Advantages:

- By encouraging candidates to seek first, as well as lower-preference votes, the impact of negative campaigning or tactical voting is significantly diminished.
- Tactical voting is also less prevalent as voters are confident their “first-choice” vote isn’t wasted. This also means that voters are less likely to vote for simply one candidate (where there are multiple vacancies), for fear of risking their other votes for alternative candidates knock their preferred candidate out.
- Elected Members would be confident they were the preferred choice of the majority of the Court.
- It is highly unlikely additional rounds of voting would be required, meaning that a result could always be declared following the Court (in the normal fashion).

Disadvantages:

- Reallocating lower preference votes can, potentially, throw up a “lowest common denominator” winner without much positive support (i.e. first preference votes) of their own.
7. The Alternative Vote system is similar in practice to that currently used during the election of Committee Chairmen where there are more than two candidates, but in a more efficient manner.
 8. Presently, where there are more than two candidates standing a ballot takes place and, if one of the candidates gains 50% of the vote they win and are elected. If nobody reaches that threshold, then the candidate with fewest votes is eliminated and another ballot takes place between the two remaining candidates to determine the winner. The obvious advantage of this process is that the winning candidate is the consensus choice and will be the preference of the majority of those voting.
 9. AV simply allows for this “second round of voting” to take place automatically, without the need to re-ballot.

Current System Example: Smith, Jones and Evans stand for Chairman. You vote for Smith. The votes are counted, nobody gets 50% of the vote, but Smith turns out to be the least popular and is eliminated. Members are re-balloted; this time you vote for Evans, who you prefer to Jones. In practice, you have expressed a preference - Smith as “first preference”, Evans as “second preference”.

Under AV: The AV system allows you to indicate this preference on your initial ballot paper, by marking Smith as 1 and Evans as 2, thereby obviating the need for Members to complete ballot papers again. Officers conducting the count will simply reallocate all votes for Smith (after his elimination) to whichever candidate the voter has indicated on their ballot paper as their second preference.

Multiple Vacancies

11. The same process is applied to voting for multiple vacancies. Members vote according to their preference, just as with voting for a single vacancy. If there are three vacancies, then just as with the present system you vote for three candidates – marking them 1, 2 and 3 as appropriate.
12. The only difference is that Members have the option to express a preference for candidates beyond the three they choose to vote for. Just as with the election for Chairmen/Deputy Chairmen set out in paragraph 9, the voter is simply expressing a preference for their “next choice” in the event that one of their preferred three candidates is unsuccessful.
13. The example below demonstrates the system in practice:
14. In this example, there are 3 vacancies on a Committee and 7 Members standing. 101 Members are in attendance at the vote, all casting valid ballots. Candidates are elected if they receive the backing of 50% of voters, so in this case a candidate needs 51 votes to be returned.
15. Members vote according to their preference, just as with voting for a single vacancy, as shown in the example below. The 1, 2 and 3 are – to all intents and purposes – the same as marking an “X” if the vote was run under the current system. However, marking a “4” means here that if one of your favoured three candidates gets eliminated early on, this vote will transfer to your next preferred candidate and therefore can still influence the result.













Committee – 3 vacancies



Adams, T.	3
Bastin, C.	2
Campbell, K.	4
Drake, T.	-
Eastham, G.	5
Furnell, J.	-
George, C.	1

16. In this instance, the voter’s favoured candidate is George. However, the voter realises that George is unpopular and is unlikely to be elected. Under the current system, this vote would effectively be “wasted” and the voter may opt to vote for somebody they prefer less but who is more likely to be returned. However, under AV, the voter knows that - if George is as unpopular as expected and is eliminated in the first round - then their vote will effectively be transferred to their fourth

choice candidate. This therefore removes the present inclination to vote for just one candidate, so as to avoid potentially diluting the value of your votes.

17. Accordingly, the voter decides that, should George or one of his other two preferred candidates fail to be returned, he would favour Ms Campbell above all other candidates. He therefore marks a “4” next to her name, to indicate she is his next choice.
18. In assessing the final three candidates, the voter decides they do not wish for Drake or Furnell to be returned in any circumstance; however, all things being equal, they feel that Eastham could do a good job so make him their fifth preference, whilst declining to indicate a preference for the other two candidates. This means that, no matter what, his ballot paper will not contribute any votes to either Drake or Furnell’s candidatures.
19. The papers are collected up in the normal fashion and first, second and third preference votes for each candidate counted. As shown below, Bastin and Campbell have gained the support of half of voters from first, second and third preferences and are duly elected.
20. One vacancy therefore remains. The candidate with the fewest votes (George) is eliminated accordingly; the ballot papers where George received a first, second or third preference vote are consulted, and his 12 “votes” reallocated according to who was indicated as the voters’ fourth preference.

Candidate	VOTES AFTER:			
	1 st Round	2 nd Round	3 rd Round	4 th Round
<i>Adams</i>	19	19		
<i>Bastin</i>	80			
<i>Campbell</i>	75			
<i>Drake</i>	41	43	48	62
<i>Eastham</i>	32	35	39	
<i>Furnell</i>	36	38	40	49
<i>George</i>	12			

 = Candidate Eliminated
 = Candidate Elected

21. We can see that a number of voters have declined to express a preference for more than three candidates. The seven voters who did express a fourth choice now have their vote reallocated (as shown in the table). In the case of our voter, he named Campbell as his fourth choice – but Campbell has already been elected. Accordingly, the voter’s vote for George is now transferred to his next available preference – Eastham.
22. The second round of counting now over, and with no other candidate having received the support of half of the Court, again the candidate with the fewest votes (Adams) is eliminated and their votes reallocated according to the preferences indicated.
23. Following the reallocation of votes, again no candidate has reached the threshold to be returned, so the candidate with the fewest votes (Eastham) is eliminated and their votes reallocated according to the next preference indicated.

24. Drake consequently reaches the required number of votes and is elected to the third vacancy.

What if there is a tie?

25. AV does not entirely remove the possibility of re-balloting being required where multiple vacancies are being contested. It is possible - as with the current system - that two Members might receive an equality of votes for a vacancy after all other candidates have been eliminated and there are no further votes to reallocate. In this instance, the candidate with the highest number of first preference votes is declared the winner, providing a natural “tie-breaker.” Should this still present a tie, then a straightforward run-off would be required at the next meeting, as is currently the case. However, with up to 125 Members voting and expressing various preferences, it is unlikely that this would be a common occurrence (indeed, AV renders a draw less likely than under the current system).
26. It is also possible (although highly unlikely) that more candidates reach the required threshold than there are vacancies for. Consider the table at paragraph 20: imagine in the final round of counting, both candidates pass the 51 votes mark. In this instance, the candidate with the highest total would still be returned. Another unlikely possibility is that, after the first round of counting, five of the candidates receive 51 votes, with the remaining 48 votes split between the other two candidates. In this instance, we would again deem those with the highest number of votes to be returned, with first preference votes used as a tie-breaker if required.

Implementation

27. As with any new process, there is some small risk of confusion at the point of implementation. AV is not used in the United Kingdom for General or Local Elections and it is therefore likely that a number of Members may be unfamiliar with the voting process.
28. The risk of any confusion would be mitigated to an extent by the provision of detailed voting instructions on the ballot paper itself. Members would also be reminded of the revised voting method before each ballot while the new system “beds in”.

Implications

28. Any changes to the voting system would require amendments to Standing Orders. This would be, subject to Members agreement, handled in the usual way and would require the approval of the Court of Common Council.

Conclusion

29. This report explains how the Alternative Vote system could be utilised for the election of the Members to Committees. Members are invited to consider whether they would wish to pursue its implementation for ballots held at the Court of Common Council.

Gregory Moore

Senior Committee & Member Services Officer

Town Clerk’s Department

T: 020 7332 1399

E: gregory.moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committee:	Date:
Policy and Resources Committee	24 September 2015
Subject: Ceremonial Protocols Working Party	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Decision

Summary

At its 17 July 2015 meeting, the Policy and Resources Committee agreed to establish a Working Party to oversee a review of the City Corporation's ceremonial protocols.

This report sets out the proposed composition and terms of reference of this Working Party and invites interested Members to put themselves forward to serve.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Approve the proposed Composition and Terms of Reference of the Working Party, as set out in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the report and at appendix 1; and
- Appoint Members to the Working Party.

Main Report

Background

1. At the Resource Allocation Sub Committee's informal meeting of 20 June 2015, a discussion paper was circulated setting out the case for a review of the current ceremonial practices and protocols.
2. Members noted that the current guidance as set out in the *Ceremonials* book was, broadly speaking, unchanged since 1991 and was often contradicted by other, more up-to-date specific guidance manuals (such as the *Swordbearer's Instructions* and the *Sheriffs' Red Book*). Consequently it was agreed that the totality of the guidance was in need of refreshing, so as to reflect current practice and present a consistent set of advice.
3. The Policy and Resources Committee subsequently discussed this matter at its 17 July 2015 meeting and agreed to establish a Working Party to oversee this review of the City Corporation's ceremonial protocols.

Composition and Terms of Reference

4. As discussed by your Resource Allocation Sub Committee and as agreed by your Committee in July, the remit of the Working Party would be to review the existing guidance documents, with a view to updating those elements where

practice has evolved. The Working Party would also consider those areas where there is a lack of clarity or where certain protocols should be revised, making recommendations as appropriate to the Grand Committee. Finally, as a direct result of this review process, the Working Party will seek to produce an updated and consolidated Ceremonials Book.

5. The **Terms of Reference** of the Working Party are therefore proposed as follows:

- To review the totality of the City Corporation's ceremonial protocols and practices, with the intention of bringing them up to date to reflect current circumstances;
- To examine the principles behind each protocol, particularly where there have been changes in practice over recent years, making recommendations as to the approach to take in future, with a view to an updated and consolidated Ceremonials Book being produced.

6. In line with your Committee's discussions at the July meeting, the proposed **composition** of the Working Party is as follows:

Ex-Officio Members

- Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee
- A Deputy Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee
- Chief Commoner
- Two Aldermen, nominated by the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen

Elected Members

- Three Members appointed by the Policy and Resources Committee (ideally candidates will have some interest/experience in ceremonial matters)
- Two Members with over ten years' service, elected by the Court of Common Council
- Two Members with under ten years' service, elected by the Court of Common Council

Officers

- The Remembrancer
- The Town Clerk

7. Members should consider whether the Chairman of the Working Party should be the Chairman of the Policy and Resources Committee, with the Chief Commoner as Deputy Chairman.

8. For ease of reference, the draft Terms of Reference and Composition are also set out at appendix 1.

9. Expressions of interest are therefore sought for the following vacancies:

- THREE Members with interest/experience in ceremonial matters

10. Expressions of interest in the following vacancies will then be sought from the full Court of Common Council, with any ballot to take place at the 15 October meeting:
 - TWO Members with more than ten years' service on the Court
 - TWO Members with fewer than ten years' service on the Court

11. Relevant officers without a place on the Working Party would also be closely involved and would be invited to attend meetings at the appropriate juncture; for instance, the Secondary and Under Sheriff for matters affecting the Sheriffs, or the relevant staff from the Mansion House for matters concerning the Mayoralty.

Conclusion

12. This report sets out the proposed composition and terms of reference for a Working Party to review the City Corporation's Ceremonial protocols and procedures. Members are asked to approve the composition and terms of reference as set out in appendix 1 and appoint Members to the Working Party accordingly.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Composition and Terms of Reference

Gregory Moore

Senior Committee & Member Services Officer

Town Clerk's Department

T: 020 7332 1399

E: gregory.moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Ceremonial Protocols Working Party

Composition

- Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee
- A Deputy Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee
- Chief Commoner
- Two Aldermen, nominated by the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen
- Three Members appointed by the Policy and Resources Committee
- Two Members with over ten years' service, appointed by the Court of Common Council
- Two Members with under ten years' service, appointed by the Court of Common Council
- The Remembrancer
- Assistant Town Clerk (Members' and Democratic Services)

Terms of Reference

- To review the totality of the City Corporation's ceremonial protocols and practices, with the intention of bringing them up to date to reflect current circumstances;
- To examine the principles behind each protocol, particularly where there have been changes in practice over recent years, making recommendations as to the approach to take in future, with a view to an updated and consolidated Ceremonials Book being produced.

Committees	Date:
Policy and Resources Court of Common Council	24 September 2015 15 October 2015
Subject: Public Sector Pensions Board and Police Pensions Sub-Committee – Revision to appointment process	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Decision

Summary

This report requests that the Policy and Resources Committee agrees to amend the process by which Scheme Member representatives are appointed to the Public Sector Pensions Board, such that they are appointed through an application and appointment process, rather than through an election involving all Scheme Members. The positions would still be open to all Scheme Members.

At present, the Terms of Reference state that the Scheme Member representatives would be “selected by election by Scheme Members.” Amending this to appoint Scheme Member representatives through an application and appointment process through an open and transparent appointment process against an agreed set of criteria would be the most effective way to ensure that appropriate candidates are selected. That process would also be significantly more cost effective than staging an election, and would also be in line with the approach being taken by many London Borough Councils.

Recommendation

Members are asked to recommend that the Court of Common Council approves an amendment to the Terms of Reference of the Public Sector Pensions Board such that the reference to the appointment of Scheme Members within the Board’s Terms of Reference is amended to read “Three Scheme Member representatives, appointed by a process determined by the Town Clerk and Chief Executive.”

Main Report

Background

1. In April 2015 the Court of Common Council approved the creation of the Public Section Pensions Board to comply with the requirements of the Public Services Pensions Act 2013. The purpose of this Board is to scrutinise the adequacy of arrangements in place to meet the requirements of scheme regulations and the extent to which local policy and guidance is fit for purpose.

2. The Court of Common Council agreed that the Public Sector Pensions Board should comprise three Scheme Manager representatives and three Scheme Member representatives, appointed as follows:

Scheme Manager Representatives

- Two Elected Members elected by Court of Common Council.
- One senior officer, appointed by the Town Clerk.

Scheme Member Representatives

- Three Scheme Member representatives appointed by election by all Scheme Members

3. These arrangements are set out within the Terms of Reference of the Board which were approved by the Court of Common Council. Therefore, a change to the process by which Members or Officers are appointed to the Board requires an amendment to the Terms of Reference (and therefore approval by Court of Common Council).

Current Position

4. The vacancies for two Elected Members to be appointed as Scheme Manager representatives to the Public Sector Pensions Board were advertised to the Court of Common Council. On 25 June 2015, the Court of Common Council appointed Alderman Ian Luder and James Tumbridge to be the Court's Scheme Manager Representatives to the Pensions Board for terms of four years.
5. The vacancy for a senior officer to be appointed by the Town Clerk has also been filled. Jon Averns, Port Health and Public Protection Director, has agreed to take this position.
6. The Terms of Reference of the Public Sector Pensions Board which were approved by Court of Common Council on 29 April 2015 stated that the Scheme Member representatives would be "selected by election by Scheme Members."
7. This approach was recommended to Members as it was thought at that time that an election would be required to ensure that the Scheme Member representatives were truly representative of the Scheme Members.
8. However, consultation with other London Boroughs had revealed that this is not a requirement. Of 19 London Boroughs who have responded to questions, 18 have decided to appoint Scheme Member representatives through an application appointment process.
9. There are two main benefits to this approach. Firstly, there is a significant financial benefit. It is estimated that an election would involve an electorate of around 12,000 people and cost approximately £15,000, in addition to being administratively burdensome. It is estimated that an application and appointment process would cost approximately £3,000, including officer time for review of applications review and the selection process, including

interviews, if required. This is likely to be a significant overestimate of the cost, as it is unlikely that two full days would be required for the selection process. However, it is financially prudent to assume the highest possible cost.

10. Secondly, appointment based on an application and appointment process, with assessment against clear and open criteria, (which would include areas such as knowledge of pensions schemes and the role of the Local Government Pensions Board or openness to learning about the schemes) would be the most effective way to ensure that appropriate Board Members are selected. It will also mean that consideration can be given to striking a balance between active Scheme Members (current employees), deferred Scheme Members (past employees not yet claiming a pension) and current pensioners, as these groups would have different priorities and concerns. This would obviously be dependent upon the applications received.
11. In order to implement this change, it will be necessary to amend the Terms of Reference of the Local Government Pensions Board. To offer the greatest degree of flexibility in future years, it is suggested that the process of appointing Scheme Member representatives be determined by the Town Clerk. The Town Clerk may consult with recognised unions as part of this process.
12. Therefore, it is recommended that the Terms of Reference are amended to read “Three Scheme Member representatives, appointed by a process determined by the Town Clerk and Chief Executive.”
13. Revised Terms of Reference are set out at Appendix A.
14. Members should note that the Public Sector Pensions Act 2013 also sets out a requirement for a Police Pensions Board to be created. This was created through a similar process to the Local Government Pensions Board, but as a Sub-Committee of the Police Committee. However, the appointment process for the Police Pensions Board is set out within the guidance, and is different from the Public Sector Board. The guidance requires that the Pensions Authority (in this case the Police Committee) appoints a Chairman, and the Chairman is then responsible for appointing the other Scheme Manager and Scheme Member representatives. Therefore, no amendment will required to the Police Pensions Sub (Police) Committee and no similar report will be submitted to the Police Committee.

Proposal

15. As stated above, amending the process by which Members are appointed to the Local Government Pensions Board requires an amendment to the Terms of Reference, and therefore approval by the Court of Common Council. The Committee is asked to recommend that the Court approves the amendment to the Terms of Reference to amend the reference to how Scheme Member representatives are appointed to the Committee.

Appendix

- Local Government Pensions Board – Proposed revised terms of reference

Chris Braithwaite

Senior Committee and Member Services Officer

T: 020 7332 1427

E: christopher.braithwaite@cityoflondon.gov.uk

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PENSIONS BOARD

1. **Constitution**

A Non-Ward Committee consisting of,

- Three Scheme Manager Representatives, of which;
 - Two will be Members of the Court of Common Council (who may not be Members of the Investment Committee, Financial Investment Board or Establishment Committee);
 - One will be an Officer of the Corporation, nominated by the Town Clerk and Chief Executive; and
- Three Scheme Member Representatives, selected by an appointment method determined by the Town Clerk and Chief Executive.

In addition, the Board has the power to appoint one co-opted member (with no voting rights) as an independent advisor to the Board, should the Board require further technical guidance.

2. **Quorum**

The quorum consists of any two Members, including one Scheme Manager Representative and one Scheme Member Representative.

3. **Membership 2015/16**

Three Scheme Manager Representatives
Three Scheme Member Representatives

together with the co-opted Member referred to in paragraph 1 above.

4. **Terms of Reference**

In line with the requirements of the Public Services Pensions Act 2013 for the management of the City of London Corporation's Pension Scheme, to be responsible for assisting the Scheme Manager (the City of London Corporation) in the following matters:

- a) Securing compliance with the scheme regulations and other legislation relating to the governance and administration of the scheme and any statutory pension scheme that it is connected to;
- b) Securing compliance with requirements imposed in relation to the scheme and any connected scheme by the Pensions Regulator; and
- c) Other such matters as the scheme regulations may specify.

5. **Chairmanship**

Any Member of the Board will be eligible to be Chairman. However, to allow reporting to the Court of Common Council, either the Chairman or Deputy Chairman must be a Common Councilman.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 7

Committee	Dated:
Policy and Resources Community and Children's Services (for information) Property Investment Board (for information)	24 September 2015 9 October 2015 14 October 2015
Subject: Increasing the supply of homes – the role of the City of London Corporation	Public
Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services The City Surveyor	For Decision

Summary

At the last meeting of the Committee Members were advised (via the notes of the informal meeting of the Resources Allocation Sub-Committee) that in response to the housing shortage in the capital a report setting out the scope for the provision of additional housing was being prepared and would be considered in the autumn. This report, in response to housing shortage in the capital, the City of London Corporation, set out proposed ambitions to deliver more homes in the policy document "Increasing the supply of homes – the role of the City of London Corporation."

The inability of the capital to supply sufficient housing to meet demand has led to problems of affordability for many households on low and medium incomes. This situation impacts not only London's communities, but is a risk to the capital's competitiveness and economy.

Meeting the housing needs of the capital requires the commitment and action of all local authorities to support new supply. The policy document before Members sets out the City Corporation's ambition to build on its presence and partnerships beyond the boundaries of the Square Mile to increase housing supply in the capital. It is an ambition that includes a commitment to increase the supply of homes on its social housing estates by 25 per cent, and provide 3,000 additional homes on development sites in the City Corporation's ownership. In doing so the City Corporation will deliver a range of homes – those that are social rented, homes that offer shared ownership and homes for market sale and rent.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- approve the policy document "Increasing the supply of homes – the role of the City of London Corporation"

- approve the commitment of that document to provide additional homes through opportunities
 - I. on the City Corporation’s social housing estates
 - II. on other City Corporation sites with development potential
- note that where the delivery of this vision will require additional resources this requirement will be set out and brought to Members for approval
- note that the progress of developing detailed proposals to support the ambition set out will be reported to Members.

Main Report

Background

1. The imbalance of housing supply and demand has seen house prices and rental costs rise faster than wage inflation. Homes for sale at the lower end of the capital’s housing market are now only affordable to those whose incomes are in the top quartile.
2. It is estimated that London needs to deliver 49,000 homes each year for ten years to address the existing backlog and newly arising demand. This level of delivery has not been achieved in any year in the last decade. Issues of infrastructure investment, planning policy, skills and material shortages, site ownership and control, and the availability of debt financing have all contributed to constrained supply.
3. Such housing shortage not only impacts on the capital’s population, but is a significant risk to London’s economy as it threatens the successful recruitment and retention of staff.
4. Responding to this issue has become a priority for national, regional and local government.

Proposals

5. The policy document “Increasing the supply of homes – the role of the City of London Corporation” sets out the contribution the City Corporation can deliver to respond to the housing challenges facing the capital. It acknowledges that no single organisation can deliver the homes London needs – rather it requires all of London’s local authorities to support delivery and maximise the opportunities for supply through their enabling role, their local plans and the formation of constructive partnerships.
6. In this context the City Corporation will play its role in meeting this challenge by identifying sites and partnerships through which new homes can be delivered. This includes opportunities both on its existing social housing estates and on other sites in the city’s ownership that offer the potential for development. In doing so the City aims to deliver the ambition set out in the Policy to provide 3,700 homes by 2025.

7. The Policy before Members sets out an ambitious commitment to provide homes of mixed tenures for those on a range of incomes. Within the City Corporation's social housing estates this programme will be funded through planning gain receipts, grant funding, borrowing within the Housing Revenue Account and cross subsidy from market sale of some new homes. On development sites outside of the HRA the City will explore the potential of private financing, joint ventures, borrowing or disposal to support the development of new homes.
8. The City Corporation will also work to enable private/public partnerships to maximise delivery of new homes. In addition the Policy sets out the City's intention to work with London Councils, central government and the Mayor of London to influence policy change to enable and support the market to respond to the scale of need that exists.
9. If approved, the implementation of the objectives set out will be overseen by the Housing Steering Group, jointly chaired by the Director of Community and Children's Services and the City Surveyor. This will provide the leadership alongside that of the Common Council to deliver this ambition.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

10. The ambitions set out in "Increasing the supply of homes – the role of the City of London Corporation" is consistent with the City's corporate priorities of supporting London to be the world's leading financial and business centre, and for delivering for London and the nation.

Implications

11. Delivery of the City Corporation's housing vision will require additional resources. These resources will be identified in the detailed proposal set out to support delivery and will be brought to Members for approval.

Conclusion

12. Tackling housing shortage in the capital is one of the most urgent issues facing all tiers of government in London. The City Corporation has the opportunity to contribute to addressing this issue by increasing the supply of homes on development sites across London. In doing so it has the opportunity to provide homes of mixed tenures for those on a range of incomes.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Increasing the supply of homes – the role of the City of London Corporation

Simon Cribbens

Policy Development Manager – housing and social care

T: 020 7332 1210

E: simon.cribbens@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Increasing the supply of homes – the role of the City of London Corporation

1 Context

- 1.1 Housing shortage in London is one of the most pressing economic and social issues that the capital faces. Growing population and reducing average household size is driving an exponential increase in demand for housing. London has both more people living there and a growth in people living alone or in smaller households – meaning any given number of people will now occupy more homes than in previous generations. Forecast growth in the capital over the next ten years will see London absorbing an additional population that is greater than that of Birmingham.¹ The Greater London Authority estimates this growth, combined with an existing backlog of demand, will require the delivery of 49,000 new homes each year for ten years.²
- 1.2 Despite this, supply has not kept pace. Issues of infrastructure investment, planning policy, skills and material shortages, site ownership and control, and the availability of debt financing have all contributed to constrained supply, and therefore the effective response of the market. Some local authorities with ambition to develop homes have also been constrained by borrowing caps imposed by government, and concerns about the impact of right to buy.
- 1.3 Capacity for homes has been identified on brownfield³ sites, but such sites often need investment in remediation or infrastructure to unlock their development potential. Other more viable development opportunities are stymied by local opposition, and local and national politicians have been reluctant to consider contentious issues such as reviewing the scope and scale of some planning constraints.
- 1.4 This imbalance of supply and demand has seen house prices and rents rise significantly faster than wage inflation, resulting in issues of affordability or households having to allocate very high proportions of income to meet housing costs.
- 1.5 The relationship between house prices in London and the incomes of the majority places the purchase of a home out of reach for many not already on the housing ladder. In 2014 the cheapest ten per cent of homes were sold at a price that was greater than four times the salary earned by three quarters of those in full time employment. The resulting inability to buy has seen a transfer to private renting and the growth of that sector to the point that it is now, at 27 per cent of homes, larger than the capital's social housing sector.

¹ *Homes for London: The London Housing Strategy 2014*, Greater London Authority, April 2014

² *Housing in London 2014*, Greater London Authority, April 2014

³ Brownfield is a term used in urban planning to describe land previously used for industrial purposes or some commercial uses.

- 1.6 While the social sector represents almost a quarter of homes, access to them is limited and many local policies, such as that of the City Corporation, exclude households on incomes that are high in relation to social rents, but would not buy a family home in the capital.
- 1.7 The scale of exclusion from housing – particularly home ownership – requires a response that is beyond the means and role of publicly funded subsidised housing. It is necessary for the market to meet the needs of the majority. To achieve this requires the delivery of a significantly increased supply of homes to bring market prices within the range of those currently excluded.
- 1.8 The impact of housing shortage is not just an issue for London’s residential communities, but for its economy. Recent research undertaken and reported by London First⁴ illustrates the scale of concern among both businesses and employees. Three quarters of London businesses surveyed thought that housing supply and costs are a significant risk to the capital’s economy. This concern is underlined by the experience of employees, particularly those aged 25-39, 70 per cent of whom find the cost of their rent/mortgage makes it difficult to work in London – and half of whom would consider leaving London to work in another region.
- 1.9 The implications of such research is that London businesses may fail to recruit and retain the skilled workforce it will continue to need to compete internationally, and fail to house those of all skill levels whose work sustains the functioning of a large and diverse economy. In response the London Chamber of Commerce and Industry has called for increased supply within London, with a particular emphasis on delivering market homes to meet the needs of those with an annual income of less than £50,000 – an ambition achievable only through significant change in the balance of supply and demand.⁵
- 1.10 Housing in London is now a political priority for national, regional and local government. Policy responses have to date failed to deliver the quantum of supply needed, with many initiatives focussed on stimulating demand for market homes rather than driving delivery. Some initiatives have subsidised homes for a narrow section of the population on the lowest incomes, and done little for those on low and middle incomes. Those initiatives that have targeted specific “keyworker”⁶ groups have subsidised housing for some, without meeting the needs of those employed in the range of roles essential to the functioning of public and private sectors.
- 1.11 The government is responding to this priority. In its recently published productivity plan⁷ the government recognised the importance of an effective land and housing market to the nation’s economic productivity and prosperity. It reflected that the UK has been incapable of building enough homes to keep up with growing demand, and has set out plans to tackle this by addressing the “excessively strict planning system”,

⁴ *Moving Out – How London’s housing shortage is threatening the capital’s competitiveness*, London First, September 2014

⁵ *Getting our house in order: The impact of housing undersupply on London businesses*, London Chamber of Commerce and industry, May 2014

⁶ A key worker is a public sector employee who is considered to provide an essential service. The term is often used in the context of those who may find it difficult to buy property in the area where they work.

⁷ *Fixing the foundations: Creating a more prosperous nation*, HM Treasury, July 2015

delivering higher density housing, improving co-operation between local authorities and releasing unneeded commercial land for housing.

2 Role of the City of London Corporation

- 2.1 The City of London Corporation has a role that goes beyond that of an ordinary local authority. The City Corporation works to support and promote London as the world's leading international financial and business centre and attract new business to the capital and the UK as a whole. It also works in partnership with public, private and voluntary sectors to improve long-term economic, social and environmental well-being across London.
- 2.2 It is for these reasons that the City Corporation wants to support the continuing development of an infrastructure, including housing, in which the City and the wider capital can continue to thrive.
- 2.3 For the City of London, the capital and the nation it is crucial that the right homes are delivered in the right places. The Square Mile has been granted exemption from the permitted development rights allowing the conversion of office space to residential units without planning permission. This exemption does not undermine the City Corporation's commitment to delivering more homes: it recognises instead that the economy is best served by supporting the agglomeration of the financial sector, and that the capital's housing needs will not be met by selective developments in the prime commercial market.
- 2.4 The City Corporation will build on its presence and partnerships beyond the boundaries of the Square Mile to deliver its commitment to increasing housing supply in the capital.

3 Housing vision

- 3.1 The City Corporation's vision is to deliver an ambitious programme of housing development, providing homes of mixed tenures for those on a range of incomes. Within our social housing estates this programme will be funded through planning gain receipts, grant funding, borrowing within the Housing Revenue Account⁸ and cross subsidy from market sale of some new homes. On development sites outside of the HRA the City will explore the potential of private financing, joint ventures, borrowing or disposal to support the development of new homes.
- 3.2 The City Corporation will use its close relationship with the finance sector and stability to enable partnership across the private and public sectors to maximise supply, and share innovation and best practice. The City Corporation will also work to shape and influence policy change that will enable supply and unlock opportunities.
- 3.3 By 2025 the City Corporation will deliver 3,700 new homes on sites across the capital.

⁸ The Housing Revenue Account (HRA) is a "ring-fenced" account held by the City Corporation and all local authorities that own council homes. It contains all the spending and income related to the dwellings owned by the City Corporation acting as social landlord.

4 Principles

- 4.1 The delivery of the City Corporation's vision for housing will be guided by five principles:

A focus on supply

- 4.2 London needs more homes. Delivering these homes requires all of the capital's local authorities to support delivery and maximise the opportunities for supply through their enabling role, their local plans and the formation of constructive partnerships. The City Corporation will play its role in meeting this challenge, identifying sites and partnerships through which new homes can be delivered.

Delivering a range of tenures to meet needs across the income scale

- 4.3 London needs to house a range of households, delivering the diversity of skills and labour required by the capital. Subsidised housing meets the needs of a limited group, while the failure of supply has locked those on low and middle incomes out of homes ownership. The City Corporation will deliver a range of homes – those that are social rented, homes that offer shared ownership and homes for market sale and rent.

Maximising site potential whilst delivering improved amenity

- 4.4 Delivering higher density housing is essential to meeting the capital's housing needs, and has been at the heart of the City Corporation's historic housing programme. Many of London's most desirable and affluent neighbourhoods are those that have the highest densities. Brownfield sites, surplus land, infill opportunities and the changing nature of town centres offer chances to intensify housing supply within the reach of transport hubs and other services. The City Corporation will continue to deliver high density homes in high quality environments, and use opportunities to intensify housing supply to deliver improved amenity.

Unlocking opportunities and partnerships

- 4.5 London housing issues cannot be tackled in isolation. The City Corporation will maximise the delivery of new homes by fostering and developing partnerships across the public and private sectors. It will build on the Corporation's existing experience of working in a number of London boroughs and leading partnerships that add value to local communities.

Securing value, assets and returns

- 4.6 Through delivering more social homes the City Corporation will increase the asset base within its Housing Revenue Account. It will deliver homes funded through Section 106 receipts, and cross subsidy from shared ownership sales and the provision of market homes. It will explore partnership ventures that unlock private funding while allowing the City to retain land assets. Where investment offers competitive long term returns, the City Corporation will explore the potential to fund new homes.

5 Objectives

25 per cent increase in homes on City Corporation housing estates

- 5.1 The City Corporation will deliver a 25 per cent increase in homes on its Housing Revenue Account estates by 2025. The City Corporation has already resumed the development of social housing, delivering 70 new homes since 2012.
- 5.2 Further delivery will be achieved by identifying sites for new homes on the City Corporation's own housing estates. An assessment of opportunities to increase the housing density within these existing estates has identified sites offering the potential to deliver more than 700 additional homes.
- 5.3 New homes will be delivered at "lifetime homes" design standards to ensure they meet both a range of needs, and needs that change over time. High standards of design will also ensure energy efficiency measures which will contribute to reducing fuel poverty, and contribute to the creation of attractive, well designed, accessible neighbourhoods that promote wider economic, health and social wellbeing.
- 5.4 The development programme will be supported by funding drawn from Section 106 receipts, grant funding from the Mayor of London's housing investment programme, borrowing within the Housing Revenue Account and cross subsidy from shared ownership and market sales. This approach will deliver a range of tenures to meet a variety of needs and incomes.

3,000 additional new homes

- 5.5 The City Corporation holds sites across many parts of London. Many are protected green spaces that are safeguarded and maintained by the City Corporation for the benefit of London's communities. Other sites, however, offer the potential to provide quality homes with improved local amenity and green spaces. Sites owned by the City Corporation have already been identified offering the potential to deliver 3,000 new homes by 2025.
- 5.6 The City Corporation will work with partner local authorities where it identifies potential sites and, where necessary and appropriate, discuss the re-designation of land where it has previously served other uses.
- 5.7 To deliver these new homes the City Corporation will explore the potential to partner with developers and housing associations. It will also explore the potential to establish a local housing company, either wholly owned by the City of London or in partnership with others, as a vehicle that could attract investment and deliver returns through the delivery of housing.
- 5.8 These homes will provide opportunities for home ownership and market rent, with additional affordable homes being provided in line with local planning requirements. The intention of this supply will be to contribute to meeting the needs of the vast majority of working households for whom subsidised housing is not and cannot be available.

Enabling private/public partnerships to maximise delivery of new homes

- 5.9 In the last parliament the government commissioned a review of the role of local authorities in delivering housing.⁹ One of the central recommendations, supported by government, is the development of closer partnerships between business and local authorities to unlock development opportunities and financing.
- 5.10 The City Corporation will support this work, building its own partnerships, and helping to enable them among others. This enabling support will be delivered in part through the City Corporation's proposed role as a founding member of the Housing and Finance Initiative (HFI). The HFI is a body focused on increasing the pace and scale of delivery of housing across all tenures by helping public and private sector bodies more easily form joint ventures through better understanding of needs and risks.
- 5.11 The City Corporation will also explore partnership opportunities and models that deliver both additional homes and added value to local communities and Londoners.

Influence policy change to encourage supply

- 5.12 Unlocking the supply opportunities the Capital needs requires policy makers in national, regional and local government to re-examine the barriers and constraints that exist. Public funding alone cannot resource the scale of additional housing that is needed, and therefore policy must enable and support the market to meet this need.
- 5.13 For the City Corporation this will mean working with London Councils, central government and the Mayor of London to influence change and debate. The City is committed to protecting the capital's quality green spaces, but recognises the need to look at the potential of land that is of lower quality and proximate to existing transport hubs to provide homes needed by Londoners.
- 5.14 The City Corporation will also work with partners to explore the role new housing supply and policy can take in promoting the better use of London's existing housing stock.

6 Implementation

- 6.1 A Housing Steering Group, jointly chaired by the Director of Community and Children's Services and the City Surveyor, has been established to lead the delivery of the City Corporation's housing vision. This will provide the leadership alongside that of the City Corporation's Common Council to deliver this ambition.

⁹ *From statutory provider to housing delivery enabler: Review into the local authority role in housing supply*, Department of Communities and Local Government, January 2015.

Committee(s) Policy and Resources	Dated: 24 September 2015
Subject: PIF Proposal: Housing & Finance Institute	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Decision

Summary

The Housing & Finance Institute (HFi) is an accelerator hub designed to increase both the speed and number of new homes built across all tenures in the UK. It aims to achieve this through working with local authorities and the private sector to define their housing ambitions and strategies, develop networks of professional and financial advisers to assist the delivery of housing projects, and to showcase examples of successful housing delivery partnerships. The HFi is completing its start-up phase and requires core-funding to become fully operational. It is in this context that it has requested funding from the City of London Corporation.

Recommendation(s)

Members agree that,

- The City of London Corporation become a Founding Member of the Housing & Finance Institute (HFi) at the cost of £40,000 per annum for 2015/16, 2016/17 and 2017/18, to be allocated to the *New Areas of Work* section of the Policy Initiatives Fund and charged to City's Cash.
- Authority be delegated to the Town Clerk, under Standing Order 41, to enter into membership of the HFi on such terms as he considers appropriate.

Main Report

Background

1. During the previous Parliament the then-Coalition Government launched a review into the role that local authorities play in housing supply. The report – *From Statutory Provider to Housing Delivery Enabler: Review into the local authority role in housing supply* – was published in January 2015 and is commonly referred to as the [Elphicke-House Report](#). Common issues identified by the report included the facts that new housing projects took between 3-5 years to deliver new homes and secure finance, and that businesses found they had between 300-400 meetings across different local authorities to secure a single contract. Moreover new businesses were sometimes struggling to access the tools, resources and contacts to help deliver new homes.
2. The report's recommendations included the establishment of the Housing & Finance Institute (HFi), an accelerator hub to increase the speed and number of

new homes financed and built across all tenures of housing. The intention to implement this recommendation was announced in the March 2015 Budget and was formally adopted following the May 2015 General Election.

Housing & Finance Institute

3. The HFi (www.thehfi.com) was launched in Guildhall in June 2015 and is currently raising its core funding. It is a company limited by guarantee (No. 96554497) in the form of a not-for-profit member organisation overseen by board drawn from the public sector and the housing and finance industries. The HFi Board will be responsible for overseeing the HFi work programme and monitoring the effectiveness of its membership and business engagement.
4. The HFi consists of a staff of Chief Executive, full-time Programme Director and part-time Communications Assistant. The Chief Executive is Natalie Elphicke, co-author of the Elphicke-House Report, a qualified barrister with expertise in housing finance, and co-founder and Chairman of Million Homes, Million Lives.
5. As an accelerator hub the HFi will seek to increase the speed and number of new homes financed nation-wide through three main areas of activity. First and foremost the HFi will through a *Housing Business Ready* programme help local authority partners define their housing ambitions and strategies, assist them in evaluating and understanding risk, as well as assessing options for the funding and delivery of homes. The first cohort of local authorities commenced the *Housing Business Ready* programme in September 2015. Secondly, *HFi Plus* will develop a network of professional and financial advisers who will provide local authority partners with project-specific feedback. Third, *HFi Celebrate* will showcase examples of innovation and delivery in financing, partnerships and homebuilding.

Invitation to be Founding Member

6. The City of London Corporation has been invited to join the board of the HFi as a Founding Member. Founding Members provide core funding or benefits-in-kind to the HFi, with core funding used to finance its set-up and salary costs. The City Corporation has been asked to provide the HFi with £120,000 over three years (£40k per annum). Current Founding Members include Pinnacle PSG (housing management regeneration) KeepMoat (homebuilding) and Local Partnerships (a national delivery body jointly owned by HM Treasury and the Local Government Association).
7. Founder Members sit on the HFi Board and provide strategic guidance on the HFi work programme, membership and business engagement.
8. Should the City Corporation choose to join the HFi as a Founding Member, the HFi will provide the City Corporation with a demonstrable role and profile in the delivery of housing and housing finance at both the London and national level. City Corporation support for the HFi would be consistent with both principles of

'housing delivery' and 'unlocking partnerships' outlined in the City of London Corporation housing policy document elsewhere on the agenda.

9. Furthermore, having established that the HFi has the full support of the Government and that it accords with the City Corporation's own housing objectives, the Policy Chairman has agreed to chair the HFi Board. This role is not dependent on the Policy Committee's decision regarding core funding.
10. The HFi receives additional funding and resources from corporate (non-founding) members including Laing O'Rourke (major housing association based in north east of England) Home Group (midsized housing association based in northwest of England). The Royal Bank of Scotland plus two further institutional investors have pledged corporate subscriptions.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

11. The Chamberlain, Comptroller & City Solicitor and the Director of Community and Children's Services have been consulted on this report and their comments incorporated.
12. It is proposed that the sum of £40,000 per annum for three years (2015/16, 2016/17 and 2017/18) be allocated from your Committee's Policy Initiatives Fund for those years categorised under the *New Areas of Work* section of the Fund and charged to City's Cash. The current uncommitted balance available within your Committee's Policy Initiatives Fund 2015/16 amounts to £389,000, for 2016/17 £472,000 and for 2017/18 sufficient funds will be available prior to any allowance being made for other proposals on today's agenda.

Conclusion

13. The HFi has been established in order to facilitate faster and more efficient delivery of new housing across all tenures through working with local authorities and private sector partners to define housing ambition, develop contacts and relationships, and celebrate best practice. The HFi has requested some core funding from the City of London Corporation in order to become fully operational. Given the aims of the HFi match the principles expressed in the City of London Corporation's housing policy it is recommended that members agree the allocation of £40,000 per annum for three years in core funding to the HFi.

Alistair MacLellan

Town Clerk's Department

T: 020 7332 1416

E: alistair.maclellan@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 9

Committee(s) Planning and Transportation – <i>for information</i> Policy and Resources Court of Common Council	Dated: 8 September 2015 24 September 2015 15 October 2015
Subject: City of London Corporation Aviation Policy	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Decision

Summary

This report sets out the City of London Corporation's policy positioning on the issue of UK aviation capacity since 1996. It notes that the City Corporation has consistently supported expansion in aviation capacity and, in light of the recent Airports Commission, recommends that Members adopt an aviation policy position to inform, as far as possible, the Government's response to the Airports Commission. The report also recommends that the Policy Committee provide financial assistance to the *Let Britain Fly* campaign so that it may continue to make the case for the expansion of airport capacity in London and the South East ahead of the expected Government response the Airports Commission's recommendations at the end of this year.

Recommendations

Members of the Planning and Transportation Committee and the Policy and Resources Committee are asked to,

- Note the City of London Corporation's positioning on UK aviation policy to date;

Members of the Policy and Resources Committee are asked to,

- Agree that an additional £10,000 be allocated to the *Let Britain Fly* campaign from the Committee's Policy Initiatives Fund, 2015/16, allocated to the *Events* section of the Fund and charged to *City's Cash*.
- Agree the following policy position be recommended to the Court of Common Council for approval:

The City of London Corporation is clear that the lack of airport capacity in the South East of England has been needed to be addressed for a number of years. Not only because it is integral in maintaining the City of London's preeminent position a leading financial centre, but it is also essential for the creation of jobs and growth across wider London and the rest of the UK.

Our own research backs this up showing that airport capacity remains one of the key factors necessary to achieve the forecast of 145,000 jobs being

created in Central London in the next ten years. Furthermore, additional reports we published on the issue of aviation capacity in both 2002 and 2008 highlight its potential impact on the wider economic performance of the City. The latter found that 82 per cent of businesses regarded Heathrow as 'critical' or 'very important' to their organisations.

Following the publication of the Final Report of the independent Airports Commission, led by Howard Davies, in July 2015, the City of London Corporation supports the main recommendation for the expansion of Heathrow through the building of a third runway.

If the City is to continue to compete on the global stage then the financial and professional services firms based in the UK need to be able to do business globally. They especially need to be easily able to travel to emerging markets where economic opportunity is abundant. As the Commission made clear, Heathrow can provide that capacity most efficiently and effectively.

The City of London Corporation also agrees that expansion should not come at a cost which ignores the measures that the Airports Commission highlighted, in their entirety, which help address the negative impact on the local environment, air quality and communities.

As with the Commission's view, we urge the Government to make a quick decision on the Commission recommendations and keep to their commitment on an announcement before the end of the year.

Main Report

Background

1. The City of London Corporation has engaged in the debate regarding UK national aviation policy since the 1930s when it purchased land for a City of London Corporation airport at Fairlop in Essex. More recently, engagement since the late 1990s has consisted of consultation responses and the commissioning of research to establish the requirements for UK aviation policy in the context of maintaining London as the world's leading international financial and business centre.
2. Since 1996 the City of London Corporation has consistently supported and endorsed proposals that have sought to increase aviation capacity in the south east of England, provided they are accompanied by the requisite surface transport infrastructure and appropriate environmental safeguards. A summary of policy positions adopted by the City Corporation on aspects of UK aviation capacity is included as an appendix.

Current Position

3. The Airports Commission was established in September 2012 with the remit to examine the need for additional UK airport capacity and recommend how that need could be met in the short, medium and long term. The Commission (often

referred to as the Davies Commission, after its Chairman) produced its final report in July 2015. It concluded that a new northwest runway at Heathrow airport, a westerly extension to the existing northern runway at Heathrow, and a new runway at Gatwick, all presented credible options for expansion, but nevertheless concluded emphatically that a new northwest runway at Heathrow Airport, allied with a package of measures to mitigate its environmental and community impacts, presented the strongest case for increased airport capacity in the south east of England. Should the Government choose to expand capacity at Heathrow, the City of London Corporation would seek to ensure that appropriate environmental measures were put in place to protect City managed open spaces.

4. The Airports Commission noted that London airport capacity has been a UK public policy issue for over 50 years. For the last 20 of those, the City of London Corporation has consistently supported expansion of some kind or other at a variety of existing London airports. Now that the Commission has reported to government with an emphatic recommendation for increasing London's airport capacity through a new runway at Heathrow, and in anticipation of the government's final decision on airport capacity, which is expected by the end of 2015, the City of London Corporation has the opportunity to endorse the Commission's recommendation and reflect the needs of the City's business community and London's role as the world's leading international financial and business centre.
5. Therefore it is proposed that the City of London Corporation adopt the policy position outlined in the recommendations above. The statement reflects the positioning adopted by the City Corporation to date, the evidence it has gathered through its commissioning of research, the needs and requirements of City businesses, and the evidence-led recommendations of the Airports Commission.

Let Britain Fly

6. Members are also asked to provide further financial assistance to the *Let Britain Fly* campaign. *Let Britain Fly* is a business led campaign that argues for expansion of airport capacity in London and the South East to protect and enhance Britain's status as a global aviation hub. The campaign is led by London First who also provides the secretariat for the campaign; other affiliates include the City Corporation, the Institute of Directors, the London Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Canary Wharf Group, the Federation of Small Businesses, Aberdeen Asset Management and Harrods. The campaign has made a very positive contribution to the debate on airport capacity through a successful programme of events, political engagement and media activity.
7. In October 2013, the Policy and Resources Committee made a contribution of £25,000 to assist in the establishment of *Let Britain Fly*. The campaign is now requesting a further £10,000 of funding from each of its main supporters to help maintain momentum in the run up to the Government's response to the findings of the Davies Commission, which is expected before the end of the year.

8. This report therefore recommends that the City Corporation contribute a further £10,000 to the *Let Britain Fly* Campaign, funded from the Committee's Policy Initiatives Fund, 2015/16, allocated to the *Events* section of the Fund, and charged to *City's Cash*. The current uncommitted balance available within your Committee's Policy Initiatives Fund, 2015/16 amounts to £389,300, prior to any allowance being made for any other proposals on today's agenda.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

9. The Comptroller & City Solicitor, Director of Open Spaces, Director of Public Relations, Director of Economic Development and the Director of the Built Environment have been consulted on this report and their comments incorporated.

Conclusion

10. The City of London Corporation has been engaging consistently with the issue of UK aviation capacity since 1996. Now that the Airports Commission has reached a comprehensive recommendation for expansion and expansion at Heathrow in particular, members are recommended to adopt a policy position so that the case for increased aviation capacity can be made as strongly as possible ahead of the Government's decision on expansion at the end of this year.

Alistair MacLellan

Town Clerk's Department

T: 020 7332 1416

E: alistair.maclellan@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Appendix – City of London Corporation’s Positioning on UK Aviation Capacity

11. In September 1996, the Policy and Resources Committee resolved to support the construction of Terminal 5 at Heathrow Airport, and for the construction of Crossrail to ensure easy surface access to Heathrow from central London. This approach was endorsed by the Planning and Transportation Committee in December 2001.
12. In October 2002 the Planning and Transportation Committee noted that City Corporation-commissioned research indicated overwhelming support from the City business community for expansion of aviation capacity at Heathrow. The Committee agreed a consultation response to the Secretary of State for Transport’s consultation on airport capacity in the south east of England that called for the creation of increased capacity at Stansted and Gatwick alongside increased capacity at Heathrow. Supplementary responses to the consultation by the City Corporation included a call for environmental safeguards to ensure the protection of Epping Forest, and, in June 2003, endorsement of a proposed extra runway at Gatwick provided it was accompanied by the necessary surface access infrastructure.
13. In February 2004 the Policy and Resources Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee considered the government’s subsequent White Paper on aviation capacity and welcomed its commitment to airport expansion in the south east, and called on central government to expedite detailed proposals for airport expansion and surface access enhancements as soon as possible.
14. In June 2007 the Planning and Transportation Committee authorised a response to BAAs consultation on improved surface access to Stansted airport that called for improved public transport access to the airport alongside environmental safeguards to mitigate any adverse effect on Epping Forest.
15. In February 2008 the Policy and Resources Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee approved an interim response to the Government’s *Adding Capacity at Heathrow* consultation that stressed the critical importance of good aviation services, allied with surface transport access, to City businesses. In that context, the City Corporation supported additional capacity at both Heathrow and Stansted.
16. In July 2008 the City of London Corporation commissioned and published research by York Aviation on *Aviation Services and the City*. The report concluded that expansion of capacity at London’s airports was crucial, and that development of additional capacity at Heathrow in particular was essential. That research also established that 82% of City businesses surveyed regarded Heathrow as critical or very important for their organisations.
17. In January 2011 the City of London Corporation commissioned and published research by York Aviation on *Aviation Services and the City – 2011 Update*. Its

recommendations included an endorsement of the need to revisit the potential for an additional runway at Heathrow.

18. In September 2011 the Policy and Resources Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee authorised a response to the Department for Transport's scoping document on aviation capacity that broadly supported increased aviation capacity, particularly at Heathrow. The response expressed the view that

...a new hub airport could offer a possible long-term solution and should be considered in the forthcoming Government aviation policy review. However, London and the UK cannot afford to stand still while our rivals across the globe are building for the future and other short and medium term options also need to be covered in the review including such measures as revisiting the addition of a third runway at Heathrow, expansion of London City Airport, mixed mode operations at Heathrow, the development of high speed rail and the addition of runway capacity at either Stansted or Gatwick...

19. In December 2012 the City of London Corporation commissioned and published research by York Aviation on *London's Air Connectivity* which concluded that access to and from the City for emerging markets such as India and Latin America was dependent on an airport acting as a global hub for these routes. Heathrow accounted for almost 85% of transfer passengers in 2011, across four London airports surveyed (Heathrow, Gatwick, Stansted and Luton).

20. In February 2013 the sum of research commissioned by the City Corporation was submitted to the London Assembly's Transport Committee's investigation into London's airport capacity. The submission concluded that, whilst London was not losing connectivity in the short term, lack of investment would not leave the UK best placed to engage with emerging economies worldwide.

Committee(s):	Date(s):
Policy and Resources Committee	24 September 2015
Subject: London Devolution Settlement	Public
Report of: The Town Clerk and the City Remembrancer	For Decision
Summary	
<p>Devolution to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland has not been accompanied by devolution within England. After the September 2014 Referendum on Scottish Independence, however, the Government outlined a series of proposals for the devolution of powers from central government to other parts of the country, including parts of England.</p> <p>Within London, London Councils has been considering the devolution issue and has now agreed a proposal with the Mayor of London for the Government's consideration covering employment, skills, business support, crime and justice, health and housing. There are some significant issues to be resolved in respect of the extent of devolution in London and the governance arrangements for devolved powers. It is expected that sub-regional partnerships of boroughs will provide operational leadership in respect of any newly devolved powers. The City is a member of the most developed sub-regional borough partnership, Central London Forward.</p> <p>The City has engaged fully with this work to date, and it is in its wider interests to continue to do so.</p>	
Recommendation(s)	
<p>Members are asked to note current work to devolve powers to and within London and to agree that the City Corporation should -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support London Councils' approach to the issue of devolution. • Continue to work with the inner London boroughs in Central London Forward. • Provide legal, technical and political support where this can be helpful to London Councils and Central London Forward to support the devolution agenda. 	

Main Report

Background

1. Since the late 1990s Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland have each achieved varying degrees of devolution, while London has an elected Mayor with responsibility for policy, transport and limited powers over planning and economic development. Nevertheless, the United Kingdom remains one of the

most centralised democracies in the developed world. In particular, there has been little devolution within England. Although proposals were brought forward in the early 2000s to devolve power to English regions, they were abandoned when the North East voted against them by a significant majority in a 2004 referendum.

2. The issue of further devolution to parts of England was catalysed, however, by the referendum on Scottish independence. On the morning after the vote, the Prime Minister outlined a series of proposals for the devolution of powers from central government to other parts of the country, including parts of England. Since then the Government has agreed substantial devolution deals with Manchester and Cornwall, covering transport, health and social care and economic development functions. Proposals for both areas had been in development for some time and, crucially, political leaders in both areas were able to come to a consensus on the details of the proposals.
3. The Government has linked the devolution of powers to enhanced governance. Areas seeking devolved powers are expected to demonstrate to Ministers and officials that they have robust governance arrangements in place. The Government's preferred model is devolution to an elected mayor at the head of a combined authority, in line with the deal agreed with Manchester. The Government has recognised, however, that the mayoral model may not be suitable for all contexts, particularly rural areas. Cornwall Council's deal does not require it to adopt a mayoral governance model.
4. The legislative changes required to implement the Government's devolution policy are in the Cities and Local Government Devolution Bill, introduced to Parliament shortly after the General Election. The Bill puts in place a broad legislative framework that enables the establishment of combined authorities led by elected mayors, and empowers Ministers to devolve a wide range of powers and functions to them. The Bill also enables functions to be transferred to district and county councils in England. As it stands, the Bill does not enable significant further devolution to London. It could, however, be amended to do so.

The position in London

5. There is a tendency on the part of some to equate devolution with elected mayors, hence a view that because London has an elected Mayor it has devolution and that nothing more needs to be done. However, the powers of the Mayor of London are very limited in comparison to, for example, the Mayor of New York or the devolved assemblies/Parliaments in the UK. Accordingly, London political leaders, including the Mayor, have pressed the case for more devolution to London.
6. In 2013 the London Finance Commission, established by the Mayor of London and chaired by Tony Travers, reviewed the devolution issue. This exercise was recognised as part of a long-term debate to secure broad agreement on the need for devolution and how it might be achieved. On taxation the commission recommended the devolution of property taxes

collected in London. The Commission's report received widespread backing within London local government, but with no great expectation of early progress.

7. Devolving tax raising powers is generally opposed by the Treasury and carries with it significant practical issues. Partly for this reason, the focus of the debate about further devolution to London has shifted away from fiscal devolution towards the devolution of public services. In this context, the devolution debate has been linked with a separate debate about the inadequacy of national programmes in dealing with a number of major policy areas, particularly employment and skills training. Consequently, these areas are widely seen as the most fertile for devolution.
8. Within London there has also been recognition that some issues are best handled at a level above that of the boroughs but below that of the Mayor. As a result, a number of sub-regional groupings of boroughs have emerged with varying degrees of collaboration. The most developed of these is Central London Forward (CLF), which comprises the City, Westminster, Kensington and Chelsea, Wandsworth, Lambeth, Southwark, Islington and Camden. Each member contributes to the cost of a small secretariat, which is housed by the City Corporation. The chairmanship rotates annually between the leaders. Individual projects are typically led by one of the members. This grouping works well, with a high degree of trust having been developed among the members, notwithstanding political differences. CLF's three main objectives are: -
 - to influence policy on major issues affecting Central London;
 - to promote the strategic importance and needs of Central London; and
 - to identify and facilitate coordinated working on areas of mutual interest to partners.
9. The next most developed group is probably the "Growth Boroughs", the six councils (all labour) that hosted the Olympics – Barking and Dagenham, Greenwich, Hackney, Newham, Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest. Other groupings are less well-established and can be susceptible to change of political control. None of the groupings has any legal status, so generally one borough has to be "purse holder" – as the City is for Central London Forward.
10. The most developed project run at sub-regional level is Central London Forward's Working Capital Pilot, established as part of the 2014 London Growth Deal. The £11 million project provides employment services to those leaving the Government's Work Programme without a job and claimants of Employment Support Allowance, and aims to demonstrate that improved outcomes can be achieved where services are devolved to a sub-regional level.
11. The Government has signalled that it is willing to consider fully worked-up proposals from areas seeking devolution, with the Treasury now acting as the lead government department on devolution. There have been intensive discussions between London Councils (the representative body for the

London boroughs and the City), the Mayor's office and the Treasury to develop a devolution package for London. A full proposal, entitled 'The London Proposition', was submitted to Treasury at the beginning of September by London Councils and the Mayor of London. The full document is not yet in the public domain and has been circulated separately. The document calls for devolution and public service reform in the following areas:-

- employment;
 - skills;
 - business support;
 - crime and justice;
 - health; and
 - housing.
12. Included in the proposal was an outline for joint decision making arrangements for the exercise of newly devolved powers, designed to meet the governance requirements requested by the Government. Under the proposals, the London Congress—which consists of the Mayor and the leaders of the boroughs and the City of London—would have strategic oversight for newly devolved responsibilities across Greater London, with sub-regional partnerships of London local authorities, such as Central London Forward, exercising the powers at an operational level.
13. There are, however, difficulties associated with further devolution to London. The key points are: –
- The Government's preferred option is to devolve to an elected Mayor rather than to a body such as the London Congress.
 - The Mayor's office would generally prefer powers to be with the Mayor whereas the boroughs are uncomfortable with this and want power to be with them.
 - The boroughs recognise that sub-regional groupings are needed, but if these are to have devolved powers they need to be formally constituted with sound governance arrangements.
 - There are differences of view between boroughs on the extent to which they are willing formally to share power on specific issues with other boroughs.
 - There is no enthusiasm for any formal merger between boroughs.
14. There is currently no provision in existing legislation or the Cities and Local Government Devolution Bill that would allow substantial powers to be devolved to the Congress or sub-regional groups of boroughs. Although more modest initiatives, such as the Working Capital Pilot discussed in paragraph 10, would be possible without the need for legislation, the devolution settlement agreed at the Congress is likely to require legislative changes. The City of London Corporation has been working with London Councils and Central London Forward to secure amendments to the Cities and Local Government Devolution Bill that would enable further devolution to London.

15. Amendments sponsored by London Councils that would have enabled the devolution of powers from central government to sub-regional groupings of boroughs were debated during the Bill's Report stage in the House of Lords. However, the proposals were portrayed as premature, with Lord True, leader of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames, objecting with concerns that the amendments could curtail the independence of the boroughs. Following the debate, the Minister leading on the Bill suggested that further discussion on changes to the Bill that would enable devolution to London be continued at a later stage. It seems likely that a substantial devolution deal for London will only be secured if the boroughs and the Mayor of London can achieve a degree of unanimity over powers sought and the governance arrangements under which they will be exercised.
16. The Bill has now completed its House of Lords stages. There will be a further opportunity to press for changes that would enable devolution to London when the Bill enters the House of Commons after the party conferences.

City of London position

17. Successive Policy Chairmen have taken the view that it is in the interests of the City, as well as London as a whole, for the City Corporation to be fully involved in London government issues and pan-London bodies such as London Councils, for which the current Policy Chairman is Vice Chair and a member of the Executive Committee. By deepening the City's involvement in London government, the City is better able to shape and influence discussions on issues that affect the Square Mile. For example, the City convenes a number of events for London's political leaders and is able to use its non-party status to play other useful roles, as in the case of the collective investment vehicle for local authority pension schemes, which the Policy Chairman chairs.
18. The issue of devolution is currently one of the most salient policy issues in London, with several key bodies pressing the Government for further devolution. As an integral part of London, noting the position of the current current Policy Chairman and previous incumbents, the City should be fully engaged in these discussions to secure a new devolution settlement for London. Specific attention will be paid to the City's constitutional position in the discussions.

Proposals

19. Members are asked to note current work to devolve powers to and within London and to agree that the City Corporation should -
 - Support London Councils approach to the issue of devolution.
 - Continue to work with the inner London boroughs in Central London Forward.

- Provide legal, technical and political support where this can be helpful to London Councils and Central London Forward and the devolution agenda.

Conclusion

20. The UK has one of the highest levels of centralisation across democracies in the developed world. London in particular has far fewer powers compared with other world cities, and hardly any independent sources of revenue. Following the referendum on Scottish independence, however, the Government has indicated its willingness to devolve significant powers and functions to areas of England. This momentum and the Government's introduction of the Cities and Local Government Devolution Bill has created an opportunity for London to push for its own new devolution settlement. London Councils is continuing to develop proposals and advocate for such a settlement, and the City of London Corporation should play its full part in the debate.

Appendices

- The London Proposition (non-public circulated separately)

Michael Johnson

Parliamentary Briefings Officer, Remembrancer's Office

T: 020 7332 1202

E: michael.johnson@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Matthew Pitt

Policy Officer, Town Clerk's Department

T: 020 7332 1425

E: matthew.pitt@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committee: Policy & Resources	Dated: 24 September 2015
Subject: Funding for renewal of Heart of the City's Newcomers Programme for City Businesses	Public
Report of: Director of Economic Development	For Decision

Summary

This report:

- (a) Notes that the current City of London Corporation (City Corporation) funding term for the charity, Heart of the City (HOTC), is due to expire on 31 March 2016.
- (b) Provides an update on the charity's achievements under the current funding period and recent changes in response to a need for more innovative ways of supporting London's civil society.
- (c) Sets out the next steps in transforming and extending the HOTC programmes to support businesses and communities across Greater London, which will position the charity as one London's key business-community support organisations.
- (d) Requests a further three years of funding of £511,570 to support 'Newcomer' businesses in the City (which complements recently approved funding from City Bridge Trust to support non-City businesses).

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- Approve a grant from City's Cash of £511,570 over three years (2016/17: £167,000, 2017/18: £170,500, 2018/19: £174,000) to HOTC to enable it to continue its delivery of social and environmental support to City businesses under its new model and to deepen the connections between the business sector and the community sector.

Main Report

Background

1. HOTC was launched in 2000 as a joint initiative of the City Corporation, the Bank of England, and the then Financial Services Authority. It obtained charitable status in 2006, and the City Corporation remains a core funder.
2. HOTC's purpose is to support a thriving, inclusive private sector which has a positive social and environmental impact. It offers businesses membership to a

peer-to-peer learning network, facilitating events, mentoring, online and offline learning, and community collaboration.

3. HOTC's network comprises over 800 businesses including Newcomers (businesses new to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR))¹; Members (graduates from the Newcomers programme which require on-going support) and Contributors (businesses with CSR expertise which can give back to/mentor other businesses). These businesses commit to sharing their experiences, resources, and their time, with others in order to deliver long-term benefits and measurable outcomes in the wider community.
4. The charity is well-networked across the Square Mile, whilst also maintaining good working relations with the City Corporation. The City Corporation houses the charity in Guildhall and the Lord Mayor is co-President of the charity with the Governor of the Bank of England.
5. The charity has a board of 10 including one representative from the City Corporation, the Assistant Director of Economic Development, and its Chairman is Harvey McGrath. The charity is advised by an impressive Council of nearly 30 CEO-level City business leaders, including the Bishop of London, as well as the Chairman of Policy and Resources and, more recently, the Chairman of the City Bridge Trust. See Appendix 1 for the list of Trustees and Council Members.
6. In February 2012, the Policy and Resources Committee approved funding for 2013/14 – 2015/16 of £165,000 per annum (see para 15).
7. The relationship between HOTC and the City Corporation, which provides finance, staff and HR support services, is governed by a Service Level Agreement, which is reviewed every three years (currently being negotiated for 2016/17 – 2019/2020).

Newcomers programme

8. Originally set up to support City businesses with volunteering, in 2011 HOTC's free 'Newcomers' programme began enabling on small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs),² which are new to the notion of CSR, to tap into the experts and contacts they need to quickly build an effective programme of community engagement and environmental management. This programme is offered at no cost to business in order to remove the barriers that sceptics often give for why they have not started these activities previously. In targeting smaller businesses through the Newcomers programme, HOTC helps to create change which might not otherwise occur without their support.
9. The City Corporation founded and has funded the Newcomers programme since its inception in 2005, and it has evolved over this period, directly enabling over 400 City businesses to start or grow their social and environmental programmes.

¹ Corporate Social Responsibility is a concept whereby companies integrate social and environmental concerns in their business operations and interactions with their stakeholders.

² SMEs are defined as businesses with fewer than 250 employees and less than £40 million in turnover.

Achievements During the Current Grant Term

10. Appendix 2 confirms that the charity has met requirements from the previous grant and Appendix 3 sets out HOTC's key achievements since April 2013. A few highlights include:

- (a) 180 Newcomers supported to start social and environmental activities, 60% from financial and professional service firms.
- (b) 607 business referrals to community groups and charitable organisations made (against a target of 600). At least 150 of these referrals were to City Corporation programmes such as City Action (City Corporation's in-house volunteering brokerage), the Local Employability/Recruitment Programme and the Lord Mayor's Dragon Awards.
- (c) Relationships with a broad range of opinion formers maintained and developed further, resulting in the joining of Bank of England Governor Mark Carney as co-President of the charity in 2014.
- (d) Each Newcomers programme lasts for one year, and the impact is immediately realised. Last year's Newcomer cohort (55 businesses graduating in 2014) made over £2,180,000 in charitable contributions to their community. This included corporate donations and staff volunteering time.

Strategic Expansion of HOTC

11. The charity has been fortunate to secure City Bridge Trust funding recently, for three years, to extend its business support programme to all London boroughs. This was announced as part of HOTC's 15 year anniversary celebration this year.

12. The strategic expansion of the charity's remit is the result of a growing need for support from communities in Outer London and the financial pressures faced by the public and voluntary sectors. With nearly 40,000 businesses employing 10 – 250 employees (HOTC's target Newcomer), these businesses have the potential to lift provision of support to many of these community groups. They are not often thought of as a usual source of assistance. A recent study has shown that the majority of SMEs are unaware of the notion of CSR and do not know how to approach social and environmental activities strategically.

13. The proposed expansion has been planned following consultation with key London bodies (e.g. London Councils, Greater London Authority, Greater London Volunteering and Business in the Community) and strategic alliances forged. The expansion is reflective of HOTC's growing profile and in turn should provide much enhanced positive profile for the City Corporation as a core supporter of HOTC since its foundation.

Funding

14. HOTC is currently funded from three main sources: recently introduced business fees/donations of approximately £30,000 per annum; a grant from the Policy

and Resources Committee of £165,000 per annum, with a supplement from the Economic Development Office, £29,000; and a recently agreed strategic grant from the City Bridge Trust of £278,328 phased over three years . In addition to this, it receives approximately £250,000 per annum in in-kind support from Contributor businesses, such as hosting, mentoring, and speaking at events, which is crucial to delivery of the HOTC programmes.

15. In 2008, 2010 and 2012, a review of hundreds of trusts, foundations, local authorities and private sector funders was undertaken and all determined that there was no organisation likely to fund a business support organisation, such as HOTC, despite the high impact achieved. Speculative applications were submitted to Garfield Weston and Esmee Fairbairn without success. HOTC is now developing a self-financing model through its recently introduced membership fees.

Proposal

16. Renewal of City Corporation’s funding at an amount of £511,570 over three years (2016/17: £167,000, 2017/18: £170,500, 2018/19: £174,000) is requested to maintain current activity levels in the City. This covers 3.1 members of staff (of a total team size of 4.8 – the rest is covered as shown in para 18 below), plus a very small operational budget contribution (of less than £10,000), as shown in Table 1 below.

Contribution	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
3.1 members of staff	£160,766	£162,599	£164,488
Operations Budget	£6,224	£7,901	£9,582

Table 1: P&R contribution to staff salary and budget

17. Heart of the City does not directly employ any staff, they are seconded from the City of London Corporation for the purposes of the Charity. The increase in current funding levels (£165,000 p.a.) is needed to accommodate the recent 2% pay award and incremental progression.

18. HOTC’s three year funding forecast is outlined below:

	2016/17	2017/2018	2018/2019
<u>Minimum Funds Required</u>	£586,211	£557,127	£546,375
<u>Funding Sources (Cash)</u>			
- P&R Committee	£167,000	£170,500	£174,000
- EDO supplement	£28,000	£28,000	£28,000
- City Bridge Trust expansion ³	£106,211	£68,627	£14,375

³ City Bridge Trust grant runs from July – June and therefore is split across financial years. Y1 funding (July 2015 – June 2016) is £118,820, Y2 funding (July 2016 – June 2017) is £102,008, Y3 (July 2017 – June 2018) is £57,500.

- City business fees/donations	£35,000	£40,000	£80,000
<u>Funding Source (In-Kind)</u>			
- Contributions In-Kind	£250,000	£250,000	£250,000
<u>Balance</u>	-	-	-

Table 2: Three-year funding forecast

19. The requested funds would enable HOTC to deliver its programme directly to 90 City Newcomers and indirectly to support over 180 Newcomers (City and non-City) over the grant period. From this, a strong local community impact is expected including facilitating over £3 million in charitable contributions and over 600 referrals to community groups.
20. In anticipation of the funding shortfall from 2017/2018, HOTC has been piloting charging some businesses for continued or more advanced social and environmental support. This attempt at self-financing should be positively noted.

Benefits to the City Corporation

21. Continued City Corporation support for HOTC would help to ensure that while the Square Mile is the world's leading financial service centre, it also promotes a giving culture. The fact that 80% of HOTC's Newcomers community impact takes place in Greater London contributes to the City's aim to operate as a 'good neighbour'.
22. With the City Corporation's support, HOTC has become the UK's largest responsible small business network and one of the larger financial services networks. This brings considerable profile to the City Corporation as well as broadening and strengthening its range of stakeholder relationships.
23. Strategic engagement with City leaders is enabled through participation on HOTC's Council of Members.
24. Renewal of funding to continue activity to support City SMEs would complement recently secured funding from City Bridge Trust which enables HOTC to extend its programme of support across Greater London and to amplify its ability to connect businesses with charities across London. At the same time, HOTC will be enabled to increase the number of referrals it makes to the City Corporation's other business engagement programmes (e.g. City Action and the Lord Mayor's Dragon Awards).

Corporate & Strategic Implications

25. HOTC contributes to the City Corporation's strategic priority of supporting and promoting 'The City' as the world leader in international finance and business services. Businesses cite improved staff morale, winning new contracts and raised brand profile as their top business reasons for starting social and environmental programmes through the HOTC Newcomers programme. Moreover, by ensuring that City businesses are responsible in their activities, the charity is helping the Square Mile to demonstrate its commitment to good

governance. HOTC further directly supports the City Corporation's aim of encouraging regeneration and CSR by working with City business and communities in neighbouring boroughs.

Conclusion

26. At a time of unprecedented financial pressures on public and voluntary sectors to meet the needs of disadvantaged Londoners, it is crucial that all sectors work together to achieve better outcomes. HOTC has an excellent track record of engaging and developing City business to adopt a CSR agenda: mobilising their time, skills, and resources to benefit charities to improve their resilience and ability to deliver.

27. This report seeks a funding renewal from City's Cash for the three years from 2016/17 to 2018/19. There will also be a contribution from the Economic Development budget. Evidence showing that for every £1 invested by the City Corporation in HOTC, Newcomer businesses make at least £8 in charitable contributions demonstrates that HOTC provides sound value for money.

Appendices

1. HOTC Trustees and Council Members
2. 2012/13 – 2014/15 Grant Conditions
3. HOTC Key Achievements from April 2013 – August 2015

Damian Nussbaum

Director, Economic Development Officer

T: 020 7332 3600

E: Damian.Nussbaum@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Appendix 1: HOTC Trustees and Council Members

TRUSTEES

- Harvey McGrath, Chairman
- Richard Hardie, Deputy Chairman
- Charlotte Cowley, Marketing Director, Columns
- Gay Harrington, Social & Economic Development Manager, Canary Wharf Group
- Gill Parker, Joint Managing Director, BDG architecture + design
- Linda Barnard, Community Relations Manager, Bank of England
- Liz Skelcher, Assistant Director, Economic Development Office, City Corporation
- Matt Sparkes, Global Head of Corporate Responsibility, Linklaters
- Peter Sherratt, Chairman, Lehman's Brother Foundation Europe & Business Advisory Council member, Oxford Said Business School
- Sushil Saluja, Managing Director for Financial Services, Accenture

COUNCIL OF MEMBERS

- The Rt Hon The Lord Mayor of the City of London, co-President, HOTC
- Governor Mark Carney, co-President, HOTC

- Harvey McGrath, Chairman, HOTC
- Richard Hardie, Deputy Chairman, HOTC
- Antonio Simoes, CEO UK & Head of Retail Banking and Wealth Management Europe, HSBC Bank plc
- Brian Winterflood, Life President, Winterflood Securities
- Sir Gerry Grimstone, Chairman, TheCityUK
- Ian Powell, Chairman and Senior Partner, PricewaterhouseCoopers
- Inga Beale, CEO, Lloyd's of London
- John Griffith-Jones, Chairman, Financial Conduct Authority
- Malcolm Sweeting, Senior Partner, Clifford Chance
- Mark Boleat, Chairman, Policy & Resource Committee, City Corporation
- Nicholas Cheffings Partner & Chair, Hogan Lovells
- Nick Owen, UK Chairman, Deloitte
- Rt Revd & Rt Hon Richard Chartres DD FSA, Bishop of London
- Robert Elliott, Senior Partner, Linklaters
- Ruby McGregor-Smith, CEO, MITIE
- Sebastian Grigg, Head of UK Investment Banking, Credit Suisse
- Simon Collins, UK Chairman & Senior Partner, KPMG
- Simon Mackenzie-Smith, Chairman of UK & Ireland, Corporate and Investment Banking, Bank of America Merrill Lynch
- Lord Tim Clement-Jones, London Managing Partner, DLA Piper UK
- Will Lawes, Senior Partner, Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer
- William Maltby, Senior Adviser, Investment Banking, Deutsche Bank

Appendix 2: 2012/13 – 2014/15 Grant Conditions

Grant Condition	Final Output
55 Newcomer businesses supported in each year (165 total), 60% of which come from City-type firms.	A total of 180 Newcomers have been supported (2013: 45 Newcomers; 2014: 55 Newcomers; 2015: 80 Newcomers) 60% each year have been financial and professional service firms
200 referrals to community groups and charitable organisations to be made every year (600 in total).	300 referrals made per year (900 total)
300 Alumni businesses to be supported through web support.	Met
90 Contributor businesses to be inspired to support the programme's delivery through technical and other in-kind provision.	Met
25 Council Members to be inspired to continue to provide leadership and active championship through attendance at HotC events and meetings.	Met
Relationships with a broad range of Opinion Formers to be maintained and developed further.	Met

Appendix 3: HOTC Key Achievements April 2013 – August 2015

The Newcomers programmes lasts for one year, and the impact is immediately realised. Last year's Newcomer cohort (55 businesses graduating in 2014) made over £2,180,715 in charitable contributions to their community. This included corporate donations and staff volunteering time.

Over 90% of graduating Newcomers developed waste reduction and recycling initiatives, and 82% reduced their energy consumption. Over 50% started purchasing from green, fair-trade or local social enterprises.

Importantly, the majority of Newcomer businesses also put in place the structure needed to sustain their programmes once HOTC's support finishes. Over 89% of the businesses engaged their senior staff (CEO, Chairman, etc) to ensure lasting endorsement. Over 72% had established a formal CSR committee and network of champions throughout the business in order to ensure accountability and smooth the workload.

Since April 2013, over 180 Newcomers have been supported to start social and environmental activities, 60% were financial and professional service firms. From this, 607 business referrals to community groups and charitable organisations made (against a target of 600). At least 150 of these referrals were to City Corporation programmes such as City Action, Local Employment Programme or Dragon Awards.

300 Alumni businesses have been supported through HOTC's website and through the SchoolstoBusiness platform.

HOTC's programmes are highly regarded. 100% of businesses rated the Newcomers programme as good to excellent in 2014. Participants particularly highlighted the importance of time saved by quickly getting access to insight, resources and case studies through HOTC.

For every £1 invested into HOTC, a further £1 is leveraged in probono support and a further £8 is made in charitable donations. During the next three-year period, HOTC expect to leverage an additional £750,000 in pro-bono support.

Committee(s)	Dated:
Policy & Resources	24 September 2015
Subject: Contract to deliver the City of London Business Traineeship programme	Public
Report of: Director of Economic Development	For Decision

Summary

- The City of London Business Traineeship (CBT) scheme is an important strand of the City Corporation’s work to maximise employment opportunities in the City for local residents. It links up talented A-level school/college leavers living and attending state schools in the City’s neighbouring boroughs with paid work placements in City-type firms, placing over 1,100 trainees since 2001.
- The current three year contract, delivered by the Brokerage Citylink, ends on 31 October 2015. Following a competitive tendering exercise, the Brokerage Citylink has been selected to deliver the contract for the CBT programme for the academic years 2015/16 – 2017/18, with the potential to extend for a further two years to 2019/20 subject to satisfactory delivery of the initial three-year contract.
- The total value of the proposed initial three-year contract is £267,949 with the potential two-year extension valued at up to £180,000.
- Your Committee’s approval is sought both to commit the sums above from the Economic Development Office’s local risk budget and to appoint the Brokerage Citylink to deliver the City Business Traineeship scheme as outlined above.

Recommendations

That your Committee:

1. Approve the appointment of the Brokerage Citylink to deliver the City Business Traineeship scheme for the academic years 2015/16 – 2017/18, at a cost of £267,949 to be met from the Economic Development Office’s local risk budget.
2. Delegate authority to extend the contract with the Brokerage Citylink for a further two years (the academic years 2018/19 and 2019/20) to the Director of Economic Development, in consultation with the Chamberlain, subject to satisfactory delivery of the 2015/16 – 2017/18 contract, at a cost of up to £180,000 to be met from the Economic Development Office’s local risk budget.

Main Report

Background

1. The City of London Corporation initiated and has funded the City of London Business Traineeship (CBT) scheme since 1994. The scheme is a central part of the City Corporation's efforts to support employability in neighbouring communities. The programme regularly generates favourable regional and national press coverage.
2. The scheme introduces high-achieving A-level school/college leavers from schools in neighbouring boroughs to prestigious paid placements in the City, to increase their long-term employment prospects, thereby promoting local recruitment to City firms and City Corporation departments.
3. While host organisations pay trainees a wage, the City Corporation supports the administration and management of the programme. This includes development of placement opportunities, selection/screening of candidates, matching candidates to employers, delivery of workshops, and the annual awards ceremony hosted by the Lord Mayor.
4. Each year, around 600 young people from around 70 City fringe schools and colleges register on the highly competitive scheme, of which around 400 participate in a series of employability workshops. Participation in the workshops has a lasting benefit even for those not securing a placement.
5. The quality of service offered to employers has been demonstrated by endorsements from over 30 companies confirming their commitment to supporting the programme.
6. The scheme promotes diversity in the workplace. Of the 2015 intake, 57% of trainees were female and 85% from Black, Asian or Minority Ethnic (BAME) backgrounds. It is also a key example of the City Corporation's efforts to support the social mobility agenda, a key priority for the Government.
7. From facilitating 35 placements in 2001 to 114 placements across 21 firms in 2015, the CBT programme has gone from strength to strength with a broadly consistent input from the City Corporation in terms of funding provided and number of placements hosted.
8. In view of the high levels of youth unemployment, at over $\frac{3}{4}$ million young people in the UK¹, the CBT programme goes some way towards equipping young people from disadvantaged communities with valuable experience to compete in the labour market in the longer term.

Current Position

9. The existing contract to deliver the programme, held by the Brokerage Citylink and worth £269,604 over three years, ends on 31 October 2015.

¹ Parliamentary research briefing, August 2015

10. The contract to deliver the programme for a further three years (with an option to extend for an additional two years) has therefore been re-tendered via an open and competitive tendering process to ensure ongoing value for money and quality of provision.

Procurement process and outcome

11. A two stage procurement process was undertaken by City Procurement in line with EU and City Corporation procurement regulations and 68 expressions of interest were received.
12. Eight organisations provided submissions at the pre-qualification questionnaire stage, which were scored by Officers in line with a scoring system published with the PQQ. References were sought for the top scoring companies and financial, health and safety and insurance assessments were undertaken to ensure compliance with City Corporation standards.
13. Although three organisations were invited to submit a full tender, only the Brokerage Citylink chose to do so. At a cost of £267,949, the tender is within the advertised budget.
14. Liz Skelcher, Assistant Director of Economic Development, is a trustee of the Brokerage Citylink. In recognition of the potential perceived conflict of interest, she has not played any role in the tender process.
15. The award criterion for the contract was the most advantageous tender to the City Corporation in terms of quality (80%) and price (20%).
16. Officers scored the Brokerage Citylink's tender as 69 out of a possible 100 points on quality and considered it to be a very strong bid, providing good value to the City Corporation on the proposed overall methodology as well as on City firm, youth and stakeholder engagement.

Proposals

17. The Brokerage Citylink will deliver the following key activities each year over the three year contract term:
 - Through a comprehensive outreach programme, recruit a pool of at least 400 young people in the City's neighbouring boroughs and provide them with a range of support to help them secure paid work placements within City businesses.
 - Secure at least 110 paid work placements from at least 25 City businesses, of which 5 will be within businesses participating in the programme for the first time, and place young people into these placements, facilitating the interview and recruitment process.
 - Facilitate an awards ceremony, involving the Lord Mayor, to celebrate young people's achievements, recognise the contribution of City businesses and support longer term business engagement.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

18. Delivery of the City Business Traineeship scheme supports Key Policy Priority 4 of the Corporate Plan (*Maximising the opportunities and benefits afforded by our role in supporting London's communities*). It also contributes to delivery of objective 4 of the Economic Development Office Business Plan 2015-2018: *Working with businesses and CoLC departments (including City Bridge Trust), to understand and realise the economic and social potential of London, but especially the City and the neighbouring boroughs.*
19. An Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out. The project will have a positive impact on equalities by seeking to promote City careers to disadvantaged communities in the City's neighbouring boroughs. A high percentage (likely over 80%) of the participants will be from minority ethnic backgrounds owing to the population makeup of the target boroughs.

Implications

20. The total value of the initial three-year contract will be £267,949 (£89,316 per annum), spanning four financial years and remaining at broadly the same level as the current three year contract, which is worth £269,604. The potential two-year extension, subject to satisfactory delivery of the initial three-year contract, will be up to £180,000 (up to £90,000 per annum). The cost will be met from the EDO local risk budget.
21. The new contract will see the CBT programme continuing much as at present with some additions: a target for an additional 30 placements over the three year term; a more targeted business marketing campaign that will engage at least five new City firms each year; facilitation of employer for and best practice events; enhanced tracking of trainees post-placement; and improved measurement of the long-term impact of the programme. The cost, therefore, compares favourably with the current contract.
22. The Chamberlain has conducted a financial appraisal of the accounts of the Brokerage Citylink, and confirmed that the charity appears financially satisfactory to undertake the proposed contract.

Conclusion

23. The CBT programme has been a key part of the City Corporation's work to strengthen links between the City and its neighbouring boroughs.
24. A competitive tendering exercise has demonstrated that the Brokerage Citylink is well placed to deliver the scheme for a further three years on the basis of value for money and quality of provision.

Appendices

None

David Pack

Economic Development Office

T: 020 7332 1268

E: david.pack@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committee: Policy and Resources	Date: 24 September 2015
Subject: Additional Events and Topical Issues Programme: Funding Request	Public
Report of: Director of Economic Development Director of Public Relations	For Decision

Summary

The Committee agreed in July 2012, March 2013 and May 2014 to extend the Chairman’s contact programme through additional events and a topical issues programme, (TIP), at a cost of £55,000 a year for 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15. Continuing this additional activity remains a priority following the 2015 General Election and Labour leadership election and in advance of the 2016 Mayoral election. Additional resources would ensure that the City of London Corporation remains fully engaged with key audiences and strategic issues, both in the UK and abroad. It is, therefore, proposed to continue this additional activity at the same cost in the current financial year, 2015-16.

Recommendation

The Committee is recommended to approve the proposal to continue the extended events and topical issues programme through appropriate events and papers at a cost of £55,000 funded from your Committee’s Policy Initiatives Fund 2015/16, categorised under the “Promoting the City” section of the Fund and charged to *City’s Cash*. Approval for the expenditure on each individual event or paper will be sought from the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and a Deputy Chairman.

Main Report

Background

1. This Committee agreed in July 2012, March 2013 and May 2014 to extend the Chairman’s contact programme through additional events and a topical issues programme at a cost of £55,000 per annum for 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15. The objective of the additional events is to assist with the delivery of the City Corporation’s messages for supporting and promoting the City among key audiences, both in the UK and abroad. All

expenditure on individual events and papers has been approved by the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and a Deputy Chairman.

2. As part of the extended events programme, the following events were organised during 2014-15:
 - A dinner with the Transport Secretary Patrick McLoughlin and high level business figures to discuss transport issues affecting London. (15 July 2014)
 - A discussion dinner between the Employment Minister Esther McVey and high level stakeholders to consider how employers and the Government can best work together to tackle youth unemployment. (21 July 2014)
 - A dinner with the Communities and Local Government Secretary Eric Pickles and high level business figures to discuss issues relating to his department's responsibilities. (9 September 2014)
 - A dinner discussion on the UK's future relationship with the rest of the world featuring the former Attorney General Dominic Grieve, the former Foreign Office Minister Jeremy Browne and the Shadow Justice Minister Stephen Twigg. (3 February 2015)
 - The annual reception of the Whitehall and Industry Group (WIG) hosted at Guildhall and attended by over 200 senior representatives from the Civil Service, the private and tertiary sectors and a speech by the Cabinet Secretary, Sir Jeremy Heywood. (9 February 2015)
 - A discussion dinner between the Chair of the Inclusive Capitalism APG Liam Byrne MP and senior stakeholders on inclusive capitalism. (3 March 2015)
 - A seminar and reception on women in business led by the Chief Executive of the Royal Mail, Moya Greene. (24 March 2015)
 - A General Election briefing breakfast led by the founder of Populus and former Senior Adviser to the Prime Minister, Lord (Andrew) Cooper. (26 March 2015)
3. The following topical issues papers were supported during 2014-15:
 - A study on the role of charities and social enterprises in Public Services undertaken by the Association of Chief Executives of Voluntary Organisations (ACEVO).

- An update of the research work on attitudes across EU capitals and in Brussels on London as Europe’s financial capital, undertaken by the think tank, Policy Network.

Proposal

4. Continuing this additional activity remains a priority following the 2015 General Election and Labour leadership election and in advance of the 2016 Mayoral election. Additional resources are required to ensure that the City of London Corporation remains fully engaged with key audiences and strategic issues, both in the UK and abroad. The extension of the contact programme, through the organisation of additional events, has assisted with the wider delivery of the City Corporation’s messages for supporting and promoting the City to key audiences. The TIP has allowed the City Corporation to engage with key issues through papers, pamphlets and events. This funding arrangement also allows additional events and publications to be arranged flexibly and at short notice. It is proposed to continue this additional work, with funding at the same level as in the previous year, i.e. £55,000.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

5. It is proposed that the required funding of £55,000 be drawn from your Policy Initiatives Fund 2015/16, categorised under the “Promoting the City” section of the Fund and charged to *City’s Cash*. The current uncommitted balance available within your Committee’s Policy Initiatives Fund for 2015/16 amounts to £389,300, prior to any allowance being made for any other proposals on today’s agenda.

Conclusion

6. By continuing to commit additional resources to events and to engaging with topical issues, the ability of the City Corporation to interact flexibly and at short notice with key audiences during periods of heightened activity on the political landscape is increased. It also allows the City Corporation to continue to play an appropriate role among key policymakers.

Contact: *Damian Nussbaum*
Director of Economic Development
damian.nussbaum@cityoflondon.gov.uk
 020 7332 3600

Tony Halmos
Director of Public Relations
tony.halmos@cityoflondon.gov.uk
 020 7332 1450

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee: Policy and Resources	Date: 24 September 2015
Subject: Centre for European Reform: Sponsorship of Annual ‘Ditchley Park’ Conference	Public
Report of: Director of Public Relations	For Decision

Summary

The key think tank, Centre for European Reform (CER), is organising a major, high-level conference *Has the euro been a failure?*, taking place at Ditchley Park, Oxfordshire, on 6 - 7 November, 2015.

The CER has advised that substantial financial support has already been secured for the conference from KPMG and the European Commission Representation in the United Kingdom. The CER is seeking an additional £20,000 of sponsorship from the City of London Corporation to complete the funding package. This sponsorship would guarantee the City Corporation two places at this very select event, while the City Corporation would also receive branding on all conference related materials.

The work of the CER and, in particular, this conference accords well with the role of the City Corporation in promoting debate on key policy issues that affect the City and London more widely. It will place the City of London Corporation at the centre of a key policy debate affecting the City and enable the City Corporation actively to engage with a cross-section of its principal audiences as outlined in the *Communications Strategy, 2015-2018*.

Recommendation

This report recommends that your Committee agree to the City of London Corporation supporting the major CER conference *Has the euro been a failure?*, at a total cost of £20,000 to be met from your Committee’s Policy Initiatives Fund 2015/16 categorised under the Events section and charged to *City’s Cash*.

Main Report

Background

1. The Centre for European Reform is a leading London-based think tank, with an outstanding reputation, devoted to improving the quality of

debate on the European Union and wider international issues. The Financial Times recently commented that the CER is ‘a think tank with an increasingly influential role in the shaping of official policy.’ Membership of the CER’s advisory board includes the former Permanent Under Secretary and Head of the Diplomatic Service at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office Lord Kerr, the former senior partner of Slaughter and May, Tim Clark, the chairman of the British Bankers Association, Sir Nigel Wicks and the vice-chairman of the Deutsche Bank Group, Caio Koch-Weser.

2. The City Corporation has had a long and successful relationship with the CER with involvement in a number of high quality projects, particularly on EU economic reform and China-EU relations. Recent CER events have featured UK Permanent Representative to the EU Ivan Rogers, European Commissioner Lord Hill and US Ambassador to the EU Anthony Gardner. The City Corporation has been a sponsor of the CER’s annual Ditchley Park Conference since 2012.

Proposal

3. The CER is organising a high-level conference *Has the euro been a failure?*, to be held at Ditchley Park, Oxfordshire, on 6-7 November 2015. In common with previous conferences, the event is an invitation-only gathering encompassing leading economists, policy-makers, politicians, City and other business leaders and journalists, to discuss key questions about the economic and political challenges facing Europe.
4. The Conference aims to ask a number of key questions, under the theme, *Has the euro been a failure?* Such a suggestion draws a fierce response from Brussels and national capitals and is perceived as tantamount to calling the EU into question. But it is a legitimate question to ask. How should the euro be judged? Purely by the fact that it has survived? Or by the fact that it has become a significant international reserve currency? Or by comparing what its proponents said it would do for Europe with what has actually happened? Has the euro helped Europe to address the economic and political challenges facing it? Or has it made it harder to address these challenges, while also creating new ones? Could a dismantling of the Eurozone open the way for economic recovery and an easing of political tensions? Or would it unleash unmanageable economic and political instability?
5. Confirmed participants at the Conference so far include Ed Balls (former Shadow Chancellor), Marco Buti (Director-General for Economic and

Financial Affairs at European Commission), Willem Buiter (Global Chief Economist at Citi), Barry Eichengreen (Professor of Economic and Political Science at Berkeley), Stephanie Flanders (Chief Market Strategist for Europe at JP Morgan), Francois Heisbourg (President of the International Institute for Strategic Studies), Stephen King (Group Chief Economist at HSBC), Christian Thimann (Counsellor to the President of the European Central Bank) and Andres Velasco (former finance minister of Chile).

6. There will be five plenary sessions:
 - Has the euro project failed?
 - What needs to be done to prevent a break-up?
 - The economic consequences of dismantling the euro;
 - The political consequences of dismantling the euro;
 - The UK, the EU and the Eurozone;
7. The CER is seeking a number of joint sponsors for the Conference at a cost of £20,000 each, with a total budget of £80,000. Contributions towards the sponsorship of this event have already been secured from KPMG and the European Commission Representation in the UK, with a verbal agreement in place with a further major international financial institution. The CER is seeking the remaining £20,000 to complete the overall funding package for this conference. It is recommended that the City Corporation agrees to support the conference at a total cost of £20,000.
8. Sponsorship of this major conference would guarantee the City Corporation two places at this very select event, while the City Corporation would also receive branding on all conference related materials.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

9. The work of the CER and this project, in particular, accords well with the role of the City Corporation in promoting debate on key policy issues that affect the City and London more widely. The relationships with this think tank on this project will allow for high level interaction with a number of the City Corporation's key audiences, as specified in the *Communications Strategy 2015-2018*, and supports key elements of the City Corporation's economic development programmes.
10. It is proposed that the required funding of £20,000 is drawn from your Policy Initiatives Fund 2015/16 and categorised under the Events section

of the Fund and charged to *City's Cash*. The current uncommitted balance available within your Committee's Policy Initiatives Fund 2015/16 amounts to £389,300 prior to any allowance being made for any other proposals on today's agenda.

Conclusion

11. The work of the CER, and this conference in particular, accords well with the role of the City of London Corporation in promoting debate on issues that affect the City of London and also gives the City Corporation access to a pool of guests and speakers which it would find more time consuming to access on its own. The sponsorship of this project will allow for high level interaction with a number of the City of London Corporation's key audiences and supports the City Corporation's economic development programme.

Tony Halmos

Director of Public Relations

T: 020 7332 1450

E: tony.halmos@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committee: Policy and Resources	Date: 24 September 2015
Subject: City of London Corporation Think Tank Subscriptions, 2015-16	Public
Report of: Director of Public Relations	For Decision

Summary

Corporate membership of think tanks forms an integral part of the City Corporation's *Communications Strategy 2015-18* and wider economic development priorities. In 2014-15 the City Corporation was a corporate member of ten think tanks - CentreForum, the Centre for the Study of Financial Innovation (CSFI), Chatham House, Demos, the European Policy Forum (EPF), the Foreign Policy Centre (FPC), the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR), the Local Government Information Unit (LGIU), the New Local Government Network (NLGN) and Reform.

Following a review, it is proposed that the City Corporation cease to be member of CentreForum and Demos but continue membership of the other eight think tanks. In addition, the membership fee for the New Local Government Network has been negotiated down from £15,000 to £12,000. This will have the effect of reducing the total cost of think tank memberships from £95,000 in the previous year to £77,000 in 2015/16.

Recommendation

This report recommends renewal of the City of London Corporation's corporate membership of the eight think tanks listed in this report at a total cost of £77,000 to be met from your Committee's Policy Initiatives Fund 2015/16, categorised under the Events section of the Fund and charged to *City's Cash*.

Main Report

Background

1. The City of London Corporation's activities with a range of think tanks from across the mainstream political spectrum is an integral part of the City of London *Communications Strategy 2015-18* and wider economic development priorities. The think tanks' close relationship with and

intrinsic knowledge of the political world allows the City Corporation to engage with senior policymakers on relevant issues, through a variety of means, including public conferences, set-piece speeches and seminars, topical research projects and occasional private dinners. All necessary efforts are made by officers to ensure that this programme of work is appropriately politically balanced.

Proposal

2. A number of think tanks offer corporate membership schemes. As well as providing a means for the City Corporation to strengthen its relationship with the respective think tank, corporate membership schemes carry a number of benefits, including invitations for Members and officers to attend events, copies of all publications and receipt of policy briefings. Corporate members are also in regular contact with senior staff at the think tanks to discuss the progress of relevant projects, thereby enabling them to be on the ‘inside track’ of the development of public policy.
3. In 2014-15, the City Corporation was a member of ten think tanks: CentreForum, the Centre for the Study of Financial Innovation (CSFI), Chatham House, Demos, the European Policy Forum (EPF), the Foreign Policy Centre (FPC), the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR), the Local Government Information Unit (LGIU), the New Local Government Network (NLGN) and Reform.
4. After a review considering the value for money of the memberships, it is proposed that the City Corporation cease membership of CentreForum and Demos (N.B. It is planned to continue working with these two think tanks in other ways, but cease the annual membership and subscription). In addition, the membership fee for the New Local Government Network has been negotiated down from £15,000 to £12,000. It is proposed to continue membership of the remaining eight think tanks that are listed in the annexe. This will have the effect of reducing the total cost of think tank memberships from £95,000 in the previous year to £77,000 in 2015/16.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

5. It is proposed that the required funding of £77,000 is drawn from your Policy Initiatives Fund 2015/16 and categorised under the Events section of the Fund and charged to *City's Cash*. The current uncommitted balance available within your Committee's Policy Initiatives Fund 2015/16

amounts to £389,300 prior to any allowance being made for any other proposals on today's agenda.

Conclusion

6. Corporate membership schemes provide a means for the City Corporation to strengthen its relationship with respective think tanks, as well as a range of additional benefits for Members and officers. These memberships form an integral part of the City Corporation's *Communications Strategy 2015-18* and wider economic development priorities.

Tony Halmos

Director of Public Relations

T: 020 7332 1450

E: tony.halmos@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Annexe

Renewal of City of London Corporation Think Tank Subscriptions 2015-16		
Think tank	Recent activities with CoL	Membership fee
<p>Centre for the Study of Financial Innovation (CSFI) A not-for-profit think tank, based in the City of London, which provides a forum for well-informed debate and research about the future of the financial services sector.</p>	<p>The City Corporation has been a Corporate sponsor since the 1990s and has worked with CSFI on an academic expert directory and a high level roundtable on HM Government's Balance of Competences Review.</p>	<p>£5,000</p>
<p>Chatham House Home of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, Chatham House is an independent international policy institute based in London.</p>	<p>The City Corporation has been a Corporate sponsor since 2009 and has worked with Chatham House on a major conference on financial regulation and a dinner with the UK's Permanent Representative. The City Corporation is planning to work with Chatham House on a conference on infrastructure finance.</p>	<p>£12,500</p>
<p>European Policy Forum (EPF) Aims to improve the quality of policy ideas for the UK and the EU. Competition and choice and their interaction with other public policy objectives and the public interest overall, are at the centre of its work.</p>	<p>The City Corporation has been a Corporate Sponsor since 2006 and has worked with the EPF on a seminar on taxation, a roundtable with the Governor of the Bank of Finland and a major event on infrastructure. The City Corporation is working with EPF on a dinner with Sergio Ermotti of UBS.</p>	<p>£7,500</p>

<p>Foreign Policy Centre (FPC) A UK-based independent progressive foreign affairs think tank.</p>	<p>The City Corporation has been a Corporate sponsor since 2006 and has worked with the FPC on a conference on mobile banking and dinners with the Business Secretary, Shadow Foreign Secretary and Shadow Chancellor. The City Corporation is working with FPC on a dinner with Transport Secretary Patrick McLoughlin.</p>	<p>£10,000</p>
<p>Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) A progressive think-tank, whose aim is to produce rigorous research and innovative policy ideas for a fair, democratic and sustainable world.</p>	<p>The City Corporation has been a Corporate Sponsor since 2008 and has worked with IPPR on major research projects on globalisation and emissions trading plus a major conference on industrial policy featuring the Business Secretary, a roundtable discussion on youth unemployment with the Shadow Employment Minister and an events series on emerging markets.</p>	<p>£12,500</p>
<p>Local Government Information Unit (LGIU) LGIU is a think tank and local authority membership organisation that aims to strengthen local democracy by putting citizens in control of their own lives, communities and local services.</p>	<p>Membership of LGIU entitles a range of City Corporation Members and Officers to receive a regular series of news updates, briefings and reports.</p>	<p>£10,000</p>

<p>New Local Government Network (NLGN) An independent think tank and network of local authorities committed to promoting the decentralisation of power, public service reform, and enhancing local governance.</p>	<p>The City Corporation has been a Corporate Sponsor since 2003 and has worked with NLGN on major conferences on capital finance and local growth plus research projects on capital finance. Guildhall hosted the 2015 NLGN annual Conference.</p>	<p>£12,000</p>
<p>Reform A centre-right think tank promoting new directions for public policy based on the principles of free enterprise, limited government, and individual liberty.</p>	<p>The City Corporation has been a Corporate Sponsor since 2008 and has worked with Reform on a series of events including dinners with the Minister for the Civil Society, the Culture Secretary and the Leader of the House of Lords. The City Corporation is working with Reform on a dinner with Skills Minister Nick Boles.</p>	<p>£7,500</p>

Committee: Policy and Resources Committee	Date: 24 September 2015
Subject: Local Government Association (LGA)	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Information

Summary

1. This report provides Members with information on the work of the LGA and the City of London Corporation's involvement with the Association. It has been produced at the request of the Outside Bodies Working Party which felt that it would be useful for the Committee to be reminded of the LGA's activities and the City Corporation's subscription to and involvement with it.
2. The City Corporation has been member of the LGA since its inception in 1997. It is the national membership body for over 400 local authorities in England and Wales. It is a politically led, cross-party organisation that works on behalf of councils and the City Corporation by, amongst other things, liaising with national government on matters of mutual interest. As we subscribe to the Association's membership (£13,333 for 2015/16), all Members have access to the services it has on offer, for example leadership training, publications, briefings, updates on key announcements and legislation, conferences and seminars and other free or discounted events.

Recommendation

3. Members are asked to note the content of this report.

Main Report

Background

1. At its meeting on 26 June the Outside Bodies Working Party requested that a report be submitted to the Policy and Resources Committee to remind Members of the work of the LGA and the City Corporation's involvement with that body.
2. The LGA was formed in 1997 following a merger of a number of local government associations representing the County Councils, District Councils and Metropolitan Authorities. It is the national membership body for over 400 local authorities in England and Wales and is a politically led, cross-party organisation that works on behalf of councils and the City Corporation to ensure local government has a strong, credible voice with national government.
3. The LGA liaises directly with Westminster. It aims to:-
 - influence critical financial and policy decisions

- press for more powers to be devolved from Whitehall to local government
 - pick up emerging government thinking, ensuring councils' that views are represented
 - shape and develop the policies that local government needs
 - influence draft EU laws to get the best deal for our councils
 - work with public, private, community and voluntary organisations to secure their support for local priorities
 - speak with one voice to the public through local, regional and national media, helping to promote local government and defend its reputation
 - support councils in driving innovation and improvement and sharing best practice, to help them become more efficient and effective, deliver savings and improve services
 - negotiate fair pay and pensions, and provide advice on workforce issues to councils.
4. The LGA has a number of priorities going forward from 2015/16 and are running several campaigns to support them. For example:-
- a “fairer funding” for local government campaign. This follows concerns that if spending reductions follow a similar pattern over the next five years, councils will be facing a £12.4bn funding gap by the end of the decade;
 - a campaign to bring devolution to local areas (DevoNxt), which LGA believes will bring economic, political and social benefits to communities across the country; and
 - the Show Us You Care campaign. This calls for the Government to commit to protecting social care funding councils, which the LGA believes will ease financial pressures in other areas of council budgets.

City Corporation's Relationship with the LGA

5. The City Corporation has been member of the LGA since its inception in 1997 and the cost of subscription for 2015/16 was £13,333. As the Corporation is a member of the Association, all Members have access to the services the Association has on offer, for example leadership training (the Leadership Academy) publications, updates on key announcements and legislation, briefings and seminars, and other free or discounted events. Up-to-the minute news and information can be found on the LGA's website www.local.gov.uk
6. The Corporation is also entitled to participate in the LGA's democratic structures. Alderman Ian Luder took over from Alderman Sir David Wootton as the City Corporation's representative informally in the lead-up to Sir David's mayoralty in 2011/12. Alderman Luder attends the LGA's General Assembly and is able to exercise voting rights on behalf of the City Corporation. He has previously served on the LGA's Audit Committee and Resources Panel and on the board of Local Partnerships (a joint venture between the LGA and the Treasury) as the nominee of the LGA Independent Group.

7. The level of involvement with the Association depends on the individual. For example, Alderman Sir David Wootton is chairman of the board of Local Partnerships and by virtue of this he is also a non-voting member of the LGA's Executive. Edward Lord also serves on the Local Partnerships Board as the LibDem Group's nominee and is a previous Chairman of that Board. He previously served on the LGA Executive, the Improvement and Innovation Board as well as being the LGA's national lead on equality and social inclusion.
8. It should be noted that should Members choose to become active within the LGA, this can be achieved through the LGA's various groups i.e. the Conservative, Labour, Liberal Democrat party groups or the Independent Group. The Independent Group includes any elected member of a Local Authority in England and Wales who is not otherwise entitled to membership of the LGA Conservative, Labour or Liberal Democrat party groups.
9. To ensure that Members are aware of the City Corporation's membership of the LGA arrangements have been made for relevant information to be made available as part of the new Member induction process.
10. The LGA is also a useful source for examples of best practice and is regularly used by officers. For example, the LGA is working in partnership with the Association of Directors and Adult Social Services (ADASS) and the Department of Health to support local authorities to deliver wide ranging care and support reforms as part of its Health, Wellbeing and Adult Social Care work stream. The City Corporation's Director of Community and Children's Services has therefore accessed material to assist his work and the City Corporation's preparedness for the implementation of the Care Act, to deliver our Better Care Fund programme and more broadly to support the integration of health and social care.
11. The City Corporation has also been supportive of the LGA's moves to establish the Municipal Bonds Agency (MBA) the aim of which is to provide an alternative to the Public Works Loan Board and reduce the cost of borrowing to local authorities. Whilst it is not anticipated that the City Corporation will borrow from the MBA, which is consistent with its policy of not taking on debt, it invested £200k in the start-up phase of the Agency. The MBA is now being formally established and should be open for business in the near future.
12. Officers from the Town Clerk's department met very recently with the LGA's Principal Advisor for London and the South East. The purpose of this meeting was for both organisations, the LGA and the City Corporation, to have a better understanding of how each works, the priorities and to ascertain whether there were any gaps in the services offered by the LGA.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

13. The City Corporation does not work in isolation. It is committed to working in partnership to improve local communities, the quality of life, and increase the capacity, of the wider London community. Subscription to the LGA helps to supports this as well as the City Corporation's strategic aims to provide:-

- modern, efficient and high quality local services, including policing, within the Square Mile for workers, residents and visitors; and
- valued services, such as education, employment, culture and leisure, to London and the nation.

It also ensures that the organisation is kept up-to-date on emerging issues affecting local communities across the nation and allows the City Corporation to shape policies and be aware of best practice.

- Appendix – None

Background Papers

Report to the Court of Common Council on 20th July 2000.

Angela Roach

Principal Committee and Members Services Manager

T: 020 7332 3685

E: angela.roach@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committee(s): Policy & Resources	Date(s): 24. 9. 2015
Subject: Economic Development - progress update	Public
Report of: Director of Economic Development	For Information
<p>Summary: The cover paper provides highlights from the Economic Development Office's work.</p> <p>On EDO's promotional and regulatory work, highlights include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The appointment of a City Special Representative for discussions in Brussels and beyond. • Support for proposals on CMU (Capital Markets Union). • Publication of a key report, showing that getting regulation at the right level would boost the EU's jobs and growth. • Important milestones in promoting London's role as a key RMB centre. <p>On our work in supporting neighbouring communities, highlights include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategic review of the Lord Mayor's Dragon Awards. • The 15th anniversary of Heart of the City, marking a plan to widen its work. • Strong performance of one of the Corporation's flagship programmes – City Business Traineeships. <p>A summary of the Economic Development Office's progress against objectives in the first quarter (April to June) updated to August 2015 is attached at Appendix A.</p> <p>Recommendation(s): Members are asked to note the report.</p>	

Main Report

On EDO's promotional and regulatory work, highlights include:

1. **Appointment of Special Representative:** Jeremy Browne, former MP and Foreign Office Minister, started as Special Representative for the City in Brussels on 1 September 2015. His role will be to enhance the engagement of the UK based financial and professional services industry in the EU institutions and across Member States. Jeremy's remit also includes:
 - Engaging with the most senior EU policy makers and officials,
 - Explaining to senior EU opinion formers the value of London's role as Europe's international financial centre and how this supports EU-wide economic growth and job creation, and
 - Influencing the development of relevant EU financial services and related policy dossiers.

2. **Support for proposals on CMU (Capital Markets Union):** We have supported the Commission in bringing forward its proposals on CMU, including a dinner for Commissioners Jonathan Hill and Jyrki Katainen. The Chairman of Policy and Resources, in his visit to Lithuania (after this report was prepared), was meeting senior government figures including the PM, in order to explain the role of London in delivering an EU wide Capital Markets Union and encourage Lithuanian support for the project.
3. **Boosting jobs and growth through supportive financial services regulation:** with PwC we published a report on different levels of EU financial services regulation. It showed that pitching regulation at the right level would boost the EU's wider economy, creating jobs and growth. The Report estimates well-calibrated regulation would result in an extra 11m jobs and 850bn euros in the EU economy by 2030.
4. **Supporting London as a centre for RMB:** The Corporation, through EDO, has championed the internationalisation of the RMB over the last 3-4 years. This played an important role in encouraging Government support for London's role as a key RMB trading centre outside China. Tangible results have been the issuing of a sovereign RMB bond last year, and ever increasing volumes of RMB business in the UK. The Bank of England has now started its own series tracking RMB business volumes, a role the Corporation played up until now. This frees up the Corporation to support London's role on RMB internationalisation in other ways. In his trip to the US (after this report was prepared), the Chairman of Policy and Resources will be helping launch a joint report on the RMB's wider importance, "Renminbi Ascending" and the internationalisation of the RMB will form an important part of the Lord Mayor's trip to China.

On our work in supporting neighbouring communities, highlights include:

5. **Strategic review of the Lord Mayor's Dragon Awards:** In the feedback, the awards were found to be unique, prestigious and inspiring. Areas for further work, including marketing and governance, are being addressed. The next Awards Ceremony takes place at the end of September.
6. **The 15th anniversary of Heart of the City** was also the occasion to plan broader engagement with SMEs across London, following a grant award from the City Bridge Trust.
7. **City Business Traineeships:** This flagship programme secured over 100 placements for young people from neighbouring boroughs in City businesses.

Damian Nussbaum, Director of Economic Development

T: 020 7332 3600

E: damian.nussbaum@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Review of EDO Business Plan (2015-18) - Progress April to August 2015

Objective	Details	Date	Milestones / progress	Status
1.	Promote the City as Europe’s and the world’s preeminent financial and business centre, supporting City interests in global markets, attracting inward investment and building stronger links with other parts of the UK	On-going	<p><u>Overview</u></p> <p>EDO’s championing of RMB internationalisation has been pivotal over the last 3-5 years. The Atlantic Council report marked the next important step.</p> <hr/> <p><u>Key achievements and actions</u></p> <p>US visit made by the Chairman.</p> <p>India Advisory Council meeting and associated events in London (validating areas of focus in India: the development of India’s Credit Market, the International role of the rupee, Infrastructure, Insurance/ re-insurance, Skills development. There was additional interest in green finance and financial technology.).</p> <p>Launch of Atlantic Council ‘<i>Renminbi Ascending: How China’s Currency Impacts Global Markets, Foreign Policy, and Transatlantic Financial Regulation</i>’ and CoL RMB business volumes 2014 report.</p> <p><u>Next steps</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support UK Government’s hosting of Chinese and Indian leaders in the autumn. • Potential visit for the Chairman to Washington DC to join Atlantic Council launch event. 	G

Review of EDO Business Plan (2015-18) - Progress April 2015 to July 2015

2.	<p>Ensure that the City of London Corporation, both in its own right and working with partners (e.g. TheCityUK), plays a leading role in promoting and developing a positive business, regulatory and policy environment; one in which the international financial services industry can thrive, continue to serve its customers and be a facilitator of economic growth and job creation.</p>	On-going	<p><u>Overview</u></p> <p>The City's contribution towards the development of a Capital Markets Union (CMU) has been the key focus for engagement.</p> <p>The development of our bilateral financial dialogues are also taking shape.</p> <hr/> <p><u>Key achievements and actions</u></p> <p><i>Capital Markets Union(CMU):</i> Co-hosted an event for Irish Minister of State at the Department of Finance (this also helped develop the bilateral dialogue with Dublin);</p> <p>Agreement on Anglo French position paper on CMU, a critical tool to influence in Brussels.</p> <p><u>Next steps</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation for EU reception in Brussels and for Anglo French and Irish dialogue working meetings • Preparation for the Chairman to visit Lithuania and Pre Presidency visit to Netherlands • National Institute of Economic & Social Research (NIESR) to undertake a study and video project on perceptions of immigration. 	G
----	--	----------	---	----------

Review of EDO Business Plan (2015-18) - Progress April 2015 to July 2015

Objective	Details	Date	Milestones / progress	Status
3.	Encourage, support and promote enterprise and responsible business growth across London, but especially in the communities of the City and neighbouring boroughs.	On-going	<p><u>Overview</u></p> <p>We completed a strategic review of the Lord Mayor’s Dragon Awards, the review recognised and encouraged best practice in corporate community engagement. Those consulted perceive the Awards as unique, prestigious and inspiring. Areas for further focus included wider marketing and governance arrangements.</p> <hr/> <p><u>Key achievements and actions</u></p> <p>Heart of the City 15th anniversary - City Bridge Trust funding secured to roll out activity London-wide, research into CSR in SMEs completed for launch at 2 July celebration</p> <p>Developing the relationship with Innovate Finance to identify 3 key areas of work together (see next steps).</p> <p><u>Next steps</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A series of events to raise awareness of neighbouring boroughs of EU innovation funding commences in Q2. • Implementation of Dragon Awards review recommendations including more robust governance arrangements and planning for Awards ceremony in September. • Key areas for future working with Innovate Finance includes co-operation on :- future governance; policy, research and parliamentary programmes; and increased engagement with the fintech business membership. 	G

Review of EDO Business Plan (2015-18) - Progress April 2015 to July 2015

4.	<p>Working with businesses and CoLC departments (including City Bridge Trust), to realise the economic and social potential of London, but especially the City and the neighbouring boroughs</p>	Sept 2015	<p><u>Overview:</u></p> <p>In order to make our work more coherent we produced a comprehensive report on all City Corporation employability activity together with a report proposing a new 'process' for assessing new CoL employability ideas to support London's communities, which have progressed through relevant CoL Committees/Boards. The next step is to support the new 'Study panel' seeking to address unemployment among young people in London, alongside preparing a clear narrative for our employability work with all age groups in London .</p> <hr/> <p><u>Key achievements and actions:</u></p> <p>Procurement completed for Managing Agent, and Programme Manager in place, for Central London Forward (CLF) 'Working Capital' programme (£11m, 5 year programme under London's 'Growth Deal' focusing on a new sub-regional approach to supporting unemployed leavers of the Government's Work Programme);</p> <p>An impact report published in July demonstrates that 1,500 Academy students benefitted from volunteer involvement in 2014-15 in our 'Aspiration Academy' programme, in which City of London staff volunteer to support Academy students with employability skills.</p> <p>City Business Traineeship programme launched in July, with 106 placements (and counting) secured for young people from neighbouring boroughs in City businesses.</p> <p><u>Next steps</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City Corporation's Education Strategy will be refreshed to cover 2015-2018. EDO will feed into the 'education to employment' theme • Launch of CLF's Working Capital programme across the 8 boroughs. • £2m CLF sub-regional construction skills programme in development 	G
----	--	-----------	--	----------

Review of EDO Business Plan (2015-18) - Progress April 2015 to July 2015

5.	Inform evidence based policy and programme development through appropriate and relevant research	On-going	<p><u>Overview</u></p> <p>Major focus on social impact investment following the publication of research into <i>'Developing a Global Financial Centre for Social Impact Investment'</i> and looking at the role the City Corporation could play in implementing its recommendations.</p>	G
			<p><u>Key actions</u></p> <p><i>'The Future of the City of London's Economy'</i> report,. updates the employment forecasts for the City and identifies challenges and opportunities for growth. The report was widely picked up by national media and is part of a wider strand around how the City's economy is changing.</p> <p><i>'The Future of European Financial Services'</i> report, shows that 11 million jobs and €850 billion of extra EU GDP could be created by 2030 .</p> <p>The <i>'Developing a Global Financial Centre for Social Impact Investment'</i> report, has been drawn on in Parliament for the Charities Bill debate, as well as being picked up widely in the trade press. This report looks at London's comparative position as a global centre for social impact investment and how to become the world's leading Social Impact Investment centre.</p> <p><u>Next steps</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New research reports will be launched in early autumn looking at economic cybercrime, working with the City of London Police, and currency use in global payments, working with the Anglo French Committee. • New work is being commissioned around London's international maritime links, and looking at the City as a location for SMEs, in discussion with the City Property Association. 	

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s):	Date(s):
Policy and Resources Committee	24 September 2015
Subject: Policy Initiatives Fund/Committee Contingency	Public
Report of: Chamberlain	For Information

Summary

1. The purpose of the Policy Initiatives Fund (PIF) is to allow the Committee to respond swiftly and effectively with funding for projects and initiatives identified during the year which support the City Corporation's overall aims and objectives.
2. The Committee contingency is used to fund unforeseen items of expenditure when no specific provision exists within Committee budgets such as hosting one-off events.
3. In identifying which items would sit within the PIF the following principles were applied:
 - Items that relate to a specific initiative i.e. research;
 - Sponsorship/funding for bodies which have initiatives that support the City's overall objectives; and
 - Membership of high profile national think tanks
4. The attached schedules list the projects and activities which have received funding for 2015/16. Whilst the schedule shows expenditure to be incurred in this financial year, some projects have been given multi-year financial support (please see the "Notes" column). It should be noted that the items referred to have been the subject of previous reports approved by this Committee.
5. The balances that are currently available in the PIF and the Committee contingency for 2015/16 are £162,300 and £129,700 respectively.

Recommendations

6. It is recommended that the contents of the schedules are noted.

Contact:
 Ray Green
 020 7332 1332
ray.green2@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE - POLICY INITIATIVES FUND 2015/16

ALLOCATIONS FROM PIF					STATUS OF BALANCE	
COMMITTEE DATE	DESCRIPTION	RESP OFFICER	ALLOCATION £	ACTUAL PAID TO 10/09/15 £	BALANCE TO BE SPENT £	NOTES
	Events					
21/11/13	London Councils' London Summit - the City is to host the annual conference for 3 years	DPR	15,400	13,507	1,893	3 year funding: £16,100 final payment in 2016/17
19/02/15	The International Organisation of Securities Commissions (IOSCO): CoL to host the opening Reception at the Guildhall	DED	12,000	3,600	8,400	
26/03/15	London Councils' 50th Anniversary of the London Boroughs - The City is to host this event on 19th May 2015	DPR	18,000	13,737	4,263	
26/03/15	Wireless Broadband Alliance (WBA) Global Conference - City of London's sponsorship of this event to be held on 18-21 May 2015. The WBA is a not for profit International membership association representing leading global operators and technology partners	DED	20,000	19,993	7	
30/04/15	AIMA 25th Anniversary Dinner and 2015 Annual Conference - The City of London Corporation is to host these events on 23 September 2015	DPR	15,000	15,025	(25)	
28/05/15	Proposed Project on the Impact of Immigration on the UK: City of London to sponsor a project to improve public understanding on evidence on the economic impacts of immigration	DED / DPR	30,000	30,000	0	
23/06/15	Institute for Government - Programme on "Government and Regulation": City of London to sponsor a series of public seminars and private roundtables to be held in partnership with the Institute	DPR	25,000	0	25,000	
	Promoting the City					
02/05/13	TheCityUK: CoL's additional funding	DED	100,000	50,000	50,000	3 year funding: £75,000 final payment in 2016/17
25/07/13	City of London Singapore strategy: City of London to commission a scoping paper to investigate the opportunities for developing a substantial regulatory dialogue with Singapore	DED	10,200	0	10,200	Originally allocated from 2014/15; deferred to 2015/16
20/02/14	Sponsor the "New FinTech UK" Initiative - Creation of a new body to promote and support the 'FinTech' (financial technology) sector	DED	250,000	62,500	187,500	3 year funding: £250,000 final payment in 2016/17
26/03/15	City of London Advertising - continuation of placing advertisements in CityAM to promote services provided by COL	DPR	45,000	16,250	28,750	2 year funding: £45,000 final payment in 2016/17

ALLOCATIONS FROM PIF					STATUS OF BALANCE	
COMMITTEE DATE	DESCRIPTION	RESP OFFICER	ALLOCATION £	ACTUAL PAID TO 10/09/15 £	BALANCE TO BE SPENT £	NOTES
	Communities					
22/03/13	Continued sponsorship of Teach First through support of its Higher Education Access Programme for Schools (HEAP)	DED	18,000	15,000	3,000	3 year funding: £18,000 final payment in 2015/16
10/10/13	Sponsorship of London Works - a social enterprise temporary recruitment agency: CoL's contribution to London Works, an agency set up by the East London Business Alliance, with the aim to place over 3,000 young people into temporary/contract roles with the City and Canary Wharf in its first 5 years	DED	25,000	21,500	3,500	The Director of Economic Development has reviewed the phasing. £25,000 has been deferred from 2014/15
20/02/14	Access Europe - City Corporation to become one of four core supporters of a European Funding hub to improve access to EU funding for London's public and voluntary organisations	DED	50,000	25,000	25,000	3 year funding: £50,000 final payment in 2015/16
20/02/14	TeenTech City 2014 - 2017 - support for annual events aiming to change perceptions of STEM careers in the UK	DED	10,000	7,500	2,500	3 year funding: £10,000 final payment in 2016/17
20/03/14	STEM and Policy Education Programme - funding of the Hampstead Heath Ponds Project	DOS	59,900	18,326	41,574	The Director of Open Spaces has reviewed the phasing as follows: £37,500 in 2016/17 & £23,850 in 2017/18 and £3,000 has been deferred from 2014/15 to 2015/16
1/12/14	Sponsorship of Tech London Advocates (TLA): further sponsorship to support the delivery of 2 major bi-annual summit events and the development and promotion of TLA's series of themed, advocate-led workstreams	DED	50,000	25,000	25,000	4 year funding: £50,000 in 2015/16 & 2016/17 & £37,500 in 2017/18
22/01/15	Support for Partnership for Young London's "Youth Employment Seminars": City of London to sponsor a series of 3 seminars around youth employment in March 2015, June 2015 & July/August 2015	DED / DCCS	10,000	0	10,000	2 year funding: £10,000 final payment in 2015/16
22/01/15	Angels in the City: CoL's sponsorship to London Business Angels for continued support to deliver the Angels in the City Initiative	DED	25,000	7,247	17,753	
26/03/15	New Entrepreneurs Foundation (NEF): further sponsorship of NEF, a not-for-profit organisation focussing on equipping young entrepreneurs to run scalable businesses	DED	20,000	20,000	0	3 year funding: £20,000 in 2016/17 & 2017/18
28/05/15	Support for a Study to Strengthen the City's Role in working with London's Communities: City of London to undertake a study on the challenges facing unemployed young Londoners	DED	30,000	0	30,000	
	Research					
20/03/14	Sponsorship of Demos Research Project - Young Muslim Employment - A multi-purpose cross-party think tank, project to examine employment among young Muslims	DPR	7,500	0	7,500	£15,000 originally allocated from 2014/15, £7,500 deferred to 2015/16

ALLOCATIONS FROM PIF					STATUS OF BALANCE	
COMMITTEE DATE	DESCRIPTION	RESP OFFICER	ALLOCATION £	ACTUAL PAID TO 10/09/15 £	BALANCE TO BE SPENT £	NOTES
03/07/14	Whitehall & Industry Group: Renewal of City Corporation Membership - WIG is an independent, not-for-profit organisation with a charitable purpose to build understanding and co-operation between government and business	DPR	5,000	4,300	700	2 year funding - £5,000 final payment in 2015/16
28/05/15	Sponsorship of New Local Government Network (NLGN) research project: Social Capital - How Public Investment Can Drive Public Value: City of London's sponsor to host and shape events relating to NLGN's project including the launch	DPR	15,000	0	15,000	
28/05/15	Sponsorship of Centre for London Commission on Housing for Londoners on Low-to-Middle Incomes: City of London's sponsor to host and shape events relating to the Commission's project including the launch	DPR	20,000	20,000	0	
16/07/15	Sponsorship of the King's Commission on London: City of London Corporation to be one of 4-6 core outside sponsors of a two-year research project on the future challenges and issues facing London.	TC	50,000	0	50,000	2 year funding - £50k in 2016/17
Attracting and Retaining International Organisations						
19/09/13	International Valuation Standards Council (IVSC) - City of London to support the accommodation costs of the IVSC	CS	50,000	12,500	37,500	5 year funding - £50k per year until 2018/19
03/07/14	International Forum of Sovereign Wealth Funds (IFSWF) - City of London to support the IFSWF Secretariat locating in the City	DED	120,700	59,820	60,880	4 year funding - £124,500 in 2016/17 & £31,300 in 2017/18
BALANCE REMAINING			1,106,700	460,804	645,896	
TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET			389,300			
ANALYSIS OF TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET			1,496,000			
ORIGINAL PROVISION			750,000			
APPROVED BROUGHT FORWARD FROM 2014/15			193,000			
TRANSFERRED FROM CONTINGENCY			253,000			
APPROVED ADDITIONAL RESOURCES			300,000			
TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET			1,496,000			

Page 111

NOTES:

(i) The Committee date records the actual approval meeting; in some instances approval is given for multi-year support for a project but the financial details in this table only show the expenditure due in the current year (2015/16). It should be noted that actual payments sometimes are made towards the end of a financial year.

KEY TO RESPONSIBLE OFFICER:-

MBC	Managing Director Barbican Centre	DPR	Director of Public Relations	CGO	Chief Grants Officer
DED	Director of Economic Development	DOS	Director of Open Spaces	DBE	Director of the Built Environment
TC	Town Clerk	CS	City Surveyor	DCCS	Director of Community & Childrens Services

This page is intentionally left blank

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE - POLICY INITIATIVES FUND

	2015/2016
	£
POLICY INITIATIVES FUND	
- Balance remaining prior to this meeting	389,300
<u>Less possible maximum allocations from this meeting</u>	
- Commonwealth Local Government Forum	25,000
- Think Tank Subscriptions	77,000
- Additional Events and Topical Issues Programme	55,000
- Centre for European Reform - Ditchley Park Conference	20,000
- REMIX Summit	10,000
- Housing and Finance Institute	40,000
	<hr/>
	227,000
Balance	<hr/> <hr/> 162,300

Caroline Al-Beyerty
Financial Services Director

This page is intentionally left blank

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE - CONTINGENCY 2015/16

<u>ALLOCATIONS FROM CONTINGENCY</u>					<u>STATUS OF BALANCE</u>	
<u>COMMITTEE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>RESP OFFICER</u>	<u>ALLOCATION</u>	<u>ACTUAL PAID TO 10/09/15</u>	<u>BALANCE TO BE SPENT</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<u>DATE</u>			<u>£</u>	<u>£</u>	<u>£</u>	
14/02/13	Platinum Partnership with London & Partners - the official promotional organisation for London	DCHL	25,000	25,000	0	3 year funding: £25,000 final payment in 2015/16
22/03/13	City of London Reserved Forces' Cadets' Association: continued funding of the RFCA	TC	42,000	42,000	0	3 year funding: £42,000 final payment in 2015/16. Previously the funding has been met by the Finance Grant Sub Committee
02/05/13	Support for Major Sports Events: the City Corporation to host a number of legacy objectives following the success of the London 2012 Games. One of these objectives is to support efforts to bring major world sporting events to London and the UK through the provision of hospitality	TC	8,800	0	8,800	£23,000 originally allocated from 2014/15, £8,800 deferred to 2015/16
27/06/13	The Mayor's Thames Festival: support for an education project known as The Rivers of the World - an annual free festival to celebrate the River Thames through arts, music & education	DPR	12,000	12,000	0	3 year funding: £12,000 final payment in 2015/16
21/11/13	'Supporting the City of London Corporation's Programme of European Engagement: CoL's additional funding towards the debates about Britain's relationship with the EU	DED / DPR	15,000	3,750	11,250	£179,800 originally allocated from 2014/15, £15,000 deferred to 2015/16
3/01/14	Career fairs - City of London Corporation to host up to three events per year to enhance employability of young people in neighbouring communities	DED	80,300	0	80,300	3 year funding: £45,300 deferred from 2014/15. £35,000 final payment in 2015/16
20/03/14	800th Anniversary of the Magna Carta - additional financial support for a number of additional activities as the 2015 anniversary approaches	DPR	25,500	9,885	15,615	2 year funding: £9,500 deferred from 2014/15. £16,000 final payment in 2015/16
08/05/14	City of London Scholarship - Anglo-Irish Literature: CoL to award a yearly scholarship to a single student to continue their studies in the field on Anglo-Irish Literature	TC	25,000	0	25,000	
02/10/14	800th Anniversary of Magna Carta: CoL to fund a number of activities including a contribution towards the cost of the prime national and international event to mark the anniversary at Runnymede on 15 June 2015	DPR / DCHL	107,000	106,894	106	2 year funding: £107,000 final payment in 2015/16
02/10/14	Great Fire of London: Feasibility Study - CoL to commission Artichoke to undertake a study on the viability of delivering a major public event in the City to commemorate the Great Fire of London	DCHL	4,600	4,600	0	£19,600 originally allocated from 2014/15, £4,600 deferred to 2015/16

<u>ALLOCATIONS FROM CONTINGENCY</u>					<u>STATUS OF BALANCE</u>	
<u>COMMITTEE DATE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>RESP OFFICER</u>	<u>ALLOCATION</u> £	<u>ACTUAL PAID TO 10/09/15</u> £	<u>BALANCE TO BE SPENT</u> £	<u>NOTES</u>
06/11/14	Livery Schools Link Consultant Project Manager: to cover recruitment of a part-time consultant for a one-off 6 month period to develop the business plan for the education office	TC	5,100	2,500	2,600	2 year funding: £2,100 deferred from 2014/15. £3,000 final payment in 2015/16
11/12/14	Encourage City Developers to buy from local and SMEs: to boost local economies within deprived London boroughs and to support small business growth	DPR	25,000	10,551	14,449	
11/12/14	National Maritime Museum - funding towards a special exhibition on Samuel Pepys and the Stuart Age at Royal Museums Greenwich	DED	25,000	25,000	0	
19/02/15	Supporting the Commonwealth (CWEIC): to engage with the Commonwealth further by becoming a partner of the Commonwealth Enterprise and Investment Council	TC	73,000	11,219	61,781	
26/03/15	Lord Mayor's Show Fireworks: City of London Corporation to hold a public fireworks display following the LM's Show. Funding to cover all aspects of the planned display including the fireworks display itself, and all the traffic management, public safety and crowd and related events management issues.	DPR	125,000	0	125,000	
			598,300	253,400	344,900	
	BALANCE REMAINING		129,700			
	TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET		728,000			
	ANALYSIS OF TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET					
	ORIGINAL PROVISION		800,000			
	APPROVED BROUGHT FORWARD FROM 2014/15		181,000			
	TRANSFERRED TO POLICY INITIATIVES FUND		(253,000)			
	TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET		728,000			

Page 116

NOTE: The Committee date records the actual approval meeting; in some instances approval is given for multi-year support for a project but the financial details in this table only show the expenditure due in the current year (2015/16). It should be noted that actual payments sometimes are made towards the end of a financial year.

KEY TO RESPONSIBLE OFFICER:-

CH	Chamberlain	DPR	Director of Public Relations	CGO	Chief Grants Officer
DED	Director of Economic Development	CPO	City Planning Officer	DBE	Director of the Built Environment
TC	Town Clerk	CS	City Surveyor	DCCS	Director of Community & Childrens Services
DOS	Director of Open Spaces			DMCP	Director of Markets & Consumer Protection
DCHL	Director of Culture, Heritage and Libraries				

CAROLINE AL-BEYERTY - FINANCIAL SERVICES DIRECTOR

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE - CONTINGENCY

		2015/2016
		£
CONTINGENCY		
- Balance remaining prior to this meeting		129,700
<u>Less possible maximum allocations from this meeting</u>		
-	<u>0</u>	0
Balance		<u>129,700</u>

Caroline Al-Beyerty
Financial Services Director

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee: Policy and Resources	Date: 24 September 2015
Subject: Decisions taken under delegated authority or urgency powers	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Information

Summary

This report advises Members of action taken by the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman since the last meeting of the Committee, in accordance with Standing Order Nos. 41(a) and 41(b).

Recommendation

To note the action taken since the last meeting of the Committee

Main Report

1. The following action has been taken under the urgency procedures, in accordance with Standing Order No. 41(a), since the last meeting of the Committee:-

Crossrail Arts Strategy – Transfer of Funding to Crossrail Ltd and the Crossrail Arts Foundation.

Approval was given to the transfer of the balance of the City Corporation's core funding of £173,928.08 to Crossrail Ltd (CRL) and to the Crossrail Arts Foundation (CAF) i.e. £116,500.00 transferred to the CRL and the remaining £57,428.08 to the CAF.

In December 2013 it was agreed that £250,000 in core funding should be provided over a period of three years (2013/14, 2014/15 and 2015/16) to facilitate the work required to secure private sponsorship to match the City Corporation's £3.5million contribution towards the Crossrail Arts Strategy. Since then the CAF has been established as a company and registered as a charity with the Charity Commission. Both the City Corporation and the CRL have directly expended sums in support of the Art Strategy. Approval was given to release £92,000.00 of the City Corporation's core funding, of which £76,071.92 has been spent on various projects. In turn CRL has directly incurred expenditure of £140,211.00 on professional and consultancy costs, both in furtherance of the Art Programme/Culture Line generally (£116,500.00) and also to directly benefit the CAF (£23,711.00).

Now that the charitable company has been established and has its own bank account it was considered prudent to transfer the balance of the City Corporation's core funding to CRL and the CAF in sums mentioned above as a donation as was always intended.

The transfers would assist with the charity's operating costs for the remainder of the fundraising and construction of the Crossrail stations period and would include the costs of promotional events, consultancy work, legal and professional fees and as well as cover the cost of reimbursing CRL for their expenditure on consultancy and legal services directly benefitting CAF to-date (£23,711.00. Making the monies available to the charity, rather than the City Corporation or CRL, allows the CAF to operate independently and transparently in raising sponsorship for the Crossrail Art Programme, and reflects legal advice.

Urgent action was taken as it was felt that it was no longer appropriate for payments associated with this project, some of which were outstanding, to continue to be made direct by the City Corporation as the Foundation was now fully up and running. Continuing to do so would undermine the Foundation's status and its oversight of the project as a whole.

Visit to Vilnius, Lithuania

Approval was given to Alderman Sir Roger Gifford and the City Corporation's Senior European Officer accompanying the Chairman of the Policy and Resources Committee on a visit to Vilnius on 13-15 September 2015 at a cost of approximately £1,600.

The purpose of the visit was to further engagement with ministers (including the Prime Minister), senior government officials and the finance industry, discuss EU financial services issues and attend a financial services conference at which both the Chairman and Sir Roger were speaking on the capital markets union.

Urgent action was taken as approval for this business travel proposal was needed prior to the visit and the Committee was not due to meet again until 24th September.

The REMIX Summit

Approval was given to the City Corporation becoming the strategic partner and host for the 2015 London REMIX Summit at a cost of £10,000.

The REMIX Summit is a high profile global event organised by a group of cultural entrepreneurs, CultureLabel, which has taken place in London, New York, Sydney and Dubai since 2012. The Summit brings together entrepreneurs and senior business leaders from the tech and culture sectors in order to network and develop strategies over a period of two days. It is to be held on 7th and 8th December 2015 (in Guildhall and at the Barbican Centre respectively).

The cost is being met from the Committee's Policy Initiatives Fund for 2015/16, categorised under Events and charged to City's Cash.

Urgent approval was sought as the conference organisers were keen to announce the event and venue as soon as possible and to begin to put the supporting logistics in place in consultation with the other corporate sponsors.

Contact:

Angela Roach, Principal Committee and Members Services Manager

T: 020 7332 3685

E: angel.roach@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank