

PLEASE BRING THIS AGENDA WITH YOU

1

The Lord Mayor will take the Chair at ONE  
of the clock in the afternoon precisely.



## COMMON COUNCIL

SIR/MADAM,

You are desired to be at a Court of Common Council, at **GUILDHALL**, on  
**THURSDAY** next, **the 7th day of December, 2017.**

JOHN BARRADELL,  
*Town Clerk & Chief Executive.*

*Guildhall,  
Wednesday 29th November 2017*

Sir Michael Bear

Matthew Richardson

}

*Aldermen on the Rota*

1 **Introduction of newly-elected Member**2 **Apologies**3 **Declarations by Members under the Code of Conduct in respect of any items on the agenda**4 **Minutes**

To agree the minutes of the meeting of the Court of Common Council held on 12 October 2017.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 1 - 20)

5 **Vote of Thanks to the Late Lord Mayor**

To pass the Vote of Thanks, read informally at the last meeting of the Court, to the late Lord Mayor.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 21 - 22)

6 **Resolutions on Retirements, Congratulatory Resolutions, Memorials**7 **Mayoral Visits**

The Right Honourable The Lord Mayor to report on his recent overseas visits.

8 **Policy Statement**

To receive a statement from the Chairman of the Policy and Resources Committee.

9 **Docquets for the Hospital Seal**10 **The Freedom of the City**

To consider a circulated list of applications for the Freedom of the City.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 23 - 28)

11 **Legislation**

To receive a report setting out measures introduced into Parliament which may have an effect on the services provided by the City Corporation.

**For Information**  
(Pages 29 - 30)

12 **Ballot Results**

The Town Clerk to report the outcome of the (several) ballot(s) taken at the last Court:

★ denotes appointed.

(A) One Member on **The City Bridge Trust Committee.**

Matthew Bell	9
Tijs Broeke	23
Peter Gerard Dunphy	52★

- (B) One Member on the **Health and Wellbeing Board**.

	<b>Votes</b>
Rehana Banu Ameer	13
Marianne Bernadette Fredericks	80★

**For Information**

### 13 **Appointments**

To consider the following appointments:

- (A) One Member on the **Community and Children's Services Committee**, for the balance of a term expiring in April 2018.

**Nominations received:-**

Adrian Mark Bastow

- (B) Four Members on the **Board of Governors of the Museum of London**, for four-year terms expiring in December 2021.

**Nominations received:-**

\*Vivienne Littlechild, J.P.

Paul Nicholas Martinelli

\*Jeremy Paul Mayhew

Wendy Mead, O.B.E.

Judith Lindsay Pleasance

\*John George Stewart Scott, J.P.

- (C) One Member on the **Mitchell City of London Charity and Educational Foundation**, for a five-year term expiring in December 2022.

**Nominations received:-**

Tom Hoffman, Deputy

- (D) One Member on the **Dr Johnson's House Trust**, for a two-year term expiring in December 2019.

**Nominations received:-**

\*Jeremy Lewis Simons

**For Decision**

### 14 **Questions**

15 **Motions**

- (A) By Tom Hoffman, Deputy  
“That the Resolution of Thanks to the late Lord Mayor, passed by Common Hall on 29 September last, be presented in a form agreeable to him?”
- (B) By Dr Giles Robert Evelyn Shilson, Deputy  
“That the Resolution of Thanks to William Anthony Bowater Russell, Alderman and Haberdasher and Peter Kenneth Estlin, Alderman and International Banker, the late Sheriffs of the City, passed by Common Hall on 29 September last, be presented in a form agreeable to them?”
- (C) By Joyce Carruthers Nash, O.B.E., Deputy  
“That Randall Keith Anderson be appointed on the Community and Children’s Services Committee as a representative for the Ward of Aldersgate, in the room of Richard Peter Crossan?”

16 **Awards and Prizes**

To receive a report of the Chairman of the Hampstead Heath, Highgate Wood and Queen’s Park Committee advising of the recent receipt of several awards.

**For Information**  
(Pages 31 - 32)

17 **Finance Committee**

To consider reports of the Finance Committee, as follows:-

- (A) **City Fund and Pension Fund Financial Statement** – to receive the City Fund and Pension Fund Financial Statements for 2016/17.
- (B) **City’s Cash, Bridge House Estates, City’s Cash Trust Funds and Sundry Trust Funds** – to receive the auditors’ report and financial statements relating to these accounts.

**For Information**  
(Pages 33 - 46)

**For Information**  
(Pages 47 - 82)

18 **Planning and Transportation Committee**

To consider the annual On-Street Parking Accounts for 2016/17.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 83 - 86)

19 **Planning and Transportation and Port Health and Environmental Services Committees**

To consider minor amendments to the Scheme of Delegations.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 87 - 100)

- 20 **Audit and Risk Management Committee**  
To consider the re-appointment of an external Member of the Committee.  
**For Decision**  
(Pages 101 - 104)
- 21 **Community and Children's Services Committee**  
To consider a Gateway 4b report relating to a programme of works across several housing estates maintained by the City Corporation.  
**For Decision**  
(Pages 105 - 108)
- 22 **Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee**  
To consider the adoption of a cultural strategy.  
**For Decision**  
(Pages 109 - 122)

## MOTION

- 23 **By the Chief Commoner**  
That the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business below on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act, 1972.  
**For Decision**
- 24 **Non-Public Minutes**  
To agree the non-public minutes of the meeting of the Court held on 12 October 2017.  
**For Decision**  
(Pages 123 - 126)
- 25 **(A) Policy and Resources Committee**  
To consider proposals concerning the relocation of the Museum of London.  
**For Decision**  
(Pages 127 - 132)
- 25 **(B) Markets Committee**  
To receive concerns raised by the Markets Committee in relation to the proposed relocation of the Museum of London *(to follow)*.  
**For Information**
- 26 **Policy and Resources and Finance Committees**  
To consider the award of a Work and Health Programme contract.  
**For Decision**  
(Pages 133 - 136)
- 27 **Finance Committee**  
To receive a report advising of action taken under urgency procedures relative to the award of a minor works contract.  
**For Information**  
(Pages 137 - 138)

- 28     **Audit and Risk Management Committee**  
To consider the appointment of an external auditor.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 139 - 142)

- 29     **Property Investment Board**  
To consider reports of the Property Investment Board, as follows:-

- (A)     **Reconciliation of Funds** – to consider a reconciliation of funds relative to a Bridge House Estates Property.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 143 - 146)

- (B)     **Report of Urgent Action Taken: Fleet House** – to receive a report advising of action taken under urgency procedures concerning the development of a site.

**For Information**  
(Pages 147 - 148)



## PARMLEY, MAYOR

# COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL

**12th October 2017**  
**MEMBERS PRESENT**

### ALDERMEN

Nicholas Anstee  
Sir Michael David Bear  
Alison Gowman  
David Andrew Graves  
Sheriff Timothy Russell Hailes, JP  
Peter Lionel Raleigh Hewitt, JP

Robert Picton Seymour Howard  
Vincent Thomas Keaveny  
Alastair John Naisbitt King  
Ian David Luder JP  
Nicholas Stephen Leland Lyons  
The Lord Mountevans, Jeffrey Evans

The Rt. Hon. the Lord Mayor, Dr Andrew  
Charles Parmley  
Matthew Richardson  
Sir David Hugh Wootton  
Sir Alan Colin Drake Yarrow

### COMMONERS

George Christopher Abrahams  
John David Absalom, Deputy  
Caroline Kordai Addy  
Munsur Ali  
Rehana Banu Ameer  
Randall Keith Anderson  
Alexander Robertson Martin Barr  
Douglas Barrow, Deputy  
Adrian Mark Bastow  
Matthew Bell  
John Bennett, Deputy  
Peter Gordon Bennett  
Nicholas Michael Bensted-Smith, JP  
Sir Mark Boleat  
Mark Bostock  
Keith David Forbes Bottomley, Deputy  
David John Bradshaw, Deputy  
Tijs Broeke  
Roger Arthur Holden Chadwick,  
OBE, Deputy  
John Douglas Chapman  
Dominic Gerard Christian

Henry Nicholas Almroth  
Colthurst  
Richard Peter Crossan  
Peter Gerard Dunphy  
Mary Durcan  
Emma Edhem  
Anne Helen Fairweather  
Sophie Anne Fernandes  
John William Fletcher  
Stuart John Fraser, CBE  
Marianne Bernadette Fredericks  
Prem Goyal OBE JP  
Caroline Wilma Haines  
The Revd Stephen Decatur  
Haines, Deputy  
Graeme Harrower  
Christopher Michael Hayward  
Tom Hoffman, Deputy  
Ann Holmes  
Michael Hudson  
Wendy Hyde, Deputy  
Jamie Ingham Clark, Deputy

Henry Llewellyn Michael Jones,  
Deputy  
Angus Knowles-Cutler  
Tim Levene  
Vivienne Littlechild JP  
Edward Lord, OBE, JP, Deputy  
Paul Nicholas Martinelli  
Andrew Paul Mayer  
Jeremy Mayhew  
Catherine McGuinness, Deputy  
Andrew Stratton McMurtrie, JP  
Wendy Mead, OBE  
Robert Allan Merrett, Deputy  
Andrien Gereith Dominic Meyers  
Brian Desmond Francis Mooney,  
Deputy  
Hugh Fenton Morris  
Alastair Michael Moss, Deputy  
Sylvia Doreen Moys  
Joyce Carruthers Nash, OBE,  
Deputy  
Dhruv Patel

Susan Jane Pearson  
William Pimlott  
James Henry George Pollard,  
Deputy  
Jason Paul Pritchard  
Stephen Douglas Quilter  
Richard David Regan, OBE,  
Deputy  
Elizabeth Rogula, Deputy  
James de Sausmarez  
Ruby Sayed  
John George Stewart Scott, JP  
Ian Christopher Norman Seaton  
Jeremy Lewis Simons  
Tom Sleigh, Deputy  
Graeme Martyn Smith  
Sir Michael Snyder  
William Upton  
Michael Welbank, MBE  
Mark Raymond Peter Henry  
Delano Wheatley  
Philip Woodhouse, Deputy

*Mead, W., O.B.E.,;*  
*Mayhew, J.P.*

***Resolved Unanimously*** – That Neil Graham Morgan Redcliffe, one of the Sheriffs of the City, be invited to take his seat on the Dais.

1. Apologies      The apologies of those Members unable to attend this meeting of the Court were noted.
2. Declarations    There were none.
3. Minutes        ***Resolved*** – That the Minutes of the last Court are correctly recorded, subject to Tim Levene being added to the list of those Members marked as present.

4. Draft Vote of Thanks to the Lord Mayor Tom Hoffman, Deputy of the Ward of Vintry, read the draft terms of a vote of thanks to the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, which was intended to be Moved formally at the next meeting of the Court.
- The Lord Mayor was heard in reply.
5. Letter A letter of the Lord Mayor Elect, declaring his assent to take upon himself the Office of Lord Mayor, was received.
6. Resolutions Tom Sleigh, Deputy of the Ward of Bishopsgate, read a vote of thanks to Pooja Suri Tank.  
*Sleigh, T.C.C., Deputy; Mead, W., O.B.E.*  
*Resolved unanimously* – That this Honourable Court wishes to extend to  
Pooja Suri Tank  
its gratitude for her service as a Member for the Ward of Bishopsgate over the past few months.  
As Members of this Court will be aware, sadly Pooja was only able to be with us for a short period following her election earlier this year. Unfortunately, the demands of her job have required her to relocate to New York and she is therefore unable to continue in her role on the Common Council. Nonetheless, we wish to take this opportunity to express our sincere appreciation for her efforts during her time with us, and extend our very best wishes for her future good health and happiness and hope that she may have the opportunity to re-join this Court at a future time.
7. Mayoral Visits The Right Honourable The Lord Mayor reported on his recent overseas visits to Mozambique, Zambia, South Africa, and the Republic of Ireland.
8. Chief Commoner The Court proceeded to elect a Chief Commoner for 2018/19.  
One valid nomination had been received in accordance with Standing Order No. 18, namely, that of John George Stewart Scott, J.P.  
*Resolved* – That John George Stewart Scott, J.P. be declared to be elected to the office of Chief Commoner for 2018/19.
9. Policy Statement There was no statement.
10. Hospital Seal Sundry documents were sealed with the Hospital Seal.
11. Freedoms The Chamberlain, in pursuance of the Order of this Court, presented a list of the under-mentioned persons who had made applications to be admitted to the Freedom of the City by Redemption:-  
**Alastair Turner Laidlaw** a Teacher Kensington, London  
*Giles Robert Evelyn Shilson, Deputy* Citizen and Ironmonger  
*Ian Christopher Norman Seaton, CC* Citizen and Girdler



<b>Georgina Mary Froggatt Stewart</b> <i>Colin Anthony Hart</i> <i>Thomas Linton Brettle</i>	a Practice Manager <i>Citizen and Broderer</i> <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i>	Ifield Green, Sussex
<b>Henry Stuart David Lynn</b>  <i>Lesley Jane Lynn</i> <i>Christopher Sandford Hall</i>	a Corporate Development Manager <i>Citizen and International Banker</i> <i>Citizen and Broderer</i>	Bermondsey, London
<b>Professor Zenobia Nadirshaw</b> <i>John Garbutt, Ald., JP</i> <i>Lord Karan Bilimoria, OBE DL</i>	a Clinical Psychologist <i>Citizen and Weaver</i> <i>Citizen and Draper</i>	Golders Green, London
<b>Martin Wayne White-Peart</b> <i>Stanley Brown, QGM, TD</i> <i>James William Lane</i>	a Social Worker <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Tyler &amp; Bricklayer</i>	Dartford, Kent
<b>James Alexander Hasler</b> <i>Jeffrey Bines</i> <i>Martin John Davies</i>	a Livery Company Beadle <i>Citizen and Fan Maker</i> <i>Citizen and Scrivener</i>	Catford, London
<b>Ian Raymond Lee</b> <i>Peter Claude Cave</i> <i>Daphne Edwina Cave</i>	an Insurance Broker <i>Citizen and Insurer</i> <i>Citizen and Glover</i>	Rushmoor, Farnham, Surrey
<b>Justin Charles Foley</b>  <i>Michael Richard Adkins</i> <i>Stanley Brown, QGM, TD</i>	a Regular Army Non-Commissioned Officer <i>Citizen and Water Conservator</i> <i>Citizen and Loriner</i>	Northampton, Northamptonshire
<b>David McKay Blair</b>  <i>Alistair Edward Telfer</i> <i>Manuel Salvador Cerrone Morales</i>	a Chartered Accountant  <i>Citizen and Musician</i> <i>Citizen and Musician</i>	Papworth Everard, Cambridgeshire
<b>Alexander James Oxley</b> <i>Christopher Punter</i>  <i>Robert George Williams</i>	a Postgraduate Student <i>Citizen and Information Technologist</i> <i>Citizen and Information Technologist</i>	Deal, Kent
<b>Daniel George Herbert</b> <i>Marianne Bernadette Fredericks, CC</i> <i>Robert James Ingham Clark, Deputy</i>	a Beadle <i>Citizen and Baker</i> <i>Citizen and Clothworker</i>	Hornchurch, Essex
<b>Michael Anthony Corcoran</b> <i>John Gavin</i>  <i>Michael Francis Lyons</i>	an Accounts Director <i>Citizen and Information Technologist</i> <i>Citizen and Information Technologist</i>	Esher, Surrey
<b>Iain Boyd Douglas</b> <i>William Stephen Gibbs</i> <i>Derek Mottershead</i>	an Architect <i>Citizen and Skinner</i> <i>Citizen and Mason</i>	Canterbury, Kent
<b>Edward Howard Longmore Devereux</b> <i>Patricia Agnes Campfield, MBE</i> <i>Phillip Arthur Dean</i>	a Chartered Insurer, retired  <i>Citizen and Wheelwright</i> <i>Citizen and Coachmaker &amp; Coach Harness Maker</i>	Southend-on-Sea, Essex
<b>Oladele Ede Craig</b> <i>Stephen Decatur Haines, Deputy</i>	a Priest <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i>	Lambeth, London

<i>Catherine Sidony McGuinness, Deputy</i>	<i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>	
<b>Michael Karl Rottmann</b> <i>Abdul Latif Dr Amin Latif</i>	a Consultancy Company Director <i>Citizen and Poulter Citizen and Poulter</i>	High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire
<b>Alan Charles Trotter</b> <i>Harold Ebenezer Piggott Paul Stephen Hollebhone</i>	a Graphic Artist <i>Citizen and Basketmaker Citizen and Chartered Accountant</i>	Barnham, West Sussex
<b>Dr Linda Elisabeth Radford</b> <i>Diane Irene Warman Alan Leslie Warman</i>	a Pharmacist, retired <i>Citizen and Clockmaker Citizen and Clockmaker</i>	Hertford, Hertfordshire
<b>Kevin Paul Saunders</b> <i>Stanley Brown, QGM, TD Michael Richard Adkins</i>	an Electrician <i>Citizen and Loriner Citizen and Water Conservator</i>	Feltham, Middlesex
<b>Gary Pridmore</b> <i>Michael Peter Cawston Colin Trevor Gurnett</i>	a Property Company Director <i>Citizen and Tyler &amp; Bricklayer Citizen and Wheelwright</i>	Rainham, Essex
<b>Kirsty Jane Patel</b> <i>Michael Hudson, CC Roger Arthur Holden Chadwick, OBE, Deputy</i>	a Housewife <i>Citizen and Painter Stainer Citizen and Bowyer</i>	Epsom, Surrey
<b>Samir Jayantilal Patel</b> <i>Michael Hudson, CC Roger Arthur Holden Chadwick, OBE, Deputy</i>	an Investment Manager <i>Citizen and Painter Stainer Citizen and Bowyer</i>	Epsom, Surrey
<b>Eamonn Francis McGurk</b> <i>Christopher Michael Hayward, CC William Frederick Welch</i>	a Plant and Transport Company Managing Director <i>Citizen and Pattenmaker Citizen and Plaisterer</i>	Gloucester, Gloucestershire
<b>Raymond Stewart Ellis</b> <i>Keith Richard Stevens John Edwin Hughes</i>	an Engineering Manager, retired <i>Citizen and Management Consultant Citizen and Loriner</i>	Bagworth, Leicestershire
<b>Anthony Frederick Nicholls</b> <i>Stephen Lawrence Purdy Thomas George Sharpe</i>	a Licenced Taxi Driver, retired <i>Citizen and Painter Stainer Citizen and Carman</i>	Rainham, Essex
<b>Samuel Mark Dallimore</b> <i>Anjola Adeniyi Charlotte Anne Green</i>	a Space Engineer <i>Citizen and Information Technologist Citizen and Baker</i>	Hatfield, Hertfordshire
<b>Daniel Filipe Pedrosa Da Silva</b> <i>Peadar O'Mordha Andrew Norris</i>	a Graphic Designer <i>Citizen and Apothecary Citizen and Feltmaker</i>	Pimlico, London
<b>Rear Admiral Richard Stokes</b> <i>Brian Andrew Kay, OBE, TD, DL Margaret Mary Miller</i>	a Royal Naval Officer <i>Citizen and Furniture Maker Citizen and Furniture Maker</i>	Havant, Hampshire
<b>Andrea Claire Stokes</b> <i>Brian Andrew Kay, OBE, TD, DL</i>	a Management Consultant <i>Citizen and Furniture Maker</i>	Havant, Hampshire

<i>Margaret Mary Miller</i>	<i>Citizen and Furniture Maker</i>	
<b>Daniel Nathan Van Gelder</b> <i>Sir Michael Bear, Kt., Ald.</i> <i>Alastair Michael Moss, Deputy</i>	a Chartered Surveyor <i>Citizen and Pavior</i> <i>Citizen and Goldsmith</i>	Swanwick, Hampshire
<b>Sarah Marie Lowther</b>  <i>Graham George Cooke</i> <i>Andrew Thomas Lister</i>	a Will Writing Company Director <i>Citizen and Painter Stainer</i> <i>Citizen and Vintner</i>	Caversham, Berkshire
<b>Commander Alistair John Marshall</b> <i>Gordon Lenham Warren</i>  <i>William Fitzgerald-O'Connor</i>	a Royal Navy Officer  <i>Citizen and Gold &amp; Silver Wyre Drawer</i> <i>Citizen and Gold &amp; Silver Wyre Drawer</i>	New Southgate, London
<b>David John Reynolds</b>  <i>Christopher James Caine</i>  <i>Alan Robert Brumwell</i>	a Chartered Accountant, retired <i>Citizen and Maker of Playing Cards</i> <i>Citizen and Plumber</i>	Leigh-on-Sea, Essex
<b>Stewart Gordon Smith</b>  <i>Peter Lionel Raleigh Hewitt, Ald.</i> <i>Alastair John Naisbitt King, Ald.</i>	a Financial Services Company Chairman <i>Citizen and Woolman</i> <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i>	Weybridge, Surrey
<b>Serena Patricia Caroline Miles</b>  <i>Philippe Roland Rossiter</i> <i>David Alastair Morgan-Hewitt</i>	a Hotelier  <i>Citizen and Innholder</i> <i>Citizen and Innholder</i>	Hardmead, Buckinghamshire
<b>Deborah Parritt</b> <i>Clive Anthony Parritt</i> <i>Jonathan Grosvenor</i>	a Public Relations Consultant <i>Citizen and Chartered Accountant</i> <i>Citizen and Chartered Accountant</i>	Hampstead, London
<b>Lesley Lawson</b> <i>Wendy Mead, OBE, CC</i> <i>Ann Elizabeth Esslemont</i>	an Actress and Model <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Glover</i>	Earls Court, London
<b>Allan Leigh Lawson</b> <i>Wendy Mead, OBE, CC</i> <i>Ann Elizabeth Esslemont</i>	an Actor, Director and Writer <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Glover</i>	Earls Court, London
<b>Professor Nicola Brindley</b> <i>Ian Alexander Mason</i> <i>Brian Wadsworth</i>	a University Professor <i>Citizen and Constructor</i> <i>Citizen and Carman</i>	Queens Park, London
<b>John Newman Winter</b>  <i>Geoffrey Douglas Ellis</i> <i>Wesley Val Hollands</i>	a Refrigeration Manufacturing Managing Director <i>Citizen and Joiner</i> <i>Citizen and Loriner</i>	Padbury, Buckinghamshire
<b>Gay-Yee Westerhoff</b> <i>Sir Michael Bear, Kt., Ald.</i> <i>Lady Barbara Anne Bear</i>	a Musician and Composer <i>Citizen and Pavior</i> <i>Citizen and Musician</i>	Holland Park, London
<b>Tania Lee Davis</b> <i>Sir Michael Bear, Kt., Ald.</i> <i>Lady Barbara Anne Bear</i>	a Musician <i>Citizen and Pavior</i> <i>Citizen and Musician</i>	Bournemouth, Dorset

<b>Sqn. Ldr. Matthew Brian Little</b> <i>Alan Leslie Warman</i> <i>Diane Irene Warman</i>	a Royal Air Force Officer <i>Citizen and Clockmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Clockmaker</i>	Bushey Heath, Hertfordshire
<b>Michael David Budden</b> <i>Stanley Brown, QGM, TD</i> <i>Michael Richard Adkins</i>	an Airline Headset Operator <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Water Conservator</i>	Hayes, Middlesex
<b>David James Cowan</b> <i>John Alexander Smail</i> <i>Elizabeth A Thornborough</i>	a Treasury Analyst <i>Citizen and Distiller</i> <i>Citizen and Upholder</i>	Kennington, London
<b>Christopher James Buss</b> <i>Jeremy Paul Mayhew, CC</i> <i>Robert James Ingham Clark, Deputy</i>	a Local Government Officer <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Clothworker</i>	Tooting, London
<b>Dr David Larry Williams</b> <i>Peter Lionel Raleigh Hewitt, Ald.</i> <i>Alastair John Naisbitt King, Ald.</i>	a Professor, retired <i>Citizen and Woolman</i> <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i>	Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada
<b>Shelagh Hilary Anne Gillard</b>  <i>Peter Hubert William Ruddy</i> <i>Melvyn Stuart Davis</i>	a Legal Secretary, retired  <i>Citizen and Bowyer</i> <i>Citizen and Bowyer</i>	Streatham, London
<b>Louis William Edward Randall</b> <i>Dr Peter Thomas James Rumley</i> <i>Dame Catherine Fiona Woolf, DBE, Ald.</i>	a Chartered Building Surveyor <i>Citizen and Plumber</i> <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>	Kensington, London
<b>Deborah Leigh Hindson</b> <i>Jeremy Paul Mayhew, CC</i> <i>Robert James Ingham Clark, Deputy</i>	a Director of Finance <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Clothworker</i>	South Woodford, London
<b>Martyn John Garrett</b> <i>Antonio Masella</i> <i>Daniel Mark Heath</i>	a Police Officer, retired <i>Citizen and Mason</i> <i>Citizen and Hackney Carriage Driver</i>	Ilford, Essex
<b>Ian Colin Smith</b> <i>Paul Joseph Jeremy Burton</i> <i>Roger Antony Prentis</i>	a Funeral Director, retired <i>Citizen and Fruiterer</i> <i>Citizen and Arbitrator</i>	Bessacarr, South Yorkshire
<b>Janet Rose Senior</b> <i>Jeremy Paul Mayhew, CC</i> <i>Robert James Ingham Clark, Deputy</i>	a Local Government Officer <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Clothworker</i>	Catford, London
<b>Rebecca Anne Pearce</b>  <i>Jani Levanen</i> <i>Vanessa Gloria Kramer</i>	a Director of Human Resources <i>Citizen and Stationer</i> <i>Citizen and Stationer</i>	Woolwich, London
<b>Christopher Andrew Cullen</b> <i>Neville John Watson</i> <i>Peter Francis Clark</i>	a Risk Controller <i>Citizen and Fletcher</i> <i>Citizen and Mason</i>	Walton-on-Thames, Surrey
<b>Trevor William Christian</b> <i>Graham John Peacock</i> <i>John Edward Peacock</i>	a Research Chemist, retired <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Loriner</i>	Pangbourne, Berkshire
<b>Geoffrey Stephen John Fall</b>  <i>Bryan Rosslyn Spearman</i>	a Country Club Manager, retired <i>Citizen and Firefighter</i>	Bognor Regis, West Sussex

<i>Richard John Bratton</i>	<i>Citizen and Firefighter</i>	
<b>Hon. Victoria Christian Fraser</b> <i>Timothy Russell Hailes, Ald., JP.</i> <i>Jeffrey Peter Mallam Kelly</i>	a Homemaker <i>Citizen and International Banker</i> <i>Citizen and Musician</i>	Mountfield, East Sussex
<b>Taylan Gungor</b> <i>Jani Levanen</i> <i>Vanessa Gloria Kramer</i>	a Historian <i>Citizen and Stationer</i> <i>Citizen and Stationer</i>	Islington, London
<b>John Clive Turnbull</b> <i>Jeremy Paul Mayhew, CC</i> <i>Robert James Ingham Clark, Deputy</i>	a Local Government Officer <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Clothworker</i>	Wickford, Essex
<b>Miles Tudor Peter Stuart-William</b> <i>William Barrie Fraser, OBE</i> <i>Roy Phillips</i>	a Stockbroker, retired  <i>Citizen and Gardener</i> <i>Citizen and Musician</i>	Surbiton, Surrey
<b>Robert Stewart</b> <i>John William Fletcher, CC</i> <i>Henry Llewellyn Michael Jones, Deputy</i>	a Printer <i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i> <i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i>	Waltham Abbey, Essex
<b>John Anastasio</b> <i>John William Fletcher, CC</i> <i>Henry Llewellyn Michael Jones, Deputy</i>	a Military Tailor <i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i> <i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i>	West Norwood, London
<b>Dr Matthew Robert Glozier</b>  <i>John James Tunesi of Liongam, The Younger</i> <i>Barry John Frederick Theobald-Hicks</i>	an Historian  <i>Citizen and Scrivener</i> <i>Citizen and Scrivener</i>	Earlwood, New South Wales, Australia
<b>David Scott Roach</b>  <i>John James Tunesi of Liongam, The Younger</i> <i>Barry John Frederick Theobald-Hicks</i>	an Import/Export Company Director <i>Citizen and Scrivener</i> <i>Citizen and Scrivener</i>	Wahroonga, New South Wales, Australia
<b>Christopher James Morgan</b> <i>Stanley Brown, QGM, TD</i> <i>Michael Richard Adkins</i>	a Police Officer <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Water Conservator</i>	Fitzrovia, London
<b>Simon Nicholas Mansfield</b>  <i>Timothy Russell Hailes, JP, Ald. &amp; Sheriff</i> <i>Alderman Charles Edward Beck Bowman, Ald.</i>	a Consulting Company Director <i>Citizen and International Banker</i> <i>Citizen and Grocer</i>	Fulham, London
<b>Alyson Faye Lockett</b> <i>The Rt. Hon. The Lord Mayor</i> <i>William Harry Dove, OBE, JP</i>	a Solicitor <i>Citizen and Musician</i> <i>Citizen and Ironmonger</i>	Brockley, London
<b>Andrew Kevin Green</b> <i>The Rt. Hon. The Lord Mayor</i> <i>William Harry Dove, OBE, JP</i>	a House Husband <i>Citizen and Musician</i> <i>Citizen and Ironmonger</i>	Brockley, London
<b>Peter Mark Turner</b> <i>Jeremy Paul Mayhew, CC</i> <i>Robert James Ingham Clark, Deputy</i>	a Director of Finance <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Clothworker</i>	Orpington, Kent

<b>The Rt. Hon. The Lord Andrew Adonis, PC</b> <i>Jeremy Paul Mayhew, CC</i> <i>Catherine Sidony McGuinness, Deputy</i>	a Member of the House of Lords <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>	Camden, London
<b>The Lord Daniel William Finkelstein, OBE</b> <i>Jeremy Paul Mayhew, CC</i> <i>Sir Michael Bear, Kt., Ald.</i>	a Journalist <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Pavior</i>	Pinner, London
<b>Adnan Ahmed Yusuf Abdulmalek</b> <i>Lady Poppy Cooksey, OBE, DL</i> <i>Mark Anthony Grove</i>	a Banking Group President <i>Citizen and Art Scholar</i> <i>Citizen and Cook</i>	Qalali, Bahrain
<b>Mark Maidment</b> <i>Jeremy Paul Mayhew, CC</i> <i>Robert James Ingham Clark, Deputy</i>	a Director of Finance <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Clothworker</i>	Ickenham, London
<b>Caroline Holland</b> <i>Jeremy Paul Mayhew, CC</i> <i>Robert James Ingham Clark, Deputy</i>	a Director of Corporate Services <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Clothworker</i>	Wandsworth, London
<b>Ian Michael Williams</b> <i>Jeremy Paul Mayhew, CC</i> <i>Robert James Ingham Clark, Deputy</i>	a Group Finance Director <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Clothworker</i>	Hackney, London
<b>James Rolfe</b> <i>Jeremy Paul Mayhew, CC</i> <i>Robert James Ingham Clark, Deputy</i>	an Executive Finance Director <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Clothworker</i>	Watton, Norfolk
<b>Michael Francis O'Donnell</b> <i>Jeremy Paul Mayhew, CC</i> <i>Robert James Ingham Clark, Deputy</i>	a Finance Director <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Clothworker</i>	Bayswater, London
<b>The Rt. Hon. David Gregory Clark, MP</b> <i>Jeremy Paul Mayhew, CC</i> <i>Catherine Sidony McGuinness, Deputy</i>	a Member of Parliament <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>	Tunbridge Wells, Kent
<b>His Excellency Sayakane Sisouvong</b> <i>The Rt. Hon. The Lord Mayor</i> <i>William Barrie Fraser, OBE</i>	The Ambassador of Laos <i>Citizen and Gardener</i>	Bayswater, London

Read.

*Resolved* – That this Court doth hereby assent to the admission of said persons to the Freedom of this City by Redemption upon the terms and in the manner mentioned in the several Resolutions of this Court, and it is hereby ordered that the Chamberlain do admit them severally to their Freedom accordingly.

## 12. Legislation

The Court received a report on measures introduced by Parliament which might have an effect on the services provided by the City Corporation as follows:-

### **Bills**

#### **Data Protection Bill**

The Bill will implement wide-ranging new EU rules on data protection as set out in the General Data Protection Regulation, and extend similar but modified rules to the fields of criminal justice and national security.

### **Statutory Instruments**

### **Date in force**

**The Income-related Benefits (Subsidy to Authorities) Amendment Order 2017, S.I. No. 900** 26 October 2017

The Order sets out details of the housing benefit subsidy to be paid to local authorities (including the Common Council acting in that capacity) for the financial years 2016/17 and 2017/18. It includes a new initiative to incentivise the reduction of fraud and error.

*(The text of the measures and the explanatory notes may be obtained from the Remembrancer's office.)*

### 13. Appointments

The Court proceeded to consider appointments to the Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls, The City Bridge Trust Committee, the Health and Wellbeing Board, Bridewell Royal Hospital, and the East London NHS Foundation Trust.

- (A) Two Members on the **Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls** (one vacancy for a balance of a term ending July 2018 and one vacancy for a term ending July 2020).

#### **Nominations received:-**

Rehana Banu Ameer

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Rehana Banu Ameer to be appointed to Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls for a term ending July 2020.

- (B) One Member on **The City Bridge Trust Committee** (one vacancy for a balance of a term ending April 2021).

#### **Nominations received:-**

Rehana Banu Ameer

Matthew Bell

Tijs Broeke

Peter Gerard Dunphy

Read.

The Court proceeded, in accordance with Standing Order No. 10, to ballot on the vacancy. The Lord Mayor appointed the Chief Commoner and the Chairman of the Finance Committee, or their representatives, to be scrutineers of the ballot.

*Resolved* – that the votes be counted at the conclusion of the Court and the result printed in the Summons for the next meeting.

- (C) One Member on the **Health and Wellbeing Board** (one vacancy for the balance of a term ending April 2020).

**Nominations received:-**

Rehana Banu Ameer

Marianne Bernadette Fredericks

Read.

The Court proceeded, in accordance with Standing Order No. 10, to ballot on the vacancy. The Lord Mayor appointed the Chief Commoner and the Chairman of the Finance Committee, or their representatives, to be scrutineers of the ballot.

*Resolved* – that the votes be counted at the conclusion of the Court and the result printed in the Summons for the next meeting.

- (D) One Member of **Bridewell Royal Hospital** (one vacancy for the balance of a term ending October 2023).

**Nominations received:-**

Rehana Banu Ameer

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Rehana Banu Ameer to be appointed to Bridewell Royal Hospital for the balance of a term ending October 2023.

- (E) One Member on the **East London NHS Foundation Trust** (one vacancy for the balance of a term ending May 2020).

**Nominations received:-**

Rehana Banu Ameer

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Rehana Banu Ameer to be appointed to the East London NHS Foundation Trust for the balance of a term ending May 2020.

14. Questions

**Underpayments of s106 Monies**

Mary Durcan asked a question of the Chairman of Planning and Transportation regarding underpayments of s106 monies.

The Chairman advised that City Local Plan policy required housing developments with ten or more residential units to provide 30% affordable housing on-site or, exceptionally, 60% equivalent on another site or as a cash in-lieu payment.

Where a developer could not provide the required level of affordable housing, or



sought an off-site payment, they were required to justify this through a viability appraisal. This reflected guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan.

The City Corporation had commenced a review of the City's Local Plan and would be considering what changes were necessary to ensure the delivery of affordable housing going forward. In considering these changes, account would be taken of the Mayor of London's recently adopted Affordable Housing and Viability Supplementary Planning Guidance, which required developments providing less than 35% affordable housing to be justified by reference to a publicly available viability assessment.

### **City of London Police Investigation**

Prem Goyal asked a question of the Chairman of Policy and Resources regarding a City of London Police investigation. In reply, the Chairman noted that she was not able comment on police matters and encouraged the Honourable Member to raise the issue with the City of London Police directly.

In response to a supplementary question from Prem Goyal regarding a review of the outcomes of the recent City-wide elections, the Chairman clarified that the Policy and Resources Committee had surveyed potential electoral candidates who subsequently chose not to stand in the City elections in a bid to understand their reasons for not doing so, in order to inform the promotion of diversity on the Court of Common Council in the future. The Committee had not reviewed the overall outcome of the City elections.

### **Overseas Engagement**

Prem Goyal asked a question of the Chairman of the Mayoralty Visits Advisory Committee regarding the evaluation of overseas engagement.

Responding, the Chairman outlined the general level of expenditure associated with overseas visits made by the Lord Mayor and the Chairman of the Policy and Resources Committee and noted that these visits were central elements of the City Corporation's more strategic, joined-up and complementary programme of overseas engagement. The programme reflected the greater overseas focus of the City Corporation's enhanced trade and investment strategy and regular reports were made on the outcomes of the visits to Members, through various mechanisms.

The Chairman also reminded Members of the outcomes of the Fraser Review, since which officers in Mansion House and the Economic Development Office (EDO) had been working closely with Her Majesty's Government and businesses to look at how to continue to drive stronger, shared outcomes and build a more co-ordinated approach. The Mayoral Visits Advisory Committee also continued to monitor the impact of visits and their policy and trade and investment outcomes, alongside Government and the businesses involved, and recent reorganisations in both EDO and Mansion House had brought increased international expertise with which to review the programme of visits, using a variety of metrics including new Foreign Direct Investment projects landing in London and positive business feedback on Mayoral visits.

### **Pedestrian Safety**

Alderman Ian Luder asked a question of the Chairman of Planning and Transportation regarding pedestrian safety in the City.

In reply, the Chairman advised that pedestrian casualties had become the primary focus of the City of London Corporation's Road Danger Reduction work programme. Activity also continued on engineering, behavioural and educational programmes to further reduce pedestrian injuries. To support this, the City Corporation was modelling current and likely future pedestrian flows within the City which it would be using to identify overcrowding hot-spots. This data would be used to explore opportunities for crowd dissipation, promoting alternative walking routes and reducing pedestrian overcrowding that could result in spillage onto City streets. The Chairman further noted that current data on pedestrian casualties held by the City of London Police was not broken down across factors such as age or disability.

In response to a supplementary question from Deputy Brian Mooney regarding the potential for greater levels of pedestrianisation across the City in the longer term, the Chairman replied that his immediate priority was to focus on safety on the City's streets. He observed that there were many methods of achieving this, of which pedestrianisation was one, and advised that all options would be considered by the Planning and Transportation Committee in due course.

#### 15. Motions

The Town Clerk advised that the Lord Mayor had directed that an urgent motion be put before the Court of Common Council, pursuant to Standing Order 12(4).

*Ali, M.;*  
*Bell, M.*

*Motion* – “That this Honourable Court expresses its deep regret at the ongoing violence in Myanmar and the oppression of that country's minority Rohingya population. It further expresses its considerable disappointment that Aung San Su Kyi, Myanmar's Foreign Minister and State Counsellor, Nobel Laureate and Honorary Freeman of the City of London has not appeared to challenge the conduct of her armed forces to end their humanitarian crisis.

The Court notes the concerns expressed by several Honourable Members at the timing of and the process leading to the grant to Aung San Suu Kyi, Myanmar's Foreign Minister and State Counsellor of the honorary freedom.

This Court therefore resolves:

- (a) To instruct its Freedom Applications Committee to Review the process by which proposals for the Honorary Freedom are promulgated and brought before the Court;
- (b) To ensure that any future procedure should allow for wide informal and confidential consultation with Members prior to any proposal being made officially, and certainly before the proposed recipient is sounded out about the honour;
- (c) To establish whether, once awarded, this Honorary Freedom may be removed, and if so, by what procedure;

- (d) In the event the Court does not currently have a procedure to revoke an Honorary Freedom once granted, then the relevant steps are taken to address this lacuna and consideration is given to implementing and documenting such a procedure; and
- (e) To write to the Ambassador for Myanmar, expressing the Court's profound concern about the current situation in his country and a wish that Aung San Suu Kyi, Myanmar's Foreign Minister and State Counsellor, plays a more active role to end the humanitarian crisis."

The Chairman of the Policy and Resources Committee and the Chairman of the Freedom Applications Committee were heard in support of the Motion.

With reference to section (e) of the Motion, a Member suggested that this was arguably a matter on which the Court might wish to seek advice from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office before proceeding.

A number of Members also expressed concern that any move to remove the Honorary Freedom from Aung San Suu Kyi would weaken her political position within Myanmar and would, in the longer term, prove a mistake.

Barrow, D.G.F.,  
Deputy;  
Mooney, B.D.F.,  
Deputy

*Amendment* – That section (e) of the Motion be revised to read:-

- (e) *Subject to consideration by the Freedom Applications Committee, to write to the Ambassador for Myanmar, expressing the Court's profound concern about the current situation in his country and a wish that Aung San Suu Kyi, Myanmar's Foreign Minister and State Counsellor, plays a more active role to end the humanitarian crisis.*

This amendment was subsequently withdrawn and a further amendment moved.

Barrow, D.G.F.,  
Deputy;  
Mooney, B.D.F.,  
Deputy

*Amendment* – That section (e) of the Motion be revised to read:-

- (e) *That the Policy and Resources Committee review whether a letter should be written to the Ambassador for Myanmar, expressing the Court's profound concern about the current situation in his country and a wish that Aung San Suu Kyi, Myanmar's Foreign Minister and State Counsellor, plays a more active role to end the humanitarian crisis.*

Upon the Amendment being put, the Lord Mayor declared it to be carried.

A division being demanded and granted, there appeared:-

*For the Affirmative 26*

ALDERMEN

Sir Michael David Bear

Sheriff Timothy Russell Hailes, JP

Robert Picton Seymour Howard

## COMMONERS

Matthew Bell  
 Nicholas Michael Bensted-Smith, JP  
 David John Bradshaw, Deputy  
 Henry Nicholas Almroth Colthurst  
 Emma Edhem  
 Stuart John Fraser, CBE  
 Caroline Wilma Haines  
 Graeme Harrower

Christopher Michael Hayward  
 Tom Hoffman, Deputy  
 Michael Hudson  
 Wendy Hyde, Deputy  
 Jamie Ingham Clark, Deputy  
 Jeremy Mayhew  
 Wendy Mead, OBE

Robert Allan Merrett, Deputy  
 James Henry George Pollard, Deputy  
 James de Sausmarez  
 John George Stewart Scott, JP  
 Jeremy Lewis Simons  
 Mark Raymond Peter Henry Delano  
 Wheatley

Tellers for the affirmative – (Affirmative) Deputy Doug Barrow and Peter Dunphy (Negative).

*For the Negative 64*

## ALDERMEN

Nicholas Anstee  
 Alison Gowman  
 David Andrew Graves  
 Vincent Thomas Keaveny

Alastair John Naisbitt King  
 Ian David Luder JP  
 Nicholas Stephen Leland Lyons

The Lord Mountevans, Jeffrey Evans  
 Sir David Hugh Wootton  
 Sir Alan Colin Drake Yarrow

## COMMONERS

George Christopher Abrahams  
 John David Absalom, Deputy  
 Caroline Kordai Addy  
 Munsur Ali  
 Rehana Banu Ameer  
 Randall Keith Anderson  
 Alexander Robertson Martin Barr  
 Adrian Mark Bastow  
 John Bennett, Deputy  
 Peter Gordon Bennett  
 Sir Mark Boleat  
 Mark Bostock  
 Keith David Forbes Bottomley, Deputy  
 Tijs Broeke  
 Michael John Cassidy, CBE, Deputy  
 Roger Arthur Holden Chadwick, OBE, Deputy  
 Dominic Gerard Christian  
 Richard Peter Crossan

Mary Durcan  
 Anne Helen Fairweather  
 Sophie Anne Fernandes  
 John William Fletcher  
 Marianne Bernadette Fredericks  
 Prem Goyal OBE JP  
 The Revd Stephen Decatur Haines, Deputy  
 Ann Holmes  
 Henry Llewellyn Michael Jones, Deputy  
 Angus Knowles-Cutler  
 Tim Levene  
 Vivienne Littlechild JP  
 Paul Nicholas Martinelli  
 Catherine McGuinness, Deputy  
 Andrew Stratton McMurtrie, JP  
 Andrien Gereith Dominic Meyers  
 Alastair Michael Moss, Deputy

Sylvia Doreen Moys  
 Joyce Carruthers Nash, OBE, Deputy  
 Dhruv Patel  
 Susan Jane Pearson  
 William Pimlott  
 Jason Paul Pritchard  
 Stephen Douglas Quilter  
 Richard David Regan, OBE, Deputy  
 Elizabeth Rogula, Deputy  
 Ruby Sayed  
 Ian Christopher Norman Seaton  
 Tom Sleight, Deputy  
 Graeme Martyn Smith  
 Sir Michael Snyder  
 William Upton  
 Michael Welbank, MBE  
 Philip Woodhouse, Deputy

Tellers for the negative – (Negative) Deputy Edward Lord and Deputy Brian Mooney (Affirmative).

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared the Amendment to not be carried.

*Motion* – That, in accordance with Standing Order 11(9), the Question be now put.

*Dunphy, P.G.;*  
*Mead, W., O.B.E.*

Upon the Question being put, the Lord Mayor declared the Motion to be carried.

*Resolved* – That the deep regret of this Honourable Court be expressed at the ongoing violence in Myanmar and the oppression of that country's minority Rohingya population. Further, its considerable disappointment be expressed that Aung San Su Kyi, Myanmar's Foreign Minister and State Counsellor, Nobel Laureate and Honorary Freeman of the City of London had not appeared to challenge the conduct of her armed forces to end their humanitarian crisis.

That the concerns expressed by several Honourable Members be noted at the

timing of and the process leading to the grant to Aung San Suu Kyi, Myanmar's Foreign Minister and State Counsellor, of the Honorary Freedom.

*Further resolved – That:-*

- (a) The Freedom Applications Committee be instructed to review the process by which proposals for the Honorary Freedom are promulgated and brought before the Court;
- (b) Measures be taken to ensure that any future procedure allows for wide informal and confidential consultation with Members prior to any proposal being made officially, and certainly before the proposed recipient is sounded out about the honour;
- (c) To establish whether, once awarded, this Honorary Freedom may be removed, and if so, by what procedure;
- (d) In the event the Court does not currently have a procedure to revoke an Honorary Freedom once granted, then the relevant steps be taken to address this lacuna and consideration is given to implementing and documenting such a procedure; and
- (e) The Ambassador for Myanmar be written to, expressing the Court's profound concern about the current situation in his country and a wish that Aung San Suu Kyi, Myanmar's Foreign Minister and State Counsellor, plays a more active role to end the humanitarian crisis.

16. Awards and Prizes There was no report.

## 17. **POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**(Catherine McGuinness, Deputy)**

21 September 2017

### **Overseas Engagement**

The Policy and Resources Committee was responsible for any policy decisions on the City of London Corporation's overseas engagement activities. A review of the City Corporation's international engagement had recently been undertaken which had identified the strategic priorities for influencing policy/regulation and supporting trade and investment. These priorities had now been reflected in a draft travel schedule for the Chairman of Policy and Resources and the Lord Mayor for 2017/18. It was anticipated that engagement would now be more strategic, joined-up and complementary.

*Resolved – That the report be received.*

## 18. **HOSPITALITY WORKING PARTY OF THE POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**(Wendy Mead, O.B.E., Chief Commoner)**

13 September 2017

### **(i) Early Evening Reception to launch the Fields of Battle – Lands of Peace: Peace and Reconciliation exhibition**

From 30 April to 30 May 2018, an outdoor photographic exhibition, *Fields of Battle -*

*Lands of Peace: Peace and Reconciliation* was to be displayed in the Guildhall Yard and it was recommended that the City Corporation host an early evening reception to launch the start of this exhibition. Guests would include representatives from the countries featured in the exhibition, historians with an interest in the First World War, representatives from the City's Privileged Regiments, the Museum of London, the Imperial War Museum, London Metropolitan Archives, Parliamentarians, students from the City Academies and Schools, and Members with relevant interests.

The host element would be the Hospitality Working Party, the Culture Heritage & Libraries Committee, and Members with relevant interests.

*Resolved* – That hospitality be granted for an early evening reception, with arrangements to be made under the auspices of the Hospitality Working Party; the costs to be met from City's Cash and within the approved parameters.

**(ii) Early Evening Reception in support of a First World War Commemorative Exhibition in Guildhall Yard**

The Royal Parks and the Royal Parks Guild were intending to hold a series of events to commemorate their involvement in the First World War, and to mark the contribution made by men and women who worked in British parks and gardens and who lost their lives in the conflict. One of the proposed projects was a commemorative installation, to be delivered in partnership with the Worshipful Company of Gardeners, which was to be located in Guildhall Yard from 3 to 13 April 2018.

It was recommended that the City Corporation host an early evening reception in support of this installation, with guests to include representatives from the Livery Companies, the City's Privileged Regiments, the Museum of London, the Royal Horticultural Society, the Royal Parks, Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport, Parliamentarians, City staff who had served in the armed forces, students from the City Academies and Schools, and Members with relevant interests.

The host element would be the Hospitality Working Party, the Open Spaces & City Gardens Committee, and Members with relevant interests.

*Resolved* – That hospitality be granted for an early evening reception, with arrangements to be made under the auspices of the Hospitality Working Party; the costs to be met from City's Cash and within the approved parameters.

19.

**PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

**(Christopher Michael Hayward)**

3 October 2017

**Tudor Street/New Bridge Street – Alternative Layout Update**

The City Corporation had previously agreed to accept and support Transport for London's (TfL's) proposal for Cycle Super Highways (CSH) within the City at its Policy and Resources Committee meeting on 19 February 2015. TfL had later set out proposals in relation to the design detail of how the North/South CSH would impact on local streets, including the Tudor Street/New Bridge Street junction.

These were agreed by the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee on 22 February 2016, having first deferred the decision to facilitate further local consultation. Thereafter, TfL proceeded to implement their scheme with immediate effect.

In March 2016, the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee decision was 'called-in' and overturned by the Court of Common Council at its meeting of 21 April 2016. Despite this, TfL had proceeded to deliver their CSH scheme at Tudor Street through a Works Permit issued in late 2015 and an Experimental Order which the City Corporation was unable to prevent (as this Order related to construction and movement on New Bridge Street, for which TfL were the Highway Authority). The impact of this Experimental Order on Tudor Street was that vehicles were prevented entering from New Bridge Street. The pre-existing restriction, limiting Tudor Street egress to left turning vehicles only, was retained.

Officers were consequently instructed to work with TfL, the Temples and their transport consultant to establish if a more effective scheme could be developed and, on 12 January 2017, the Chairman of the Planning and Transportation Committee advised the Court of Common Council that TfL had agreed to work with the City Corporation to progress an alternative Tudor Street/New Bridge Street Junction layout and that a scheme had been agreed in principle by TfL which would improve egress by introducing the option of a right turn. The Court consequently approved this alternative layout, but noted that it would be subject to detailed design including safety assessments and traffic modelling. Unfortunately, it transpired that the approved layout proved to be undeliverable for TfL on safety grounds.

TfL were committed to developing an alternative layout that would deliver the same benefits as the layout agreed by the Court of Common Council. They had, therefore, been working closely with City Corporation officers and the consultant engaged by the Temples to establish a viable scheme, which had now been produced and was presented for Members' consideration. The Court's approval was now sought for officers to work with TfL to confirm whether this new alternative layout was viable through detailed design and modelling, noting that, if it was found to be so, then the cost would be in excess of £2.3million, for which funding had not currently been identified.

The Chairman spoke to introduce the item and a number of Members spoke in support of the proposal. In response to a query concerning the potential cost of the work, the Chairman replied that this represented good value for a scheme which was able to deliver an acceptable solution for all parties.

*Resolved* – That officers should continue to work with TfL and representatives of the Temples to establish the viability of the new layout through detailed design and traffic modelling; and officers be instructed to investigate possible funding options for the scheme.

20. **BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE GUILDHALL SCHOOL OF MUSIC AND DRAMA**

**(John Alfred Bennett, Deputy)**

3 July 2017

**Proposed Quorum Change**

Over the past calendar year, the Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama had been considering its compliance with *The Higher Education Code of Governance* and related matters. As a result of these deliberations, the Board had determined to recommend a change to its existing quorum in order to better comply with the Code and to reflect best practice in the Higher Education sector.

The Policy and Resources Committee had been consulted and endorsed the recommendation at its September meeting; the Court was consequently now recommended to approve a proposed change to the quorum of the Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama such that the attendance of at least three co-opted Governors would be required, in addition to the seven Common Council Governors currently needed.

*Resolved* – That the Terms of Reference and Instrument and Articles of Government of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama be amended, such that the quorum consists of any seven Common Council Governors plus three co-opted Governors.

21. **EDUCATION BOARD**

**(Henry Nicholas Almroth Colthurst)**

14 September 2017

**Appointments to the City of London Academies Trust**

Due to a potential conflict of interest, the current Chairman of the Education Board had not taken up the role of Company Member and Trustee of the City of London Academies Trust. However, it had not been possible to make an appointment in the room of the Education Board Chairman as the January 2016 resolution of the Court was explicit that the Education Board Chairman should perform both of these roles. Therefore, it was recommended that the January 2016 resolution should be adjusted to permit a representative to be appointed to those roles in the room of any Member who is not able to serve.

*Resolved* – That the January 2016 resolution of the Court of Common Council be amended to permit a representative/nominee of the Chairman/Deputy Chairman of the Policy Committee and the Education Board to serve as Company Member/Trustee of the City of London Academies Trust, where the original candidate is not able to serve.

22. *Resolved* – That the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business below on the grounds they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

*Mead, W., O.B.E.;  
Mayhew, J.P*

**Summary of exempt items considered whilst the public were excluded:-**



23. *Resolved* – That the non-public Minutes of the last Court are correctly recorded.
24. **Policy and Resources and Finance Committees**  
The Court received a report outlining action taken under urgency procedures relating to the purchase of a freehold.
25. **Police Committee**  
The Court received a report setting out action taken under urgency procedures in respect of the City Police's Action and Know Fraud Centre.

The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and ended at 2.05pm.

**BARRADELL.**

This page is intentionally left blank

## Resolution of Thanks to the Late Lord Mayor – *by Tom Hoffman, Deputy*

*To be presented on Thursday, 7<sup>th</sup> December 2017*

*To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons of  
the City of London in Common Council assembled.*

### **Motion:-**

“My Lord Mayor,

I move that the Members of this Court take great pleasure in expressing to:

ALDERMAN DR ANDREW CHARLES PARMLEY

their gratitude and appreciation for the distinguished manner in which he has served as Lord Mayor of the City of London during the past year.

Always good-humoured and unfailingly charming, Andrew has been a superb ambassador – not just for the City, but for the entire nation. From Mexico to Nepal, from Glasgow to Blackpool, the Lord Mayor has worked tirelessly both at home and abroad to champion the UK’s financial, legal, educational and professional services.

As an educator, the Lord Mayor’s motto of “Educate, Support, Inspire” has provided a fitting theme for his year, and his appointment to the Government’s Apprenticeship Delivery Board is a testament to his endeavours in this area.

He has also had the pleasure of hosting many special occasions in Guildhall and Mansion House, including the magnificent State Banquet for His Majesty the King of Spain, which I know will live long in his memory.

Andrew’s colleagues on this Court also wish to pay tribute to Wendy, the Lady Mayoress, who has herself undertaken a varied programme with passion and commitment. We express our gratitude for all her contributions.

In taking their leave of Andrew, their 689th Lord Mayor, Honourable Members reflect that his has been an exceptional Mayoralty and express our confidence that, after a well-earned rest, he will look back on a unique year with the greatest pleasure, a justifiable pride and immense satisfaction.

My Lord Mayor.”

This page is intentionally left blank



## List of Applications for the Freedom

*To be presented on Thursday, 7<sup>th</sup> December, 2017*

*To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons of  
the City of London in Common Council assembled.*

Set out below is the Chamberlain's list of applicants for the Freedom of the City together with the names, etc. of those nominating them.

<b>Dr Avtar Singh Kamboj</b> <i>John Wykes</i>  <i>Herbert Richard Sharp</i>	a Medical Doctor <i>Citizen and Chartered Secretary and Administrator</i> <i>Citizen and Loriner</i>	Claygate, Esher, Surrey
<b>Alex Nigel Jones</b> <i>Lord Robert George Alexander</i> <i>Lingfield, Kt., DL.</i> <i>Nigel Anthony Chimmo Branson, JP</i>	a Funeral Director <i>Citizen and Goldsmith</i>  <i>Citizen and Haberdasher</i>	Ardenrun, Lingfield, Surrey
<b>Eddie James Aylett</b> <i>Scott Marcus Longman</i> <i>George Henry Capon</i>	a Teacher <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i>	Romford, Essex
<b>Henry Peter Johan Kruijs</b> <i>Stuart John Fraser, CBE, CC</i> <i>John Alfred Bennett, Deputy</i>	a Management Consultant <i>Citizen and Fletcher</i> <i>Citizen and International Banker</i>	Hackney
<b>Kenneth Richard Gibson</b>  <i>Frederick Joseph Trowman</i> <i>Donald Mostyn Morris</i>	a Leprosy Organisation Chief Executive <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Distiller</i>	Kilquade, Co. Wicklow, Ireland
<b>Matthew Richard Howard-Coombe</b> <i>Richard Howard Coombe</i> <i>Donald Howard Coombe, MBE</i>	an Insurance Underwriter  <i>Citizen and Poulter</i> <i>Citizen and Poulter</i>	Greenwich, London
<b>Anthony James May</b> <i>Keith John Ebsworth</i> <i>Peter Colet Laurie</i>	a Distributing Company Manager <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Saddler</i>	Hexham, Northumberland
<b>Jo-Anne Elizabeth Cooper</b>  <i>Vivienne Littlechild, JP, CC</i> <i>Professor Ronan O'Hora</i>	a School External Engagements Manager <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Goldsmith</i>	Reigate, Surrey

<b>Pamela Ann Saunders</b> <i>Lisa Rutter</i> <i>Anne Elizabeth Holden</i>	a Human Resources Secretary, retired <i>Citizen and Patternmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	Totteridge Green, London
<b>Erol Mark Houssein</b> <i>Michael Peter Cawston</i> <i>Adarsh Kumar Sharma</i>	a Coffee Distributor <i>Citizen and Tyler &amp; Bricklayer</i> <i>Citizen and Chartered Accountant</i>	Dagenham, Essex
<b>Stephen John Bullen</b> <i>Colin James Bridgen</i> <i>Jeffrey Charles Williams</i>	a Ceramic Tiler <i>Citizen and Carman</i> <i>Citizen and Carman</i>	Emerson Green, Bristol
<b>Bradley James Seaman</b> <i>Colin James Bridgen</i> <i>Jeffrey Charles Williams</i>	a Logistics Manager <i>Citizen and Carman</i> <i>Citizen and Carman</i>	Horfield, Bristol
<b>Peter Charles Anderson</b> <i>Nicholas John Anstee, Ald.</i> <i>Vivienne Littlechild, JP, CC</i>	an Adult Education Tutor, retired <i>Citizen and Butcher</i> <i>Citizen and Glover</i>	West Wickham, Kent
<b>Mark Alan Cook</b> <i>Alan Stanley Cook</i> <i>Deborah Jane Black</i>	a Heavy Goods Vehicle Driver <i>Citizen and Gunmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Educator</i>	Shepperton, Middlesex
<b>Jordan Alexander Wain</b> <i>John Arthur Wain</i> <i>Captain Colin Anthony Cox</i>	a Nuclear Scientist <i>Citizen and Air Pilot</i> <i>Citizen and Air Pilot</i>	Broad Hinton, Wiltshire
<b>William Harris</b> <i>Andrew Stratton McMurtrie, JP, CC</i> <i>William Barrie Fraser, OBE</i>	a Teacher, retired <i>Citizen and Salter</i> <i>Citizen and Gardener</i>	Stepney, London
<b>Gillian Ruth Griffiths</b> <i>Lisa Rutter</i> <i>Anne Elizabeth Holden</i>	a Geologist, retired <i>Citizen and Patternmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	Friern Barnet, London
<b>Ross Jonathan Harmer</b> <i>Simon Jonathan Mark Burrows</i> <i>David Roots</i>	a Regular Army Warrant Officer <i>Citizen and Framework Knitter</i> <i>Citizen and Glover</i>	Camden, London
<b>Elsbeth Catriona Hanson</b>  <i>Sir Michael Bear, Kt., Ald.</i> <i>Lady Barbara Anne Bear</i>	a Musician  <i>Citizen and Pavior</i> <i>Citizen and Musician</i>	Blackrock, Co. Dublin, Ireland
<b>Katie Lee Charlwood</b> <i>Anthony Ben Charlwood</i> <i>Donald Newell</i>	an Occupational Therapist <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	Apsley, Hertfordshire
<b>Allison Grace Redmond</b> <i>Stuart John Fraser, CBE, CC</i> <i>John Alfred Bennett, Deputy</i>	a Change Consultant <i>Citizen and Fletcher</i> <i>Citizen and International Banker</i>	Hanwell, Middlesex
<b>Barbara Woodthorpe Browne</b> <i>Christopher Sarson Histed</i> <i>Robert Woodthorpe Browne, MBE</i>	a Company Director, retired <i>Citizen and Information Technologist</i> <i>Citizen and World Trader</i>	Kensington, London
<b>Grace May Turner</b> <i>Mark John Herbage</i> <i>Anjola Adeniyi</i>	a Consultant <i>Citizen and Cook</i> <i>Citizen and Information Technologist</i>	Stratford, London

<b>David William Hayes</b> <i>Antonio Masella</i> <i>Daniel Mark Heath</i>	a Head Host <i>Citizen and Mason</i> <i>Citizen and Hackney Carriage Driver</i>	Hackney, London
<b>David Mark Grant</b> <i>Paul Joseph Jeremy Burton</i> <i>Roger Antony Prentis</i>	a Pharmacist, retired <i>Citizen and Fruiterer</i> <i>Citizen and Arbitrator</i>	Adel, Leeds, West Yorkshire
<b>Christopher John Edwards</b>  <i>Christopher Michael Hayward, CC</i> <i>Stanley Ginsburg, JP</i>	a Business Development Manager, retired <i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Glover</i>	Eastbourne, East Sussex
<b>Roger John Edwards</b>  <i>Christopher Michael Hayward, CC</i> <i>Stanley Ginsburg, JP</i>	a Waste Company Managing Director <i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Glover</i>	Crowborough, East Sussex
<b>Ronald Joseph Murtagh</b> <i>Paul Joseph Jeremy Burton</i> <i>Roger Antony Prentis</i>	a Fire Officer, retired <i>Citizen and Fruiterer</i> <i>Citizen and Arbitrator</i>	Gomersal, West Yorkshire
<b>John Bayliss</b> <i>Michael Pares</i> <i>Stuart John Somerville</i>	a Chartered Builder, retired <i>Citizen and Builders Merchant</i> <i>Citizen and Builders Merchant</i>	Royston, Hertfordshire
<b>David Andrew Hawtin</b> <i>Graham John Peacock</i> <i>John Edward Peacock</i>	a Logistics Manager <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Loriner</i>	Cold Norton, Essex
<b>Shirley Florence Zangwill</b> <i>David Albert Charles Ayres</i> <i>Patricia Ann Ayres</i>	a Dental Surgeon, retired <i>Citizen and Upholder</i> <i>Citizen and Upholder</i>	Cambridge, Cambridgeshire
<b>Hazel Muriel Taylor, OBE</b>  <i>Lawrence John Day</i> <i>Mervyn Doreen Redding</i>	a Nursing & Quality Executive Director, retired <i>Citizen and Maker of Playing Cards</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	Christchurch, Newport, Wales
<b>Kenneth Damian Doyle</b> <i>John Donald Lunn</i> <i>Gordon Mark Gentry</i>	a Barrister <i>Citizen and Fan Maker</i> <i>Citizen and Baker</i>	South Woodford, Essex
<b>Dr Angela Mary Parker</b>  <i>Lisa Rutter</i> <i>Anne Elizabeth Holden</i>	a General Medical Practitioner, retired <i>Citizen and Patternmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	Southgate, London
<b>Paul Prentice</b>  <i>Iain Reid</i> <i>Richard Leslie Springford</i>	a Watermen and Lightermen Boat Master <i>Citizen and Educator</i> <i>Citizen and Carman</i>	Romford, Essex
<b>Alan Clive Davies</b> <i>Peter Kenneth Estlin, Ald.</i> <i>William Anthony Bowater Russell, Ald.</i>	a Stockbroker <i>Citizen and International Banker</i> <i>Citizen and Haberdasher</i>	Hackney, London
<b>Joy Elizabeth McGlinchey</b> <i>Iain Reid</i> <i>Richard Leslie Springford</i>	a Waterman and Lighterman <i>Citizen and Educator</i> <i>Citizen and Carman</i>	Northfleet, Kent

<b>Robert Lambkin Bushell</b> <i>Iain Reid</i> <i>Richard Leslie Springford</i>	a Waterman and Lighterman <i>Citizen and Educator</i> <i>Citizen and Carman</i>	Northfleet, Kent
<b>Roger Gould</b> <i>Guy Philip Brocklebank</i> <i>Les Chapman</i>	a Security Consultant <i>Citizen Scientific Instrument Maker</i> <i>Citizen and Master Mariner</i>	Twickenham, London
<b>Joseph Paul Lane</b> <i>Guy Philip Brocklebank</i> <i>Les Chapman</i>	a Site Manager <i>Citizen Scientific Instrument Maker</i> <i>Citizen and Master Mariner</i>	Billericay, Essex
<b>Anthony Geoffrey Soards</b> <i>Adarsh Kumar Sharma</i> <i>Michael Peter Cawston</i>	a Painter and Decorator <i>Citizen and Chartered Accountant</i> <i>Citizen and Tyler and Bricklayer</i>	Erith, Kent
<b>Davy-Joe Albert Soards</b> <i>Adarsh Kumar Sharma</i> <i>Michael Peter Cawston</i>	a Scaffolder <i>Citizen and Chartered Accountant</i> <i>Citizen and Tyler &amp; Bricklayer</i>	Erith, Kent
<b>Jillian Deborah Cerey Moffatt</b> <i>Nigel Reginald Pullman, JP</i> <i>Anthony Alexander Vlasto</i>	a Banker <i>Citizen and Leatherseller</i> <i>Citizen and Shipwright</i>	Clapham, London
<b>Cllr. Norma Jean Symonds</b> <i>Alan Leslie Warman</i> <i>Diane Irene Warman</i>	a Councillor <i>Citizen and Clockmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Clockmaker</i>	Bishop's Stortford, Hertfordshire
<b>Simon Peter Foreman</b> <i>Timothy Luke Fitzgerald-O'Connor</i> <i>David Trevor Owen</i>	a Reinsurance Broker <i>Citizen and Gold &amp; Silver Wyre Drawer</i> <i>Citizen and Gold &amp; Silver Wyre Drawer</i>	Blackheath, London
<b>Timothy Grant Dillon</b>  <i>Roger Trevor Parker</i> <i>Colin Robert Woodcock, MBE</i>	an Engineering Company Director, retired <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Security Professional</i>	Swanland, East Riding of Yorkshire
<b>Mark Paul Lawson</b>  <i>Stanley Brown, QGM, TD</i> <i>Richard George Clerk Thornton, TD</i>	an Environmental Services Manager <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Leatherseller</i>	Rochester, Kent
<b>Anthony Ronald Edgar</b> <i>Stanley Brown, QGM, TD</i> <i>David Benjamin Morris</i>	a Restaurateur <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>	Gillingham, Kent
<b>Surrinder Singh Chadha</b> <i>Christopher David McDonald</i> <i>Nicholas Garnish</i>	an Accountant, retired <i>Citizen and Security Professional</i> <i>Citizen and Baker</i>	South Woodford, Essex
<b>Charles Gideon Lawrence Montlake</b> <i>Richard Leslie Springford</i> <i>Iain Reid</i>	a Finance Director  <i>Citizen and Carman</i> <i>Citizen and Educator</i>	Greenwich, London
<b>Davina Mary Vasserman</b> <i>Marianne Bernadette Fredericks, CC</i> <i>Joyce Carruthers Nash, OBE, Deputy</i>	a Civil Servant <i>Citizen and Baker</i> <i>Citizen and Feltmaker</i>	Islington, London



<b>Angela Sharon Plumb</b> <i>Stephen John Plumb</i> <i>Andrew Stratton McMurtrie, JP, CC</i>	a Registered Midwife <i>Citizen and Musician</i> <i>Citizen and Salter</i>	Barnet, Hertfordshire
<b>Commander Stuart Andrew Finn</b> <i>Gordon Lenham Warren</i>  <i>William Fitzgerald-O'Connor</i>	a Royal Naval Officer <i>Citizen and Gold and Silver Wyre Drawer</i> <i>Citizen and Gold and Silver Wyre Drawers</i>	Pimlico, London
<b>Anna Christina Richmond</b> <i>Graham Holland</i> <i>Cllr. Belinda Claire Donovan</i>	a Payroll Manager, retired <i>Citizen and Mason</i> <i>Citizen and Glover</i>	Balham, London
<b>His Excellency Antonio Manuel Lagdameo</b> <i>Stephen Decatur Haines, Deputy</i> <i>Catherine Sidony McGuinness, Deputy</i>	a Diplomat  <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i> <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>	Westminster, London
<b>Patrick Jean-Marie Engelberg</b> <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Catherine Sidony McGuinness, Deputy</i>	a Diplomat  <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>	Brussels, Belgium
<b>Thomas Firth Jackson</b> <i>Graham Leslie Flight</i> <i>Lieutenant-Colonel John Craven Chambers</i>	a Schoolmaster, retired <i>Citizen &amp; Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Wax Chandler</i>	Chorley, Lancashire
<b>Paul Raymond Clement</b> <i>Graham Leslie Flight</i> <i>Lieutenant-Colonel John Craven Chambers</i>	a Regalia Maker <i>Citizen &amp; Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Wax Chandler</i>	Swansea, Wales
<b>Alison Louise Balsom, OBE</b>  <i>John Alfred Bennett, Deputy</i> <i>Vivienne Littlechild, JP, CC</i>	a Classical Musician  <i>Citizen and International Banker</i> <i>Citizen and Glover</i>	Church Westcote, Gloucestershire
<b>Timothy Nigel Peake, CMG</b> <i>Lord Mountevans, Ald.</i> <i>Peter Lionel Raleigh Hewitt, Ald.</i>	an Astronaut <i>Citizen and Shipwright</i> <i>Citizen and Woolman</i>	Westbourne, Hampshire
<b>Rajesh Agrawal</b> <i>Catherine Sidony McGuinness, Deputy</i> <i>Peter Kenneth Estlin, Ald.</i>	a Politician <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i> <i>Citizen and International Banker</i>	Stanmore, Middlesex
<b>Nathan Myhrvold</b>  <i>Michael Raymond Mainelli, Ald.</i> <i>Judith Lindsay Pleasance, CC</i>	a Chief Technology Officer  <i>Citizen and World Trader</i> <i>Citizen and Clockmaker</i>	Washington State, United States of America
<b>Maged Awni Aburamadan</b> <i>Dame Catherine Fiona Woolf, DBE, Ald.</i> <i>Robert James Ingham Clark, Deputy</i>	a Consultant Ophthalmic Surgeon <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>  <i>Citizen and Clothworker</i>	Gaza, Palestine

This page is intentionally left blank

## Report – City Remembrancer

### Measures introduced into Parliament which may have an effect on the services provided by the City Corporation

*To be presented on Thursday, 7<sup>th</sup> December 2017*

*To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons  
of the City of London in Common Council assembled.*

#### **Bills**

##### **Trade Bill**

The Bill will put in place the legal framework for the UK to operate an independent trade policy after withdrawing from the EU.

##### **Taxation (Cross-border Trade) Bill**

The Bill will put in place the legal framework for the UK to operate an independent customs policy after withdrawing from the EU.

##### **Sanctions and Anti-Money Laundering Bill**

The Bill will put in place the legal framework for the UK to enforce international sanctions (including under United Nations measures) once it has left the EU, and introduce domestic anti-money laundering powers to replace EU legislation in the field.

#### **Statutory Instruments**

#### **Date in force**

##### **The Environmental Offences (Fixed Penalties) (England) Regulations 2017, S.I. No. 1050**

1 April 2018

The Regulations increase the amounts payable under fixed penalty notices which local authorities (including the Common Council acting in that capacity) may issue in respect of a range of environmental offences, including littering and noise offences.

##### **The Traffic Signs (Amendment) (England and Wales) Regulations and General Directions 2017, S.I. No. 1086**

13 December 2017

The Regulations and Directions amend a range of traffic sign specifications, in order to correct errors and improve clarity. They will apply to the Common Council acting in its capacity as traffic authority.

*(The text of the measures and the explanatory notes may be obtained from the Remembrancer's office.)*

This page is intentionally left blank

## Report – Chairman of the Hampstead Heath, Highgate Wood and Queen's Park Committee

### Awards and Prizes

*To be presented on Thursday, 7<sup>th</sup> December 2017*

*To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled.*

"I wish to draw Members' attention to the following awards won by the City of London Corporation.

#### **Institute of Civil Engineers (ICE) London Civil Engineering Awards**

At the ICE London Civil Engineering Awards Ceremony on 25 May 2017, the Hampstead Heath Ponds Project won the Community Benefit Award. The award reflects the way in which the engineering project continues to benefit the community, both through increased resilience to flooding and improvements in the landscaping, ecology and water quality.

#### **Big Biodiversity Challenge Awards**

The Hampstead Heath Pond Project won the 'Large Scale Permanent' Award at the Big Biodiversity Challenge Awards on 14 September 2017. The Big Biodiversity Challenge is organised by CIRIA, the Construction Industry Research and Information Association. The CIRIA challenges constructors to add one new biodiversity enhancement to a construction site, development or existing building.

#### **British Construction Industry Awards**

At the British Construction Industry Awards on 11 October 2017 the Hampstead Heath Ponds Project received the Civil Engineering Project of the Year Award (£10M to £50M). This award celebrates best practice, innovation and delivery on time and at or under budget.

#### **Green Flag Special Innovation Award**

In November 2017, it was announced that the Hampstead Heath Ponds Project had won a 2017 Green Flag Special Innovation award.

#### **Camden Design Award**

The Ponds Project is one of seven projects to win at the 2017 awards. The project has also been shortlisted for the 'Outstand Design Award', with the winner to be announced at a ceremony taking place on 30 November 2017.

#### **Landscape Institute Award**

Last, the Hampstead Heath Ponds Project has been nominated in the Science Management and Stewardship Category at the upcoming Landscape Institute Awards, which will take place on 23 November 2017.

**London Planning Awards**

The Hampstead Heath Ponds Project has been shortlisted for the Mayor's Award for Planning Excellence at the London Planning Awards, with winners announced on 18 January 2018.

I commend these achievements to the Court."

DATED this 15<sup>th</sup> day of November 2017.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

**Karina Dostalova**

Chairman, Hampstead Heath, Highgate Wood and Queen's Park Committee

## Report – Finance Committee

### City Fund and Pension Funds - 2016/17 Statement of Accounts and Annual Audit Letter

*To be presented on Thursday, 7<sup>th</sup> December 2017*

*To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons  
of the City of London in Common Council assembled.*

#### **SUMMARY**

On 23 May 1996, the Court authorised the Finance Committee to approve, amongst other things, the Statement of Accounts for the City Fund and Pension Funds. We have duly considered and approved the City Fund and Pension Funds Statement of Accounts for the year ending 31 March 2017. Hard copies of the Statements have been placed in the Members' Reading Room and are available on request from the Chamberlain. The annual audit letter from BDO LLP on their audit work is attached for the information of the Court. In addition, the Statement and letter have been published on the City's website at <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/about-the-city/budgets-and-spending/Pages/default.aspx>.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

It is **recommended** that the Court receives the 2016/17 City Fund and Pension Fund Statement of Accounts.

All of which we submit to the judgement of this Honourable Court.

DATED this 21<sup>st</sup> day of November 2017.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

**Jeremy Paul Mayhew**  
Chairman, Finance Committee

This page is intentionally left blank



A photograph of four business professionals (three men and one woman) sitting around a glass conference table in a modern office. They are all dressed in business attire (shirts and ties). The man on the left, with grey hair, is gesturing with his hands while speaking. The other three are listening attentively. A laptop is open on the table, and there are several white coffee cups. Large windows in the background show a cityscape.

## CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION - CITY FUND AND PENSION FUND

Page 35

### ANNUAL AUDIT LETTER

Audit for the year ended 31 March 2017

19 October 2017



# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## PURPOSE OF THE LETTER

This annual audit letter summarises the key issues arising from the work that we have carried out in respect of the year ended 31 March 2017. It is addressed to the Corporation but is also intended to communicate the key findings we have identified to key external stakeholders and members of the public. It will be published on the website of Public Sector Audit Appointments Limited.

## RESPONSIBILITIES OF AUDITORS AND THE CORPORATION

It is the responsibility of the Corporation to ensure that proper arrangements are in place for the conduct of its business and that public money is safeguarded and properly accounted for.

Our responsibility is to plan and carry out an audit that meets the requirements of the National Audit Office's (NAO's) Code of Audit Practice (the Code), and to review and report on:

- The City Fund and pension fund financial statements
- Whether the Corporation has made proper arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources in respect of the City Fund.

We recognise the value of your co-operation and support and would like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation for the assistance and co-operation provided during the audit.

BDO LLP  
19 October 2017

## AUDIT CONCLUSIONS

### FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

We issued our unmodified true and fair opinions on the City Fund and pension fund financial statements on 29 September 2017.

We reported our findings to the Audit and Risk Management Committee on 24 July and 10 October. We did not identify any material misstatements.

Audit differences corrected by management in the City Fund financial statements reduced the deficit on the provision of services and increased net assets by £2.5 million. This was mainly due to releasing deferred income to revenue and transferring balances to earmarked reserves. In addition we found two audit differences not corrected in the final financial statements which would, if corrected, reduce the deficit on the provision of services by £164,000.

### USE OF RESOURCES

We issued our unmodified conclusion on the City Fund's arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources on 29 September 2017.

There are healthy levels of reserves available to support City Fund's services in the medium term and we are satisfied that there are appropriate arrangements in place to continue to remain financially sustainable over the period of the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

The Corporation is in a position to fund a significant proportion of the City Police forecast deficits. However, it is recognised that this is not sustainable over the longer term and City Police plan to address the recommendations from the external value for money review to improve the operating model and deliver service and financial savings to reduce the budget gap.

# FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

OPINION

We issued our unmodified true and fair opinions on the City Fund and pension fund’s financial statements on 29 September 2017.

## SCOPE OF THE AUDIT OF THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

An audit involves obtaining evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements sufficient to give reasonable assurance that they are free from material misstatement, whether caused by fraud or error.

This includes an assessment of whether the accounting policies are appropriate to the City Fund and pension fund’s circumstances and have been consistently applied and adequately disclosed, the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates, and the overall presentation of the financial statements.

## OUR ASSESSMENT OF RISKS OF MATERIAL MISSTATEMENT

Our audit was scoped by obtaining an understanding of the Corporation, in relation to the City Fund and pension fund, and its environment including the system of internal control, and assessing the risks of material misstatement in the financial statements.

We set out below the risks that had the greatest effect on our audit strategy, the allocation of resources in the audit, and the direction of the efforts of the audit team.

RISK DESCRIPTION	HOW RISK WAS ADDRESSED BY OUR AUDIT AND AUDIT FINDINGS	CONCLUSION
There is a risk that revenue or capital grants that are subject to performance conditions may be inappropriately recognised as revenue before the condition have been met, revenue may not exist or be recognised in the wrong financial year.	<p>We tested an increased sample of revenue and capital grants subject to performance conditions and confirmed that these were only recognised as revenue when the relevant conditions of the funding had been met.</p> <p>We tested an increased sample of grants held as deferred income and found that £0.5 million of new homes bonus grant relating to 2017/18 had been classified as a debtor and receipt in advance. As the grant relates to 2017/18 and the cash had not been received by 31 March 2017 the grant should not have been recorded in the financial statements.</p> <p>We also found that £1 million of Community Infrastructure Levy income due and received in 2016/17 had been accounted for as a receipt in advance rather than income. Management corrected these errors in the financial statements.</p> <p>We tested an increased sample of fees and charges income throughout the year and confirmed that the amounts recorded agreed to underlying documentation for charges or services provided and that the revenue had been recorded in the correct period.</p>	We concluded that revenue had been recorded correctly following the corrections to the financial statements.

# FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

RISK DESCRIPTION	HOW RISK WAS ADDRESSED BY OUR AUDIT AND AUDIT FINDINGS	CONCLUSION
<p>Local authorities are required to ensure that land, buildings and investment properties are regularly revalued.</p> <p>Management use external valuation data to assess whether there has been a material change in the value of classes of assets. Investment properties are revalued annually according to market conditions at year-end. Higher value operational properties (other land and buildings and dwellings) are revalued annually to provide assurance that carrying values are materially stated, with the remainder of non-material value assets revalued periodically (minimum of every five years).</p> <p>We consider there to be a risk over the reasonableness of the valuations due to the estimation and judgments applied.</p>	<p>We responded to this risk by reviewing the instructions provided to the valuer to confirm that the planned scope of the valuation was appropriate. We reviewed the valuer's skills and expertise and were satisfied that we could rely on this work.</p> <p>We checked whether accurate and complete data on assets held was provided to undertake the review and that the basis of valuation for assets was appropriate.</p> <p>We reviewed valuation movements against indices of price movements for similar classes of assets and challenged valuations where the movement appeared unusual.</p> <p>Property, plant and equipment valuations increased by £14.2 million with the majority being attributable to increases in values for dwellings.</p> <p>Investment properties increased by £54.9 million mainly arising from a general increase in the market (using the IPD capital index for City office space). There were several outliers where the market value had significantly increased/decreased and this was found to relate to changes in rental amounts and change in property use.</p>	<p>We concluded that the valuations for land, buildings and investment properties were reasonable.</p>

# FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Page 39

RISK DESCRIPTION	HOW RISK WAS ADDRESSED BY OUR AUDIT AND AUDIT FINDINGS	CONCLUSION
<p>An estimate of the Corporation’s pension fund liabilities (LGPS and police) and the share allocated to the City Fund is calculated by an actuary with specialist knowledge and experience.</p> <p>The estimate is based on the membership data used by the actuary for the 2016 triennial valuation and updated for local factors such as mortality rates and expected pay rises along with other assumptions around inflation when calculating the liability.</p> <p>We considered there to be a risk that the valuation was not based on accurate membership data or used inappropriate assumptions to value the liability.</p>	<p>We received and reviewed a report from a consulting actuary, commissioned by the National Audit Office, that confirmed that the actuary was independent of the Corporation and suitably experienced and qualified.</p> <p>We reviewed the accuracy of the data recorded in the membership records and the information provided to the actuary. We checked and confirmed that there had been no significant changes in employee numbers to be communicated to the actuary that could require amendment to the 2016 roll-forward data.</p> <p>We reviewed the reasonableness of the assumptions used by the actuary against other local government actuaries and other observable data. This found that the actuary had applied a higher than expected percentage for future increases in RPI, salaries and pensions (increasing the liability) but also a higher discount rate to assess the present value of these liabilities (lowers the liability). In response, we commissioned a separate review from an independent actuary to review the strength of the assumptions applied and the potential overall impact on the calculation. This concluded that the assumptions in aggregate result in a pension liability estimate that is reasonable.</p>	<p>We concluded that the actuarial valuation of the Corporation’s pension fund liability and the share allocated to the City Fund was reasonable.</p>

# FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

## OUR APPLICATION OF MATERIALITY

We apply the concept of materiality both in planning and performing our audit and in evaluating the effect of misstatements.

We consider materiality to be the magnitude by which misstatements, including omissions, could influence the economic decisions of reasonably knowledgeable users that are taken on the basis of the financial statements.

Importantly, misstatements below these levels will not necessarily be evaluated as immaterial as we also take account of the nature of identified misstatements, and the particular circumstances of their occurrence, when evaluating their effect on the financial statements as a whole.

The materiality for the City Fund's financial statements as a whole was set at £23 million based on property, plant and equipment and investment properties (of which it represents 1.0 per cent). This is because the City Fund has custody of significant public assets through its ownership of property assets and investments that are used to generate income to support the local authority services provided by the City Fund. We applied a specific lower materiality of £5.8 million on revenue resources based on a benchmark of gross expenditure (of which it represents 1.5 per cent).

The materiality for the pension fund's financial statements as a whole was set at £9.6 million. This was determined with reference to a benchmark of net assets (of which it represents 1 per cent) which we consider to be one of the principal considerations for the pension fund in assessing the financial performance.

We agreed with the Audit and Risk Management Committee that we would report all individual audit differences in excess of £460,000 for the City Fund and £193,000 for the pension fund.

## AUDIT DIFFERENCES - CITY FUND

We did not identify any material misstatements. Audit differences corrected by management reduced the deficit on the provision of services and increased net assets by £2.5 million. This was mainly due to releasing deferred income to revenue and transferring balances to earmarked reserves.

In addition we found two audit differences not corrected in the final financial statements which would, if corrected, reduce the deficit on the provision of services by £164,000.

We consider that these uncorrected misstatements did not have a material impact on our opinion on the City Fund's financial statements.

## AUDIT DIFFERENCES - PENSION FUND

We did not identify any material misstatements impacting on the Fund Account or Net Assets Statement.



# FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

## OTHER MATTERS WE REPORT ON

### Narrative report

We are satisfied that the narrative report meets the new requirements of the CIPFA Code and that financial information is consistent with the financial statements.

### Annual governance statement

We concluded that the annual governance statement was not misleading or inconsistent with other information we were aware of from our audit, the evidence provided in the City Fund's review of effectiveness of controls and our knowledge of the Corporation.

## INTERNAL CONTROLS

We did not find any significant deficiencies in internal controls during the course of our audit. A number of other areas for improvement were identified which we have discussed with management.

## WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTS

Auditors are required to review Whole of Government Account (WGA) information prepared by component bodies that are over the prescribed threshold of £350 million in any of: assets (excluding certain non-current assets); liabilities (excluding pension liabilities); income or expenditure.

Our review was undertaken in accordance with the Group Audit Instructions issued by the National Audit Office. This requires that we compare the information in your Data Collection Tool (DCT) submission with the audited financial statements, undertake testing of completeness and accuracy of WGA counter party transactions and balances, and provide an assurance statement to the National Audit Office.

This work is in progress.

# USE OF RESOURCES

## CONCLUSION

We issued our unmodified conclusion on the City Fund's arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources on 29 September 2017.

## SCOPE OF THE AUDIT OF USE OF RESOURCES

We are required to be satisfied that proper arrangements have been made to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of resources based on the following reporting criterion:

*In all significant respects, the audited body had proper arrangements to ensure it took properly informed decisions and deployed resources to achieve planned and sustainable outcomes for taxpayers and local people.*

As part of reaching our overall conclusion we consider the following sub criteria in our work: informed decision making, sustainable resource deployment, and working with partners and other third parties.

## OUR ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANT RISKS

Our audit was scoped by our cumulative knowledge brought forward from previous audits, relevant findings from work undertaken in support of the opinion on financial statements, reports from the Corporation including internal audit, information disclosed or available to support the governance statement and annual report, and information available from the risk registers and supporting arrangements.

We set out below the risks that had the greatest effect on our audit strategy, the allocation of resources in the audit, and direction of the efforts of the audit team.

RISK DESCRIPTION	HOW RISK WAS ADDRESSED BY OUR AUDIT AND AUDIT FINDINGS	CONCLUSION
<p>The Medium Term Financial Strategy for City Police has forecast significant deficits in coming years and it is expected that the police ring-fenced reserves will be fully utilised by 31 March 2018.</p> <p>Identifying the required level of savings in the medium term will be a challenge and is likely to require review of existing services.</p>	<p>We reviewed the financial outturn of City Police, the medium term financial and strategic plans and the findings of the external value for money review.</p> <p>The 2016/17 outturn was breakeven which is an improvement on the forecast overspend of £2.6 million. Net expenditure in 2017/18 is forecast to increase by £5.7 million with additional costs coming from the Action Fraud Service I.T project, additional employer pension contributions to tackle the pension deficit as well as a reduction in the core police settlement grant.</p> <p>In order to balance the budget to 31 March 2018, City Fund will provide additional resources to fund specific costs and the remaining will be met by police reserves. The MTFS to 2019/20 forecasts deficits of £5.6 million in 2018/19 and £3.8 million in 2019/20.</p> <p>The value for money review was commissioned to develop efficiency strategies to address the budget gap and financial pressures. The review focused on current and future demand and how efficiently City Police used its total resources.</p> <p>Recommendations have been made to enhance the operating model and deliver value for money which could deliver recurring savings to eliminate the budget gap identified in the MTFS. Management is working through an action plan to deliver these savings.</p>	<p>The Corporation is in a position to fund a significant proportion of forecast police deficits.</p> <p>However, it is recognised that this is not sustainable over the longer term and City Police plan to address the recommendations from the external value for money review to improve the operating model and deliver service and financial savings to reduce the budget gap.</p>



# USE OF RESOURCES

RISK DESCRIPTION	HOW RISK WAS ADDRESSED BY OUR AUDIT AND AUDIT FINDINGS	CONCLUSION
<p>The City Fund MTFS requires significant savings and income generation in the medium term. If key assumptions and savings plans have not been based on reliable data or have been overly optimistic the financial position could deteriorate over the medium term.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the financial outturn for the City Fund to date and the assumptions in the MTFS. The 2016/17 financial outturn outperformed budget by £9.3 million after taking into account a £27 million purchase of an investment property funded through a drawdown of reserves. Additional savings were achieved in operational costs across services and higher income from the Port Health services, Barbican customer receipts, grants and investment income.</p> <p>The 2016/17 budget included a £200 million contribution payable to Crossrail on the condition that certain project milestones had been met. This contribution was paid on 28 March 2017 after completion of the four required milestones and was funded through reserves that been assembled over the past few years from a planned strategy in relation to investment properties.</p> <p>The MFTS forecasts a surplus of £10.9 million in 2017/18, moving into a breakeven position in 2018/19 and then into deficits of £15.6 million in 2019/20 and £19.4 million in 2020/21. The deficits are as a result of budgeted revenue costs for the Museum of London relocation project. The relocation project has a number of funding options that are being considered in order to cover the costs. Excluding these costs the City Fund is forecast to be in surplus throughout the period.</p> <p>The projections are based on conservative income growth from business rates, council tax, rental income and other income streams as well as budgeting for increased expenditure in relation to pay rises, increased employer contributions to tackle the pension fund deficit, additional funding for City Police and increased expenditure to fund specific improvements to services and estimated increases in demand.</p>	<p>There are healthy levels of reserves available to support City Fund’s services in the medium term and we are satisfied that there are appropriate arrangements in place to continue to remain financially sustainable over the period of the MTFS.</p>

# APPENDIX

## REPORTS ISSUED

We issued the following reports since our previous annual audit letter.

REPORT	DATE
Audit plan - City Fund	18 April 2017
Audit plan - pension fund	18 April 2017
Audit completion report - City Fund	29 September 2017
Audit completion report - pension fund	20 July 2017
Annual audit letter	19 October 2017

## FEES

We reported our original fee proposals in our audit plans.

AUDIT AREA	FINAL FEES £	PLANNED FEES £
City Fund audit - scale fees	86,383	86,383
Pension fund audit - scale fees	21,000	21,000
Housing benefits subsidy certification fees	11,205	11,205
<b>Total audit fees</b>	<b>118,588</b>	<b>118,588</b>
Pooled housing receipts certification	2,340	2,340
Teachers pensions return (local authority)	4,500	4,500
Teachers pensions return (Centre for Young Musicians)	4,500	4,500
<b>Audit related services fees</b>	<b>11,340</b>	<b>11,340</b>
Other non-audit services	-	-
<b>Total assurance services</b>	<b>129,928</b>	<b>129,928</b>

FOR MORE INFORMATION:

**LEIGH LLOYD THOMAS**  
Engagement lead

T: +44 (0)20 7893 2616  
E: leigh.lloyd.thomas@bdo.co.uk

**KERRY BARNES**  
Manager

T: +44 (0)20 7893 3837  
E: kerry.barnes@bdo.co.uk

The matters raised in our report prepared in connection with the audit are those we believe should be brought to the attention of the organisation. They do not purport to be a complete record of all matters arising. No responsibility to any third party is accepted.

BDO LLP is a corporate establishment under the Limited Liability Partnership Act 2000 and a UK Member Firm of BDO International. BDO Northern Ireland, a separate partnership, operates under a licence agreement. BDO LLP and BDO Northern Ireland are both separately authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority to conduct investment business.

Copyright ©2017 BDO LLP. All rights reserved.

[www.bdo.co.uk](http://www.bdo.co.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

## Report – Finance Committee

# City's Cash, Bridge House Estates, City's Cash Trust Funds and Sundry Trust Funds Annual Reports and Financial Statements 2016/17

*To be presented on Thursday, 7<sup>th</sup> December 2017*

*To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled.*

### SUMMARY

On 23 May 1996, the Court authorised the Finance Committee to approve, amongst other things, the Annual Reports and Financial Statements for City's Cash, Bridge House Estates and the Charitable Trusts. We have duly considered and approved the Annual Reports and Financial Statements for the year ending 31 March 2017. Hard copies of the Annual Reports and Financial Statements have been placed in the Members' Reading Room and are available on request from the Chamberlain. The management letter from Moore Stephens LLP on its audit of the funds is attached for the information of the Court. In addition, for City's Cash and Bridge House Estates, the Annual Report and Financial Statements and the management letter have been published on the City's website at <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/about-the-city/budgets-and-spending/Pages/default.aspx>.

### RECOMMENDATION

It is **recommended** that the Court receives the 2016/17 City's Cash, Bridge House Estates and Charitable Trusts Statement of Accounts.

All of which we submit to the judgement of this Honourable Court.

DATED this 21<sup>st</sup> day of November 2017.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

**Jeremy Paul Mayhew**  
Chairman, Finance Committee

This page is intentionally left blank



**REPORT TO THOSE CHARGED WITH GOVERNANCE  
OCTOBER 2017**



**City's Cash, Bridge House Estates, City's Cash Trusts, and the  
Corporation's Sundry Trusts & Other Accounts**

**FINAL Audit Management Report on the 2016-17 Financial Statements Audit**

# Contents

## Audit Management Report for the year ended 31 March 2017

	Page
1. Purpose of the report	3
2. Audit conclusion	4
3. Respective responsibilities	5
4. Significant audit risks and risk factors	7
5. Significant audit and accounting matters	11
6. Accounting systems and internal controls	14
7. Follow up of prior year recommendations	18
Appendix 1 – Adjusted misstatements	20
Appendix 2 – Unadjusted misstatements	21
Appendix 3 – List of entities key financials	22
Appendix 4 – Draft letters of representation	25



# 1 Purpose of the report

International Standard on Auditing (UK & Ireland) 260, “Communication with those charged with governance” requires Moore Stephens to report to those charged with governance on the significant findings from our audit.

This report aims to provide the trustees with constructive observations arising from the audit process. We set out in this report details of:

- any expected modifications to our audit reports;
- any unadjusted items in the financial statements (except any unadjusted items which are clearly trivial) including the effect of unadjusted items related to prior periods on the current period;
- any material weaknesses in systems we have identified during the course of our audit work and our views about the quality of accounting practices and financial reporting procedures; and
- any other relevant matters.

Our procedures are carried out solely for the purpose of our audit so that we can form and express an opinion on the financial statements in accordance with applicable law and International Standards on Auditing (UK and Ireland). Our audit does not necessarily disclose every weakness and for this reason the matters referred to may not be the only shortcomings which exist.

We take this opportunity to remind you that:

- This report has been prepared for the sole use of the City of London Corporation;
- It must not be disclosed to any third party without our written consent; and
- No responsibility is assumed by us to any other person who may choose to rely on it for their own purposes.

The report has been discussed and agreed with the Chamberlain.

We would like to thank the Chamberlain, Dr Peter Kane, Caroline Al-Beyerty and the Finance Team for their co-operation and assistance during our audit.

## 2 Audit conclusion

In our opinion the financial statements of the following bodies give a true and fair view and comply with FRS 102.

<b>City's Cash</b>	
<b>Bridge House Estates</b>	
<b>City's Cash Trusts</b>	Ashtead Common
	Burnham Beeches & Stoke Common
	Epping Forest
	Hampstead Heath
	Highgate Wood & Queens Park Kilburn
	West Ham Park
	West Wickham Common and Spring Park Coulsdon & Other Commons
<b>Sundry and Other Trusts</b>	Ada Lewis Winter Distress Fund
	Charities Administered in Connection with (ICW) The City of London Freeman's School
	City Educational Trust Fund
	City of London Almshouses
	City of London Corporation Combined Education Charity
	City of London Corporation Relief of Poverty Charity
	City of London Freeman's School Bursary Fund
	City of London School Bursary Fund
	City of London School Education Trust
	City of London School Girls Bursary Fund
	Corporation of London Charities Pool
	Emmanuel Hospital
	Guildhall Library Centenary Fund
	Hampstead Heath Trust
	Keats' House
	King George's Field
	Samuel Wilson's Loan Trust
	Signore Pasquale Favale Bequest
	Sir Thomas Gresham Charity
	Sir William Coxen Trust Fund
	Vickers Dunfee Memorial Benevolent Fund

We are pleased to report that our audit reports, which are included in each of the above financial statements, are unqualified. In our opinion, from information provided to us during the audit, no events or conditions appear to exist which cast doubt on the ability of the bodies listed above to continue as a going concern. We are therefore satisfied with the disclosures in the financial statements.

Our audit opinions are based on your approval of the financial statements and signing of the Letters of Representation, a draft of which has been included as an appendix to this report. Within the letters, you have confirmed that there are no subsequent events, other than those noted, that require amendment to the financial statements.

## 3 Respective responsibilities

### Responsibilities of Management

The City of London Corporation is responsible for preparing the City's Cash financial statements in accordance with United Kingdom Accounting Standards - FRS 102. It is also responsible for keeping proper accounting records and safeguarding assets and hence for taking reasonable steps for the prevention and detection of fraud and other irregularities.

### Responsibilities of the Trustees

The Trustees are responsible for preparing the Trustees' Report and the financial statements of Bridge House Estates, City's Cash Trusts and the Sundry and Other Trusts in accordance with applicable law and regulations. The Charities Act 2011 requires the Trustees to prepare financial statements for each financial year. Under that law the Trustees have elected to prepare the financial statements in accordance with applicable law and United Kingdom Accounting Standards – FRS 102. The Trustees must not approve the financial statements unless they are satisfied that they give a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the charities and of its incoming resources and application of resources, including its income and expenditure, for that period. In preparing these financial statements, the Trustees are required to:

- select suitable accounting policies and then apply them consistently;
- make judgements and estimates that are reasonable and prudent;
- state whether applicable UK Accounting Standards have been followed, subject to any material departures disclosed and explained in the financial statements; and
- prepare the financial statements on the going concern basis unless it is inappropriate to presume that the charities will continue in business.

The Trustees are responsible for keeping adequate accounting records that are sufficient to show and explain the charities transactions and disclose with reasonable accuracy at any time the financial position of the charities and enable them to ensure that the financial statements comply with the Charities Act 2011. They are also responsible for safeguarding the assets of the charities and hence for taking reasonable steps for the prevention and detection of fraud and other irregularities.

### Responsibilities of the Auditor

Our responsibility is to audit and express an opinion on the financial statements in accordance with applicable law and International Standards on Auditing (UK and Ireland). Those standards require us to comply with the Auditing Practices Board's (APB's) Ethical Standards for Auditors.

The audit includes the consideration of internal controls relevant to the preparation of the financial statements but we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control. We are also required to communicate any significant matters arising from the audit of the financial statements that are relevant to those charged with governance in overseeing the financial reporting process. The matters being reported are limited to those deficiencies in control that we have identified during the audit and that we have concluded are of sufficient importance to merit being reported to those charged with governance.

International Standards on Auditing (UK and Ireland) do not require the auditor to design procedures for the purpose of identifying supplementary matters to communicate with those charged with governance.

### Fee

The fee for the 2016-17 audit of City's Cash, Bridge House Estates, City's Cash Trusts and Sundry and Other Trusts amounts to £115,000. Of the total fee, £36,800 has been allocated to Bridge House Estates, with the remaining £78,200 being charged to City's Cash. A further £10,000 is payable by City's Cash for the 2016-17 audit year for associated audit services at the Guildhall School of Music and Drama.

In our Audit Planning Report we set out that the fee was dependent upon:

- City of London Corporation delivering a complete Annual Report and Accounts of sufficient quality that have been subject to appropriate internal review on the date agreed;
- City of London Corporation delivering good quality supporting evidence and explanations within the agreed timetable; and
- Appropriate City of London Corporation staff being available during the audit.

There was a delay in the preparation of the annual report and financial statements for City's Cash, which resulted in the start of the audit being delayed by two weeks and consequential changes to the reporting and completion process. Other than this, we have not encountered significant delays and difficulties during the 2016-17 audit.

We have provided no non-audit services during 2016-17.

## Materiality

The concept of materiality recognises that financial statements are rarely absolutely correct, and that an audit is designed to provide reasonable, rather than absolute, assurance that the financial statements are free from material misstatement. A matter is material if its omission or misstatement would reasonably influence the decisions of users of the financial statements. The assessment of what is material is a matter of the auditor's professional judgement and includes consideration of both the amount and the nature of the misstatement. In determining materiality, we consider a range of measures relevant to the account.

Materiality levels are generally set as percentages of income or assets. This methodology has been followed for our assessment of materiality for all entities bar City's Cash. For City's Cash, as in 2015-16, there is a significant difference in value between income at £153.0m and net assets at £2,520.0m. We therefore assessed materiality based on net assets, which was set at £29.2m. Recognising that this was a high level of materiality in the context of the income and expenditure account, we treated the income and expenditure account as a sensitive area of testing, and assessed materiality as £3.1m for income and expenditure transactions. Full details of all entities' key financials, including materiality are in Appendix 3 to this report.

## Independence

International Standard on Auditing (UK & Ireland) 260, "Communication with those charged with governance" requires us to communicate on a timely basis all facts and matters that may have a bearing on our independence.

We can confirm that we have complied with the Financial Reporting Council's Ethical Standard with regard to our integrity, objectivity and independence. In our professional judgement the audit process has been independent and our objectivity has not been compromised.

## 4 Significant audit risks and risk factors

### Significant audit risks

As noted in our Audit Planning Report submitted to the Audit and Risk Management Committee in February 2017 the following audit risk areas were identified as significant matters and therefore considered in detail during our audit fieldwork.

Audit risk areas	Audit findings
<p><b>Revenue recognition (All funds and entities)</b></p> <p>Under International Standard on Auditing (UK and Ireland) 240, there is a presumed, albeit rebuttable, significant risk of fraud in revenue recognition. We consider this risk cannot be rebutted for income in all organisations.</p>	<p>We have documented, evaluated and tested the controls which ensure income is completely and accurately recorded across all entities and funds. No significant weaknesses in controls have been identified. We have substantively tested material income streams across all entities and funds and performed procedures to ensure income is complete.</p> <p>Investment property income procedures on City's Cash and Bridge House Estates included confirming the amounts received on a sample of properties to rent agreements as well as performing analytical procedures to gain assurance on the completeness of income.</p> <p>Non-property investment income procedures included agreeing dividend income obtained as well as confirming realised investments from pooled investment vehicles. We have also considered the movement in fair value on investments (City's Cash and Bridge House Estates) and the unrealised gain on investments by comparing yields obtained by the funds to fund manager reports, custodian reports and benchmarks.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b></p> <p>Satisfactory assurance has been gained in respect of the presumed risk of fraud in revenue recognition.</p>
<p><b>Management override (All funds and entities)</b></p> <p>Under International Standard on Auditing (UK and Ireland) 240, there is a presumed significant risk of material misstatement owing to fraud arising from the potential for management to override controls.</p>	<p>We have performed journals testing for all entities. We carried out focused testing on journals on City's Cash and Bridge House Estates, reviewing journal entries which had a higher susceptibility to management override – journals posted at weekends and by those who do not normally post journals for example. No significant issues were identified in our testing.</p> <p>For all entities, we considered the estimation techniques and any significant/unusual transactions. We reviewed significant estimates and judgements made in the financial statements for evidence of bias. No significant issues were noted in our testing.</p> <p>Investment property valuations for City's Cash and Bridge House Estates comprise a significant judgement in the financial statements. The value of property held by City's Cash and Bridge House Estates as at 31 March 2017 was £1,724m and £702m respectively. This represents an increase in value of 8% and 15% respectively.</p> <p>Investment property valuations are conducted internally by the City Surveyor's team and by an external firm of property valuers. We have met with representatives of the City Surveyor and the external firm of property valuers to discuss the methodology of the valuations overall and to review individual property valuations that were significantly above or below the average increase. We did not identify any</p>

Audit risk areas	Audit findings
	<p>indication of management bias in the valuations applied. No significant issues were noted in our testing.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> Satisfactory assurance has been gained in respect of the presumed risk of management override.</p>
<p><b>Hampstead Heath Ponds (City's Cash Trusts and City's Cash)</b></p> <p>During the 2014-15 financial year, a Judicial Review found in favour of the City of London Corporation and as a consequence work has begun at Hampstead Heath Ponds and has been completed in 2016-17.</p> <p>An asset under construction valued at £8.7m was recorded in the 2015-16 financial statements. The total expected value of the work is £14.7m.</p>	<p>We have reviewed supporting documentation surrounding the Hampstead Heath ponds project and verified the amounts capitalised. A total of £12.9m was transferred in year from infrastructure WIP to infrastructure, as well as a total of £6.8m being recognised as additions in year to land and buildings and infrastructure.</p> <p>We have also reviewed the accounting treatment and disclosures made in the financial statements, and deem these to be reasonable.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> Satisfactory assurance has been gained in respect of the risk identified.</p>
<p><b>Investment Property Transactions (Bridge House Estates and City's Cash)</b></p> <p>The Corporation holds a significant portfolio of investment properties. These investments bring about associated risks including that of disclosure, accounting and revaluation. Given the high values associated with investment property transactions, they carry a higher risk of material misstatement.</p>	<p>The value of property held by City's Cash and Bridge House Estates as at 31 March 2017 was £1,724m and £702m respectively. This represents an increase in value of 8% and 15% respectively.</p> <p>We have agreed property valuations to internal and external valuations performed as at 31 March 2017. We have met with representatives of the City Surveyor and the external firm of property valuers to discuss the methodology of the valuations overall and to review individual property valuations that were significantly above or below the average and benchmark increase.</p> <p>We have discussed and agreed accounting treatments for property transactions during the year.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> Satisfactory assurance has been gained in respect of the risk identified with regard to investment property transactions.</p>

## Other risk factors

As noted in our Audit Planning Report submitted to the Audit and Risk Management Committee in February 2017 the following audit risk areas were identified as risk factors which could potentially result in a material misstatement. The table below sets out our approach and conclusions to these risk factors.

Audit risk areas	Audit findings
<b>Crossrail contribution (City's Cash)</b> The 2015-16 City's Cash accounts recognised a commitment in the financial statements, with expected payment in the 2018-19 and 2019-20 financial years.	We have discussed with officers and reviewed supporting documentation to assess and agree the financial accounting treatment and disclosure made in the financial statements.  We have also reviewed and considered the disclosures made in the financial statements to ensure that they are materially correct, remain appropriate and are in line with FRS 102.  <b>Conclusion:</b>  Satisfactory assurance has been gained in respect of the risk factor identified.
<b>Non-Property Investment Transitions (Bridge House Estates and City's Cash)</b> We understand that the City of London Corporation has made a further fund manager change during the 2016-17 year. The City of London Corporation's Financial Investment Board is responsible for the appointment of fund managers.	We have reviewed supporting documentation from the transfer of funds between fund managers during the year for City's Cash. We are content that the transactions pre and post-transfer have been accounted for appropriately.  <b>Conclusion:</b>  Satisfactory assurance has been gained in respect of the risk factor identified.

## Going concern and subsequent events

We are required under International Standard on Auditing (UK & Ireland) 570, "Going concern" to consider the appropriateness of the going concern assumption in the preparation of the financial statements, and to consider whether there are material uncertainties about the organisation's ability to continue as a going concern which need to be disclosed in the financial statements.

The term "subsequent events" is used to refer to events occurring between the period end date of the financial statements and the date of the auditor's report. International Standard on Auditing (UK & Ireland) 560, "Subsequent events" requires us to assess all such matters before signing our audit report.

In order to gain assurance on these matters our work has included:

- performing a review of budgets and cash flow projections covering a period of 12 months from the expected signing of the audit report, together with management accounts for 2017-18;
- reviewing minutes of relevant City of London Corporation sub-committees held since 31 March 2017;
- enquiring of senior management and the organisation's solicitors concerning litigation, claims and assessments; and
- performing sample testing of post reporting date transactions.

There are risks to City's Cash and Bridge House Estates from the vote to leave the EU in June 2016. In particular, the future levels of demand for office accommodation in the City and surrounding areas and the consequential impacts on rent incomes. A close watching brief will be kept on this and other implications as events unfold with financial forecasts being refreshed if and when the picture becomes clearer.

We understand that there are ongoing discussions regarding the future operation of Emanuel Hospital, in relation to how the charity could better meet its objectives. We are aware that subject to the Charity Commission's agreement, it is intended that

the trusteeship of Emanuel Hospital will be transferred to another charity, achieved by a Charity Commission scheme. Therefore in effect, the City of London will be 'substituted' by this charity as the Trustee. The charity, Emanuel Hospital, will therefore still exist, under its' current registration number, so will continue to operate as a going concern. This change however had not been finalised at the time of writing this report.

## Conclusion

Our work has not highlighted any concerns or issues affecting City's Cash, Bridge House Estates, City's Cash Trusts and Sundry and Other Trusts ability to continue as a going concern.



## 5 Significant audit and accounting matters

### Audit adjustments

To enable those charged with governance to assess the extent to which the draft financial statements presented for audit have been subject to change as a result of the audit process and ongoing management review, we present below the adjustments made to the accounts during the audit process.

As a result of our audit and management review, adjustments were made to the draft financial statements presented for audit. A summary of the effect of the audit adjustments is shown below. A schedule of the actual adjustments can be found in appendix 1. Where the entity or fund is not noted below or in appendix 1, no adjustments were made.

	Statement of Financial Activities		Balance Sheet	
	DR £	CR £	DR £	CR £
<b>Sundry &amp; Other Trusts</b>				
Hampstead Heath Trust			17,261	17,261
City of London School for Girls Bursary Fund			10,597	10,597
<b>City's Cash Trusts</b>				
Ashted Common		4,226	4,226	
West Ham Park			10,453	10,453

All audit adjustments have been discussed and agreed with the Group Accountant.

### Unadjusted items

We are obliged to bring to your attention the errors found during the audit that have not been corrected as not material, unless they are 'clearly trivial', which we have identified as below 1% of assessed materiality, subject to a de-minimis reporting level of £1,000. The items that we are aware of above this amount are set out below.

A summary of the net effect of the unadjusted items is shown below. A schedule of the unadjusted items can be found in appendix 2. Where the entity or fund is not noted below or in appendix 2, no adjustments were made.

	Statement of Financial Activities		Balance Sheet	
	DR £	CR £	DR £	CR £
<b>City's Cash Trusts</b>				
Highgate Wood	12,232			12,232

It was agreed with the Group Accountant that these amounts were not considered material and did not require to be incorporated into the financial statements. We request that the Audit and Risk Management Committee confirm this decision.

## Qualitative aspects of accounting practices and financial reporting

During the course of our audit, we consider the qualitative aspect of the financial reporting process, including items that have a significant impact on the relevance, reliability, comparability, understandability and materiality of the information provided by the financial statements. The following observations have been made:

Qualitative aspect considered	Audit conclusion
The appropriateness of the accounting policies used.	We have reviewed the significant accounting policies, which are disclosed in the financial statements, and we consider these to be appropriate.
The timing of the transactions and the period in which they are recorded.	We did not identify any significant transactions where we had concerns over the timing or the period in which they were recognised.
The appropriateness of the accounting estimates and judgements used.	<p>We are satisfied with the appropriateness of accounting estimates and judgements used in the preparation of the financial statements.</p> <p>We met with representatives of the City Surveyor and the external firm of property valuers to assess the judgements applied in the valuation of investment properties. We consider the judgements used to be appropriate.</p> <p>We also reviewed the assumptions underpinning the valuation of pension liabilities, which we considered to be appropriate.</p>
The potential effect on the financial statements of any uncertainties, including significant risks and disclosures such as pending litigation, that are required to be disclosed in the financial statements.	We did not identify any uncertainties including any significant risk or required disclosures that should be included in the financial statements.
The extent to which the financial statements have been affected by unusual transactions during the period and the extent that these transactions are separately disclosed in the financial statements.	From our testing performed, we identified no unusual transactions in the period.
Apparent misstatements in the annual reports and trustees' reports or material inconsistencies within the financial statements.	Our review of the annual reports and Trustees' reports identified no misstatement or material inconsistency with the financial statements.
Any significant financial statement disclosures to bring to your attention.	There are no significant financial statement disclosures that we consider should be brought to your attention. All disclosures made are required by relevant legislation and applicable accounting standards.
Disagreement over any accounting treatment or financial statement disclosure.	There was no disagreement during the course of the audit over any accounting treatment or disclosure.
Difficulties encountered in the audit.	There was a delay in the preparation of the annual report and financial statements for City's Cash, which resulted in the start of the audit being delayed by two weeks and consequential changes to the reporting and completion process. Otherwise, we did not encounter any difficulties during the audits.

## Management representations

We have requested that a signed representation letter, covering a number of issues, be presented to us at the date of signing the financial statements. Copies of these letters for City's Cash, Bridge House Estates, the City's Cash Trusts, and the Sundry and Other Trusts are included in Appendix 4 to this report.

## Fraud and irregularity

Responsibility for preventing and detecting fraud and other irregularities lies with the trustees of the charities. We are not required to search specifically for such matters and our audit should not be relied upon to disclose them. However, we planned and conducted our audit so as to give a reasonable expectation of detecting any material misstatements in the financial statements resulting from improprieties or breach of regulations.

We are pleased to report that we did not identify any issues of concern in relation to fraud and irregularity.

## Legality

We planned and performed our audit recognising that non-compliance with statute or regulations may materially affect the financial statements.

We are pleased to report that we did not identify any instances of concern with regard to the legality of transactions or events.

## 6 Accounting systems and internal controls

During the course of our audit of the financial statements, we examined the principal internal controls which have been established to enable them to ensure, as far as possible, the accuracy and reliability of the organisation's accounting records and to safeguard the organisation's assets.

It should be noted that our audit was planned and performed in order to allow us to provide an opinion on the financial statements and it should not be relied upon to reveal all errors and weaknesses that may exist.

Our work did not identify any system weaknesses.

### Action plan – audit recommendations

We identified a number of observations which we consider require management action. Recommendations to address the observations are detailed in the action plan below, together with management responses.

Grade	Definition
1	major issues for the attention of senior management which may have the potential to result in a material weakness in internal control
2	important issues to be addressed by management in their areas of responsibility
3	problems of a more minor nature which provide scope for improvement.

#### 1 – Active Directory Domain Administrator accounts not adequately set and controlled (Priority 2)

<b>Observation</b>	<p>The Administrator rights are the most powerful in the system allowing for potentially uncontrolled actions and access to data and functions within the network. Good practice recommends those rights to be assigned to a limited number of employees only. We found that "Enterprise Administrator" and/or "Domain Administrator" right to CoLC network have been granted to more than 70 accounts.</p> <p>We further noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 34 are Service accounts with Domain Administrator rights which are in use by systems / applications; we could not confirm that all they are still in use and need to run with such rights.</li><li>• The default built in 'Administrator' account has not been renamed, as recommended by Microsoft.</li></ul>
<b>Risk</b>	<p>Excessive number of administrator accounts increases the attack surface available for an attacker and thus increases the risk of an attacker successfully gaining administrator privileges. Non-timely terminated privileged accounts increases the risk of unauthorised system activities.</p>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<p>We recommend that the Corporation, in cooperation with Agilisys Management, implement a strict policy on granting of Domain Administrator rights in Active Directory.</p> <p>Suggested measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Domain Administrator should be restricted to a limited number of employees; Other IT personnel should be granted with less powerful rights (e.g. server administrator or delegated rights).</li><li>• Service accounts should be granted minimum rights to run the intended service; unused/obsolete service accounts should be disabled or deleted.</li></ul> <p>We further recommend that the default 'Administrator' account is renamed.</p>
<b>Management response</b>	<p>A new policy for the provision and management of privileged (Service and Domain Administrator) accounts has been developed as part of the IT Transformation Programme. This policy will go live with immediate effect for full implementation by 30 November 2017.</p>

	<p>A process has been developed, which reviews all Privileged accounts (including Domain and Service accounts) every six months, in line with best practice.</p> <p>A review of existing privileged accounts is in progress and is due to finish at the end of July 2017.</p> <p>Any privileged accounts no longer required will be removed.</p> <p>Following this review, a project to rename outstanding 'Administrator' accounts will be undertaken in conjunction with the new environment delivered through Transformation.</p>
<b>Responsible Officer</b>	Matt Gosden
<b>Implementation date</b>	With immediate effect for full implementation by 30 November 2017.
<b>2 – Non-compliance with password policy</b> <b>(Priority 2)</b>	
<b>Observation</b>	<p>Active Directory (AD) is a network service that authenticates and authorises all users and computers in a Windows network by assigning and enforcing user rights and security policies. We confirm that the AD password policy has been deployed to all users. However, we identified that there were a number of user accounts where passwords are not enforced by the system to be changed periodically ('Password Never Expire' is set to 'True' or 'Password Not Required' is set to 'True').</p> <p>We also noted that there is a significant number of network user accounts that seem not to have been used for an extended period of time, but are not disabled or deleted.</p>
<b>Risk</b>	<p>Lack of strong password controls over user accounts, increases the risk of unauthorised access to the system and its resources.</p> <p>Lack of review of network user accounts could result in failure to terminate unused accounts in a timely manner, thus impacting corporate security.</p>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<p>We recommend that CoLC ICT management in cooperation with Agilysis ensure that all user accounts are set up with the approved password policy.</p> <p>In addition, we recommend that a periodic review (e.g. at least annual) is performed to ensure that accounts (including such used to run services, mailboxes, etc.) which are no longer required are disabled or removed from the system.</p>
<b>Management response</b>	<p>The password policy has been agreed and will be fully implemented as part of the transformation project. This will include regular reports and reviewing of the accounts at least monthly. This will ensure that the password policy will be enforced with all user accounts.</p> <p>The data cleansing exercise during IT Transformation will ensure that only live and valid user accounts will exist in the new environment. A new Starters, Movers and Leavers policy and process will enforce this good practice.</p>
<b>Responsible Officer</b>	Matt Gosden
<b>Implementation date</b>	With immediate effect for full implementation by 31 December 2017.
<b>3 – Database security updates are not applied to Paris Microsoft SQL server</b> <b>(Priority 2)</b>	
<b>Observation</b>	We noted that the process of applying security updates to the Microsoft and Linux/Oracle infrastructure has not included the Microsoft SQL Server 2008 database for the Paris system.
<b>Risk</b>	The lack of patch management process for all Microsoft databases could result in a system that is not secure against known vulnerabilities.
<b>Recommendation</b>	We recommend that management in cooperation with Agilysis, extends the patching cycle to include Paris Microsoft SQL database.
<b>Management response</b>	Patch Management in CoL has been improved following a review in May 2017 and now includes all database servers, underpinning key services, such as Paris, CBIS and iTrent.
<b>Responsible Officer</b>	Matt Gosden
<b>Implementation date</b>	With immediate effect for full implementation by 31 October 2017.

#### 4 – DRP for the financial systems not recently tested

(Priority 2)

<b>Observation</b>	We understand that disaster recovery (DR) tests for CBIS, iTrent and Paris systems have not been conducted since 2013. During that period the systems have undergone significant changes, including: outsourcing of the infrastructure and systems management to a third party provider (Agilisys), migration to another data centre and system hardware, replacement of server operating systems, database upgrades, changes to system functionalities.
<b>Risk</b>	Lack of regular testing for disaster recovery increases the risk that systems may not be restored in required timescales which could impact on the ability of the Corporation to return to an operational state.
<b>Recommendation</b>	We recommend management conducts disaster recovery testing for the critical business systems at least annually or after any major changes to the system or underlined infrastructure.
<b>Management response</b>	A project is being commissioned to define a DR testing plan and schedule, focusing on critical business services including CBIS, iTrent and Paris. The requirements and parameters for DR testing is dependent on the work currently being undertaken by the Business Continuity Manager which also involves the Business Continuity Sub Group (this a group of colleagues representing all departments across CoL)
<b>Responsible Officer</b>	Matt Gosden
<b>Implementation date</b>	December 2017

#### 5 – Lack of Review of ISAE 3402 Reports

(Priority 2)

<b>Observation</b>	Based on discussions held with members of the Corporate Treasury team during the audit, we identified that the Corporate Treasury team do not obtain and review ISAE 3402 reports for each fund manager and respective custodian. We were informed that the fund managers have a legal obligation to make the Corporation aware of any control issues. The Corporation have monthly or quarterly correspondence with all fund managers which helps to mitigate any risks, however the Corporate Treasury team should be reviewing ISAE 3402 reports as a further level of assurance.
<b>Risk</b>	There is a risk that there may be control issues with the fund managers and their respective custodians, which are not communicated to the Corporate Treasury team. This could have a potential impact on the recoverability of investments.
<b>Recommendation</b>	The Corporate Treasury team should request direct receipt of all ISAE 3402 reports directly from fund managers and their respective custodians. These should be reviewed to ensure there are no identified control issues.
<b>Management response</b>	We will request annual ISAE3402 reports for each investment mandate to monitor the auditor's opinion on the overall control environment.
<b>Responsible Officer</b>	Corporate Treasurer/ Group Accountant
<b>Implementation date</b>	With immediate effect for full implementation by 31 March 2018

#### 6 – Annual Declarations

(Priority 2)

<b>Observation</b>	All members are required to provide an annual declaration of interest. During our review of related parties, we noted 6 instances out of 146 where staff had not returned their conflict of interest declarations to the Finance Manager.
<b>Risk</b>	The Corporation may not be aware of potential conflicts of interest of members. There is also a risk of undisclosed related parties and related party transactions in the Annual Report and Accounts.

<b>Recommendation</b>	The annual process for completing conflicts of interests checks should be improved, so that all returns are received in a timely manner. Where returns have not been received, these should be followed up promptly, to ensure that all disclosures in the notes to the accounts are complete.
<b>Management response</b>	The City of London Corporation is committed to seeking all annual declarations of interest. However, whilst every effort is made to secure all annual declarations, this is sometimes more difficult during election year's such as 2016/17 due to some Members not being re-elected and leaving the City of London Corporation. However, in addition to the annual process, the City of London Corporation has also adopted a Standing Order which requires Members to disclose their interests when they arise during the year and these can be viewed online at <a href="http://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk">www.cityoflondon.gov.uk</a> .
<b>Responsible Officer</b>	Philip Gregory
<b>Implementation date</b>	With immediate effect

## 7 Follow up of prior year recommendations

We raised no priority 1 recommendations during our audit of City's Cash, Bridge House Estates, City's Cash Trusts and the Sundry and Other Trusts.

We did raise a number of lower priority recommendations directly with management, which we have reproduced below with an update on progress.

Point Arising	Update as at 31 March 2017
<b>Bridge House Estates</b>	
<b>Accounts Review (Priority 2)</b> Lack of full peer review of BHE accounts prior to audit which may result in inconsistent quality, leading to the requirement for additional audit time. We recommended bringing forward the full peer review process to before the first draft is provided for audit.	The 2016/17 BHE accounts had been subject to peer review before presentation for audit. As a consequence there were fewer review points raised on the first draft accounts. <b>(Status: Closed)</b>
<b>Inconsistent Tenancy Management Records (Priority 2)</b> Audit testing identified that there is not always a clear audit trail in existence to demonstrate rent increases applied to investment properties. While rent increases have been agreed and there is documentary evidence available, it is not filed with the original rental agreement as would be expected, creating a risk that incorrect rent may be charged on investment properties. We recommended that a regular sample check review is performed for investment properties to ensure that the rental amount recognised on CBIS has been agreed by both parties and that there is appropriate and consistent supporting evidence on file encompassing information from across the Corporation.	Based on our sample testing of investment property income for the 2016/17 audit, we have been able to conclude that sufficient supporting documentation exists for the rental increases applied. Documentary evidence for rental increases was readily available along with the original rental agreement for each of our samples, indicating improvements in the filing system across the Corporation compared to previous years. <b>(Status: Closed)</b>
<b>Sundry and Other Trusts</b>	
<b>Knowledge transfer (Priority 2)</b> We raised a recommendation following the 2014-15 audit of the City of London Almshouses Trust (CoLAT), that the Corporation should ensure knowledge transfer takes place before staff turnover. The 2015-16 accounts for CoLAT were prepared by a different member of staff to 2014-15 and there was little evidence of a knowledge transfer having taken place. We recommended that appropriate knowledge transfer processes were put in place.	The Accountant responsible for preparation of the CoLAT accounts changed again in 2016-17. Our audit of the accounts indicated that there had been an effective knowledge transfer process put in place which ensured that accounts were prepared in accordance with applicable reporting requirements. <b>(Status: Closed)</b>
<b>All entities and funds</b>	
<b>Corporate Treasury Scheme of Delegation (Priority 2)</b> During the 2015-16 year, over £60m of non-property investments were divested and re-invested. While the decision for the transition of the non-property investments had been appropriately approved by the Investment Committee, we noted that the actual authorisation for the divestment (three transactions of £20m) as allowed in the scheme of delegation, came from two individuals in the same team, thus opening the Corporation to the potential for a fraudulent transaction. We recommended that the scheme of delegation for significant and material non-property transactions was amended.	A new policy was implemented in Autumn 2017 so that authorisation for such transactions will come from a member of the Corporate Treasury team and the Deputy Chamberlain. There have been no transactions of this size post implementation during 2016-17 to verify the new policy is being followed. <b>(Status: Closed)</b>



#### Authorisation of Journal Entries (Priority 2)

City of London Corporation policy is that journal entries over £100,000 are authorised retrospectively. Given the volume of journals that are processed under this value, the value seems high to have no checks performed at all. We recommended that the Corporation review the policy in place regarding journal authorisation and consider either lowering the limit, or introducing a random sample check of journals posted of a lower amount across all funds and entities.

Our review of journals during 2016-17 identified that there have been no changes in the authorisation process for journals. The Corporation consider that only journals over £100k require retrospective approval.

**(Status: Closed)**

## Appendix 1 – Adjusted Misstatements

As summarised in Section 5, the following adjustments were identified during our audit work and have been incorporated into the financial statements. Where the entity or fund is not noted below, no adjustments were made. All adjustments have been discussed and agreed with the Group Accountant.

	Statement of Financial Activity		Balance Sheet	
	Dr £	Cr £	Dr £	Cr £
<b>Sundry and Other Trusts</b>				
<b>City of London School for Girls Bursary Fund</b>				
Cash			10,567	
Debtors			30	
Creditors				10,597
<i>* Being a manual adjustment for the re-classification between debtors, creditors and cash</i>				
<b>Hampstead Heath Trust</b>				
Bank Overdraft			17,261	
Net Gains/(Losses) on Investments				17,261
<i>* Being a manual adjustment to reflect the movement in cash and gains/losses on investments</i>				
	-	-	<b>27,858</b>	<b>27,858</b>
<b>City's Cash Trusts</b>				
<b>Ashtead Common</b>				
Prepayments			2,968	
Expenditure		2,968		
<i>Being the correction for misstatement of expenditure on car hire</i>				
Prepayments			1,258	
Expenditure		1,258		
<i>Being the correction for misstatement of expenditure on car hire</i>				
<b>West Ham Park</b>				
Cash at bank and in hand			10,453	
Creditors – bank overdraft				10,453
<i>Being the reclassification of the 2016/17 bank overdraft from cash to a liability</i>				
	-	<b>4,226</b>	<b>14,679</b>	-

\* Identified by client

## Appendix 2 – Unadjusted misstatements

As summarised in Section 5, the following unadjusted items were identified during our audit work. It was agreed with the Group Accountant that these amounts were not considered material and thus they have not been incorporated into the financial statements.

	Statement of Comprehensive Income / Statement of Financial Activity		Balance Sheet	
	Dr £	Cr £	Dr £	Cr £
<b>City's Cash Trusts</b>				
<b>Highgate Wood</b>				
Income	12,232			
Prepayments				12,232
<i>Being the correction for misstatement of income</i>				
	<b>12,232</b>	-	-	<b>12,232</b>

## Appendix 3 – List of entities key financials

The list of entities on which we have reported on, and which are covered by this document are included in the table below. We have included in the table income (including net gains on investments), surplus/deficit and net assets along with the materiality level we have used during the audit. Materiality was assessed based on either the income or net assets of the entity.

Activities	Income £'000	Surplus/ (Deficit) £'000	Net Assets £'000	Materiality £'000
<b>City's Cash</b>	386,900	225,600	2,520,000	29,200 3,100 (I&E)
<b>Bridge House Estates</b>	193,600	157,700	1,341,200	4,000
<b>City's Cash Trusts</b>				
<b>Ashtead Common</b>				
Preservation of the common at Ashtead	519	-	-	10
<b>Burnham Beeches</b>				
Preservation of the Open Space known as Burnham Beeches	887	(18)	767	18
<b>Epping Forest</b>				
Preservation of Epping Forest in perpetuity	6,200	(207)	7,713	128
<b>Hampstead Heath</b>				
Preservation of Hampstead Heath for the recreation and enjoyment of the public	14,957	10,237	52,376	660
<b>Highgate Wood &amp; Queens Park Kilburn</b>				
Preservation of the Open Space know as Highgate Wood & Queens Park Kilburn	1,401	1	382	28
<b>West Ham Park</b>				
To maintain and preserve the Open Space known as West Ham Park	1,473	15	51	29
<b>West Wickham Common and Spring Park Coulsdon &amp; Other Commons</b>				
Preservation of West Wickham Common and Spring Park Coulsdon & Other Commons	1,288	57	164	25
<b>Sundry Trusts</b>				
<b>Ada Lewis Winter Distress Fund</b>				
Assistance and relief for the poor and distressed during winter months	8	27	279	6
<b>Charities Administered ICW the City of London Freemen's School</b>				
Promotion of education through prizes	12	23	200	4
<b>City Educational Trust Fund</b>				
Advancement of education through grants	132	342	3,774	78
<b>City of London Almshouses</b>				
Almshouses for poor or aged people	364	181	1,640	65

Activities	Income £'000	Surplus/ (Deficit) £'000	Net Assets £'000	Materiality £'000
<b>Sundry Trusts Continued</b>				
<b>City of London Corporation Combined Education Charity</b>				
Advancing education by the provision of grants and financial assistance	39	86	1,124	23
<b>City of London Corporation Relief of Poverty Charity</b>				
Relief of poverty for widows, widowers or children of a Freeman of the City of London	4	16	157	3
<b>City of London Freeman's School Bursary Fund</b>				
Promotion of education through bursaries	47	124	915	18
<b>City of London School Bursary Fund</b>				
Promotion of education through bursaries, scholarships and prizes	119	416	3,871	78
<b>City of London School Education Trust</b>				
Advancing education	304	-	6	6
<b>City of London School for Girls Bursary Fund</b>				
Promotion of education through bursaries, scholarships and prizes	776	757	4,220	74
<b>Corporation of London Charities Pool</b>				
Investments pool for Sundry Trusts	1,022	1,164	22,867	458
<b>Emmanuel Hospital</b>				
Payment of pensions and financial assistance to poor persons	84	282	5,549	51
<b>Guildhall Library Centenary Fund</b>				
Provision of education and training in library, archives, museum, and gallery services	1	3	26	1
<b>Hampstead Heath Trust</b>				
To meet a proportion of the maintenance cost of Hampstead Heath	1,327	3,470	650	660
<b>Keats House</b>				
Maintenance of Keats House	462	37	226	7
<b>King George's Field</b>				
Open space for sports, games and recreation	44	-	-	1
<b>Samuel Wilson's Loan Trust</b>				
Granting of low interest loans to young people who have or are about to set up in business	77	289	2,415	48
<b>Signore Pasquale Favale Bequest</b>				
Granting of assistance to eligible persons in the form of marriage portions	5	2	15	1

Activities	Income £'000	Surplus/ (Deficit) £'000	Net Assets £'000	Materiality £'000
<b>Sundry Trusts Continued</b>				
<b>Sir Thomas Gresham Charity</b>	95	(1)	149	2
To provide a programme of public lectures				
<b>Sir William Coxen Trust Fund</b>				
Granting of assistance to eligible charitable trusts in the form of donations	132	125	2,627	57
<b>Vickers Dunfee Memorial Benevolent Fund</b>				
Financial assistance to distressed past and present members of the CoL Special Constabulary and their dependents	6	24	225	5

## Appendix 4 – Management representation letters for City’s Cash, Bridge House Estates and the Charities

Dear Sirs

### **CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION – CITY’S CASH**

This representation letter is provided in connection with your audit of the financial statements of City’s Cash for the year ended 31 March 2017 for the purpose of expressing an opinion as to whether the financial statements give a true and fair view in accordance with UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (FRS 102).

By a resolution of the Finance Committee, passed today, we are directed to confirm to you, in respect of the financial statements of City’s Cash (and its subsidiaries) for the year ended 31 March 2017, the following:-

1. We have fulfilled our responsibilities for preparing financial statements which give a true and fair view in accordance with UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (FRS 102) and for making accurate representations to you.
2. We have provided you with:
  - access to all information of which we are aware that is relevant to the preparation of the financial statements such as records, documentation and other matters;
  - additional information that you have requested from us for the purpose of the audit; and
  - unrestricted access to persons within the entity from whom you determined it necessary to obtain audit evidence.
3. All transactions have been recorded in the accounting records and are reflected in the financial statements.
4. We acknowledge our responsibilities for the design and implementation of internal control in order to prevent and detect fraud and to prevent and detect error.
5. We confirm that we have disclosed separately to you the results of our assessment of the risk that the financial statements may be materially misstated as a result of fraud.
6. We have disclosed to you all information in relation to fraud or suspected fraud that we are aware of and that affects the entity and involves:
  - management
  - employees who have significant roles in internal control
  - others where the fraud could have a material effect on the financial statements.
7. We are not aware of any allegations of fraud or suspected fraud with a potential effect on the financial statements which have been communicated to us by employees, former employees, analysts, regulators or other third parties.
8. We have disclosed to you all known instances of non-compliance or suspected non-compliance with laws and regulations whose effects should be considered when preparing the financial statements.
9. In our opinion, the significant assumptions that have been used in determining fair values, whether such values are disclosed or applied in the financial statements, are reasonable and reflect the ability and intent to carry out specific courses of action, where this is relevant to the determination of those values.
10. In our opinion the significant assumptions used in making accounting estimates are reasonable.
11. We have disclosed to you the identity of City’s Cash related parties and all related party relationships and transactions of which we are aware.
12. Related party relationships and transactions have been appropriately accounted for and disclosed in accordance with the requirements of UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (FRS 102).
13. In particular, no director, shadow director, their connected persons or other officers had any indebtedness, agreement concerning indebtedness or disclosable interest in a transaction with the group at any time during the year, other than as indicated in the financial statements.
14. There are no plans or intentions that may materially alter the carrying value or classification of assets and liabilities reflected in the financial statements.

15. There are no plans to abandon activities or other plans or intentions that will result in any excess or obsolete stocks, and no stock is stated at an amount in excess of net realisable value.
16. We are of the opinion that the methodology applied to the valuation of investment properties and the assumptions used are appropriate and therefore the value of investment properties is not materially misstated.
17. We are of the opinion that the costs involved in the reconstruction or analysis of past accounting records of heritage assets or in valuation are onerous compared with the additional benefit derived by users of the accounts in assessing the trustees' stewardship of the assets.
18. The group has satisfactory title to all assets and there are no liens or encumbrances on City's Cash assets, other than as disclosed in the financial statements.
19. We have recorded or disclosed, as appropriate, all liabilities, both actual and contingent, and all guarantees that we have given to third parties.
20. We confirm that the methodology used and the assumptions underlying the valuation of the Local Government Pension Scheme are reasonable. We also confirm that the methodology applied and the bases used for the allocation of costs and liabilities to City's Cash are reasonable.
21. All events subsequent to the date of the financial statements and for which UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (FRS 102) require adjustment or disclosure have been adjusted or disclosed. Should any material events occur which may necessitate revision of the figures included in the financial statements or inclusion in the notes thereto, we will advise you accordingly.
22. The group has complied with all aspects of contractual agreements that could have a material effect on the financial statements in the event of non-compliance.
23. Except as disclosed in the financial statements, the results for the year were not materially affected by:
  - any change in accounting policies;
  - transactions of a type not usually undertaken by the group;
  - circumstances of an exceptional or non-recurrent nature; or
  - charges or credits relating to prior periods.
24. We have disclosed to you all known actual or possible litigation or claims whose effects should be considered when preparing the financial statements and that they have been accounted for and disclosed in accordance with UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (FRS 102).
25. We have reviewed the reasoning for the classification of the proposed contribution by City's Cash to Crossrail as a commitment and consider that given the uncertainties surrounding the finalisations of an agreed contribution, this is the most appropriate classification of the likely costs.
26. We have reviewed going concern considerations and are satisfied that it is appropriate for the financial statements to have been drawn up on the going concern basis. In reaching this opinion we have taken into account all relevant matters of which we are aware and have considered a future period of at least one year from the date on which the financial statements were approved.
27. We confirm the financial statements are free of material misstatements, including omissions. We note that there are no uncorrected misstatements identified during the audit.
28. Except as disclosed in the notes to the City's Cash accounts, as at 31 March 2017 there were no significant capital or other commitments contracted for by City's Cash.

We confirm that the above representations are made on the basis of enquiries of management and staff with relevant knowledge and experience (and, where appropriate, of inspection of supporting documentation) sufficient to satisfy ourselves that we can properly make each of the above representations to you.

Yours faithfully

.....  
 The Chamberlain of London  
 Signed on behalf of the City of London Corporation  
 On (date)



Dear Sirs

## **CITY OF LONDON – BRIDGE HOUSE ESTATES**

This representation letter is provided in connection with your audit of the financial statements of Bridge House Estates (BHE) for the year ended 31 March 2017 for the purpose of expressing an opinion as to whether the financial statements give a true and fair view in accordance with UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (FRS 102) and the Charities Statement of Recommended Practice FRS 102.

By a resolution of the Finance Committee, passed today, I am directed to confirm to you, in respect of the financial statements of the charity for the period ended 31 March 2017, the following:-

1. We have fulfilled our responsibilities under the Charities Act 2011 for preparing financial statements which give a true and fair view in accordance with UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (FRS 102) and the Charities Statement of Recommended Practice FRS 102 and for making accurate representations to you.
2. We have provided you with:
  - access to all information of which we are aware that is relevant to the preparation of the financial statements such as records, documentation and other matters;
  - additional information that you have requested from us for the purpose of the audit; and
  - unrestricted access to persons within the entity from whom you determined it necessary to obtain audit evidence.
3. All transactions have been recorded in the accounting records and are reflected in the financial statements.
4. We acknowledge as trustee our responsibilities for the design and implementation of internal control in order to prevent and detect fraud and to prevent and detect error.
5. We have disclosed to you the results of our assessment of the risk that the financial statements may be materially misstated as a result of fraud.
6. We have disclosed to you all information in relation to fraud or suspected fraud that we are aware of and that affects the entity and involves:
  - management
  - employees who have significant roles in internal control
  - others where the fraud could have a material effect on the financial statements.
7. We are not aware of any allegations of fraud or suspected fraud with a potential effect on the financial statements which have been communicated to us by employees, former employees, regulators or other third parties.
8. We have disclosed to you all known instances of non-compliance or suspected non-compliance with laws and regulations whose effects should be considered when preparing the financial statements.
9. In our opinion, the significant assumptions that have been used in determining fair values, whether such values are disclosed or applied in the financial statements, are reasonable and reflect our ability and intent to carry out specific courses of action, where this is relevant to the determination of those values.
10. In our opinion the significant assumptions used by us in making accounting estimates are reasonable.
11. We have disclosed to you the identity of the charity's related parties and all related party relationships and transactions of which we are aware.
12. Related party relationships and transactions have been appropriately accounted for and disclosed in accordance with the requirements of UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (FRS 102) and the Charities Statement of Recommended Practice FRS 102.
13. In particular, no trustee, shadow trustee, their connected persons or other officers had any indebtedness, agreement concerning indebtedness or disclosable interest in a transaction with the charity at any time during the year, other than as indicated in the financial statements or, in the case of items not required to be disclosed, in the attached schedule.
14. The following have been properly recorded and, when appropriate, adequately disclosed in the financial statements:
  - losses arising from sale and purchase commitments;

- agreements and options to buy back assets previously sold;
  - assets pledged as collateral.
15. We have no plans or intentions that may materially alter the carrying value or classification of assets and liabilities reflected in the financial statements.
  16. We have no plans to abandon activities or other plans or intentions that will result in any excess or obsolete stocks, and no stock is stated at an amount in excess of net realisable value.
  17. We are of the opinion that the methodology applied to the valuation of investment properties and the assumptions used are appropriate and therefore the value of investment properties is not materially misstated.
  18. We are of the opinion that the costs involved in the reconstruction or analysis of past accounting records of heritage assets (bridges) or in valuation are onerous compared with the additional benefit derived by users of the accounts in assessing the trustees' stewardship of the assets.
  19. The charity has satisfactory title to all assets and there are no liens or encumbrances on the charity's assets, other than as disclosed in the financial statements.
  20. We confirm that the methodology used and the assumptions underlying the valuation of the Local Government Pension Scheme are reasonable. We also confirm that the methodology applied and the bases used for the allocation of costs and liabilities to BHE are reasonable.
  21. We have recorded or disclosed, as appropriate, all liabilities, both actual and contingent, and all guarantees that we have given to third parties.
  22. All events subsequent to the date of the financial statements and for which UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (FRS 102) and the Charities Statement of Recommended Practice FRS 102 require adjustment or disclosure have been adjusted or disclosed. Should any material events occur which may necessitate revision of the figures included in the financial statements or inclusion in the notes thereto, we will advise you accordingly.
  23. The charity has complied with all aspects of contractual agreements that could have a material effect on the financial statements in the event of non-compliance.
  24. Except as disclosed in the financial statements, the results for the year were not materially affected by:
    - any change in accounting policies;
    - transactions of a type not usually undertaken by the charity;
    - circumstances of an exceptional or non-recurrent nature; or
    - charges or credits relating to prior periods.
  25. We have disclosed to you all known actual or possible litigation or claims whose effects should be considered when preparing the financial statements and that they have been accounted for and disclosed in accordance with UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (FRS 102) and the Charities Statement of Recommended Practice FRS 102.
  26. We have reviewed going concern considerations and are satisfied that it is appropriate for the financial statements to have been drawn up on the going concern basis. In reaching this opinion we have taken into account all relevant matters of which we are aware and have considered a future period of at least one year from the date on which the financial statements are to be approved.  
  
We have also considered the adequacy of the disclosures in the financial statements relating to going concern and are satisfied that sufficient disclosure has been made in order to give a true and fair view.
  27. We confirm the financial statements are free of material misstatements, including omissions. We note that there are no uncorrected misstatements identified during the audit.
  28. All grants, donations and other incoming resources, the receipt of which is subject to specific terms and conditions, have been notified to you. There have been no breaches of terms or conditions in the application of such incoming resources.
  29. All grants paid and any subsequent grant clawbacks have been undertaken in line with the conditions of the grant agreements and have been appropriately reported in the accounts.
  30. We confirm that we are not aware of any breaches of charity regulations and that we have advised you of the existence of all endowments and funds maintained by us.

31. All income has been recorded, all restricted funds have been properly applied and all constructive obligations have been recognised.
32. All correspondence with regulators has been made available to you, including any serious incidents reports.
33. Except as disclosed in the notes to the BHE accounts, as at 31 March 2017 there were no significant capital or other commitments contracted for by BHE.

We confirm that the above representations are made on the basis of enquiries of management and staff with relevant knowledge and experience (and, where appropriate, of inspection of supporting documentation) sufficient to satisfy ourselves that we can properly make each of the above representations to you.

Yours faithfully

.....

The Chamberlain of London  
Signed on behalf of the Trustee

On (date)

Dear Sirs

## **CITY'S CASH TRUSTS – OPEN SPACES**

This representation letter is provided in connection with your audit of the financial statements of the City's Cash Trusts (Open Spaces) for the period ended 31 March 2017 for the purpose of expressing an opinion as to whether the financial statements give a true and fair view in accordance with UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (FRS 102) and the Charities Statement of Recommended Practice FRS 102.

By a resolution of the Finance Committee, passed today, I am directed to confirm to you, in respect of the financial statements of the trusts for the period ended 31 March 2017, the following:-

1. We have fulfilled our responsibilities under the Charities Act 2011 for preparing financial statements which give a true and fair view in accordance with UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (FRS 102) and the Charities Statement of Recommended Practice FRS 102 and for making accurate representations to you.
2. We have provided you with:
  - access to all information of which we are aware that is relevant to the preparation of the financial statements such as records, documentation and other matters;
  - additional information that you have requested from us for the purpose of the audit; and
  - unrestricted access to persons within the entity from whom you determined it necessary to obtain audit evidence.
3. All transactions have been recorded in the accounting records and are reflected in the financial statements.
4. We acknowledge as trustee our responsibilities for the design and implementation of internal control in order to prevent and detect fraud and to prevent and detect error.
5. We have disclosed to you the results of our assessment of the risk that the financial statements may be materially misstated as a result of fraud.
6. We have disclosed to you all information in relation to fraud or suspected fraud that we are aware of and that affects the entity and involves:
  - management
  - employees who have significant roles in internal control
  - others where the fraud could have a material effect on the financial statements.
7. We are not aware of any allegations of fraud or suspected fraud with a potential effect on the financial statements which have been communicated to us by employees, former employees, regulators or other third parties.
8. We have disclosed to you all known instances of non-compliance or suspected non-compliance with laws and regulations whose effects should be considered when preparing the financial statements.
9. In our opinion, the significant assumptions that have been used in determining fair values, whether such values are disclosed or applied in the financial statements, are reasonable and reflect our ability and intent to carry out specific courses of action, where this is relevant to the determination of those values.
10. In our opinion the significant assumptions used by us in making accounting estimates are reasonable.
11. We have disclosed to you the identity of the Trusts related parties and all related party relationships and transactions of which we are aware.
12. Related party relationships and transactions have been appropriately accounted for and disclosed in accordance with the requirements of UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (FRS 102) and the Charities Statement of Recommended Practice FRS 102.
13. In particular, no trustee, shadow trustee, their connected persons or other officers had any indebtedness, agreement concerning indebtedness or disclosable interest in a transaction with the Trusts at any time during the year.
14. We have no plans or intentions that may materially alter the carrying value or classification of assets and liabilities reflected in the financial statements, other than as disclosed in the financial statements.

15. The Trusts have satisfactory title to all assets and there are no liens or encumbrances on the Trusts' assets, other than as disclosed in the financial statements.
16. We have recorded or disclosed, as appropriate, all liabilities, both actual and contingent, and all guarantees that we have given to third parties.
17. All events subsequent to the date of the financial statements and for which UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (FRS 102) and the Charities Statement of Recommended Practice FRS 102 require adjustment or disclosure have been adjusted or disclosed. Should any material events occur which may necessitate revision of the figures included in the financial statements or inclusion in the notes thereto, we will advise you accordingly.
18. The Trusts have complied with all aspects of contractual agreements that could have a material effect on the financial statements in the event of non-compliance.
19. Except as disclosed in the financial statements, the results for the year were not materially affected by:
  - any change in accounting policies;
  - transactions of a type not usually undertaken by the Trusts;
  - circumstances of an exceptional or non-recurrent nature; or
  - charges or credits relating to prior periods.
20. We have disclosed to you all known actual or possible litigation or claims whose effects should be considered when preparing the financial statements and that they have been accounted for and disclosed in accordance with UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (FRS 102) and the Charities Statement of Recommended Practice FRS 102.
21. We have reviewed going concern considerations and are satisfied that it is appropriate for the financial statements to have been drawn up on the going concern basis. In reaching this opinion we have taken into account all relevant matters of which we are aware and have considered a future period of at least one year from the date on which the financial statements are to be approved.

We have also considered the adequacy of the disclosures in the financial statements relating to going concern and are satisfied that sufficient disclosure has been made in order to give a true and fair view.
22. We confirm the financial statements are free of material misstatements, including omissions. We believe that those uncorrected misstatements identified during the audit are immaterial both individually and in aggregate to the financial statements as a whole. A list of these items is attached to this letter of representation, together with our reasons for not correcting them.
23. All grants, donations and other incoming resources, the receipt of which is subject to specific terms and conditions, have been notified to you. There have been no breaches of terms or conditions in the application of such incoming resources.
24. We confirm that we are not aware of any breaches of charity regulations and that we have advised you of the existence of all endowments and funds maintained by us.
25. All income has been recorded, all restricted funds have been properly applied and all constructive obligations have been recognised.
26. All correspondence with regulators has been made available to you, including any serious incidents reports.
27. Except as disclosed in the notes to the City's Cash Trusts accounts, as at 31 March 2017 there were no significant capital or other commitments contracted for by City's Cash Trusts.
28. We are of the opinion that the costs involved in the reconstruction or analysis of past accounting records of heritage assets (open spaces) or in valuation are onerous compared with the additional benefit derived by users of the accounts in assessing the trustees' stewardship of the assets.

We confirm that the above representations are made on the basis of enquiries of management and staff with relevant knowledge and experience sufficient to satisfy ourselves that we can properly make each of the above representations to you.

Yours faithfully

.....

The Chamberlain of London

Signed on behalf of the Trustee

On \_\_\_\_\_ (date)

Dear Sirs

## **CITY OF LONDON – SUNDRY AND OTHER TRUSTS**

This representation letter is provided in connection with your audit of the financial statements of The City of London Corporation Sundry Trusts and Other accounts for the period ended 31 March 2017 for the purpose of expressing an opinion as to whether the financial statements give a true and fair view in accordance with UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (FRS 102) and the Charities Statement of Recommended Practice FRS 102.

By a resolution of the Finance Committee, passed today, I am directed to confirm to you, in respect of the financial statements of the charities for the period ended 31 March 2017, the following:-

1. We have fulfilled our responsibilities under the Charities Act 2011 for preparing financial statements which give a true and fair view in accordance with UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (FRS 102) and the Charities Statement of Recommended Practice FRS 102 and for making accurate representations to you.
2. We have provided you with:
  - access to all information of which we are aware that is relevant to the preparation of the financial statements such as records, documentation and other matters;
  - additional information that you have requested from us for the purpose of the audit; and
  - unrestricted access to persons within the entity from whom you determined it necessary to obtain audit evidence.
3. All transactions have been recorded in the accounting records and are reflected in the financial statements.
4. We acknowledge as trustee our responsibilities for the design and implementation of internal control in order to prevent and detect fraud and to prevent and detect error.
5. We have disclosed to you the results of our assessment of the risk that the financial statements may be materially misstated as a result of fraud.
6. We have disclosed to you all information in relation to fraud or suspected fraud that we are aware of and that affects the entity and involves:
  - management
  - employees who have significant roles in internal control
  - others where the fraud could have a material effect on the financial statements.
7. We are not aware of any allegations of fraud or suspected fraud with a potential effect on the financial statements which have been communicated to us by employees, former employees, regulators or other third parties.
8. We have disclosed to you all known instances of non-compliance or suspected non-compliance with laws and regulations whose effects should be considered when preparing the financial statements.
9. In our opinion, the significant assumptions that have been used in determining fair values, whether such values are disclosed or applied in the financial statements, are reasonable and reflect our ability and intent to carry out specific courses of action, where this is relevant to the determination of those values.
10. In our opinion the significant assumptions used by us in making accounting estimates are reasonable.
11. We have disclosed to you the identity of the charities related parties and all related party relationships and transactions of which we are aware.
12. Related party relationships and transactions have been appropriately accounted for and disclosed in accordance with the requirements of UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (FRS 102) and the Charities Statement of Recommended Practice FRS 102.
13. In particular, no trustee, shadow trustee, their connected persons or other officers had any indebtedness, agreement concerning indebtedness or disclosable interest in a transaction with the charities at any time during the year.
14. We have no plans or intentions that may materially alter the carrying value or classification of assets and liabilities reflected in the financial statements.

15. The Trusts have satisfactory title to all assets and there are no liens or encumbrances on the Trusts' assets, other than as disclosed in the financial statements.
16. We have recorded or disclosed, as appropriate, all liabilities, both actual and contingent, and all guarantees that we have given to third parties.
17. All events subsequent to the date of the financial statements and for which UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (FRS 102) and the Charities Statement of Recommended Practice FRS 102 require adjustment or disclosure have been adjusted or disclosed. Should any material events occur which may necessitate revision of the figures included in the financial statements or inclusion in the notes thereto, we will advise you accordingly.
18. The Trusts have complied with all aspects of contractual agreements that could have a material effect on the financial statements in the event of non-compliance.
19. Except as disclosed in the financial statements, the results for the year were not materially affected by:
  - any change in accounting policies;
  - transactions of a type not usually undertaken by the charities;
  - circumstances of an exceptional or non-recurrent nature; or
  - charges or credits relating to prior periods.
20. We have disclosed to you all known actual or possible litigation or claims whose effects should be considered when preparing the financial statements and that they have been accounted for and disclosed in accordance with UK Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (FRS 102) and the Charities Statement of Recommended Practice FRS 102.
21. We have reviewed going concern considerations and are satisfied that it is appropriate for the financial statements to have been drawn up on the going concern basis. In reaching this opinion we have taken into account all relevant matters of which we are aware and have considered a future period of at least one year from the date on which the financial statements are to be approved.  
  
We have also considered the adequacy of the disclosures in the financial statements relating to going concern and are satisfied that sufficient disclosure has been made in order to give a true and fair view.
22. We confirm the financial statements are free of material misstatements, including omissions. We note that there are no uncorrected misstatements identified during the audit.
23. All grants, donations and other incoming resources, the receipt of which is subject to specific terms and conditions, have been notified to you. There have been no breaches of terms or conditions in the application of such incoming resources.
24. We confirm that we are not aware of any breaches of our charity regulations and that we have advised you of the existence of all endowments and funds maintained by us.
25. All income has been recorded, all restricted funds have been properly applied and all constructive obligations have been recognised.
26. All correspondence with regulators has been made available to you, including any serious incidents reports.
27. Except as disclosed in the notes to the Sundry and Other Trusts accounts, as at 31 March 2017 there were no significant capital or other commitments contracted for by Sundry and Other Trusts.

We confirm that the above representations are made on the basis of enquiries of management and staff with relevant knowledge and experience (and, where appropriate, of inspection of supporting documentation) sufficient to satisfy ourselves that we can properly make each of the above representations to you.

Yours faithfully

.....  
 The Chamberlain of London  
 Signed on behalf of the Trustee  
 On (date)



# Report – Planning and Transportation Committee

## Annual On-Street Parking Accounts 2016/17 and Related Funding of Highway Improvements and Schemes

*To be presented on Thursday, 7<sup>th</sup> December 2017*

*To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons  
of the City of London in Common Council assembled.*

### SUMMARY

The City of London in common with other London authorities is required to report to the Mayor for London on action taken in respect of any deficit or surplus in its On-Street Parking Account for a particular financial year.

The purpose of this report is to inform Members that:

- the surplus arising from on-street parking activities in 2016/17 was £6.313m;
- a total of £3.421m, was applied in 2016/17 to fund approved projects; and
- the surplus remaining on the On-Street Parking Reserve at 31st March 2017 was £20.121m, which will be wholly allocated towards the funding of various highway improvements and other projects over the medium term.

### RECOMMENDATION

That Members note the contents of the report and approve its submission to the Mayor of London.

### MAIN REPORT

#### Background

1. Section 55(3A) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended), requires the City of London in common with other London authorities (i.e. other London Borough Councils and Transport for London), to report to the Mayor for London on action taken in respect of any deficit or surplus in their On-Street Parking Account for a particular financial year.
2. Legislation provides that any surplus not applied in the financial year may be carried forward. If it is not to be carried forward, it may be applied by the City for one or more of the following purposes:
  - a) making good to the City Fund any deficit charged to that Fund in the four years immediately preceding the financial year in question;

- b) meeting all or any part of the cost of the provision and maintenance by the City of off-street parking accommodation whether in the open or under cover;
  - c) the making to other local authorities, or to other persons, of contributions towards the cost of the provision and maintenance by them, in the area of the local authority or elsewhere, of off-street parking accommodation whether in the open or under cover;
  - d) if it appears to the City that the provision in the City of further off-street parking accommodation is for the time being unnecessary or undesirable, for the following purposes, namely:
    - meeting costs incurred, whether by the City or by some other person, in the provision or operation of, or of facilities for, public passenger transport services;
    - the purposes of a highway or road improvement project in the City;
    - meeting the costs incurred by the City in respect of the maintenance of roads at the public expense; and
    - for an “environmental improvement” in the City.
  - e) meeting all or any part of the cost of the doing by the City in its area of anything which facilitates the implementation of the Mayor’s Transport Strategy, being specified in that strategy as a purpose for which a surplus can be applied; and
  - f) making contributions to other authorities, i.e. the other London Borough Councils and Transport for London, towards the cost of their doing things upon which the City in its area could incur expenditure upon under (a)-(e) above.
3. In the various tables of this report, figures in brackets indicate expenditure, reductions in income or increased expenditure.

#### **2016/17 Outturn**

4. The overall financial position for the On-Street Parking Reserve in 2016/17 is summarised below:

	£m
Surplus Balance brought forward at 1st April 2016	17.229
Surplus arising during 2016/17	6.313
Expenditure financed during the year	(3.421)
<b>Funds remaining at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017, wholly allocated towards funding future projects</b>	<b>20.121</b>

5. Total expenditure of £3.421m in 2016/17 was financed from the On-Street Parking Reserve, covering the following approved projects:

<b>Revenue/SRP Expenditure:</b>	<b>£000</b>
Highway Resurfacing, Maintenance and Enhancements	(1,971)
Concessionary Fares and Taxi Card Scheme	(530)
Bank Junction Experimental Safety Scheme	(163)
Ring of Steel Compliance and Stabilisation	(125)
Beech Street Tunnel	(116)
Special Needs Transport	(93)
Planting Maintenance	(16)
Street Lighting Project	(3)
Off Street Parking Contribution to Reserves	233
<b>Total Revenue/SRP Expenditure</b>	<b>(2,784)</b>
<b>Capital Expenditure:</b>	
Aldgate	(531)
Bank Junction Experimental Safety Scheme	(72)
Barbican Podium Waterproofing – Phase 1	(15)
Milton Court Highway Works S278	(10)
Street Lighting Project	(5)
Barbican Area Strategy - Silk Street	(4)
<b>Total Capital Expenditure</b>	<b>(637)</b>
<b>Total Expenditure Funded in 2016/17</b>	<b>(3,421)</b>

6. The surplus on the On-Street Parking Reserve brought forward from 2015/16 was £17.229m. After expenditure of £3.421m funded in 2016/17, a surplus balance of £2.892m was carried forward to future years to give a closing balance at 31st March 2017 of £20.121m.
7. Currently total expenditure of some £69.428m is planned over the medium term up to 31st March 2022, by which time it is anticipated that the existing surplus plus those estimated for future years will be fully utilised. This total includes expenditures of £8.344m, £14.903m, £26.999m, £13.249m and £5.933m planned from 2017/18 until 2021/22 respectively, which are anticipated to reduce significantly the surpluses arising in those years.
8. The total programme covers a number of major capital schemes including funding towards the Barbican Podium Waterproofing and Highwalk Remedial Works, repairs to Holborn Viaduct & Snow Hill Pipe Subways, Street Lighting Project, Temple Area Traffic Review, Dominant House Footbridge Repairs, HVM Security Bollards & Security Team, Minorities car park structural monitoring/work, 'Ring of Steel' Compliance and Stabilisation and Bank Junction Experimental Safety Scheme.
9. The programme also covers ongoing funding of revenue projects including highway resurfacing, enhancements and road maintenance projects, concessionary fares and taxi cards, special needs transport, and contributions to the costs of Off-Street car parks. The progression of each individual scheme

is, of course, subject to the City Corporation's normal evaluation criteria and Standing Orders.

10. A forecast summary of income and expenditure arising on the On-Street Parking Account and the corresponding contribution from or to the On- Street Parking Surplus, over the medium term financial planning period, is shown below:

<b>On-Street Parking Account Reserve Projections 2016/17 to 2021/22</b>	<b>2016/17 Actual £m</b>	<b>2017/18 Forecast £m</b>	<b>2018/19 Forecast £m</b>	<b>2019/20 Forecast £m</b>	<b>2020/21 Forecast £m</b>	<b>2021/22 Forecast £m</b>	<b>Total £m</b>
Income	9.3	16.6	16.4	16.5	8.9	9.0	76.7
Expenditure ( <i>Note 1</i> )	(3.0)	(4.0)	(4.0)	(4.0)	(3.0)	(3.1)	(21.1)
<b>Net Surplus arising in year</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>12.6</b>	<b>12.4</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>55.6</b>
Capital, SRP and Revenue Commitments	(3.4)	(8.3)	(14.9)	(27.0)	(13.3)	(5.9)	(72.8)
<b>Net in year contribution (from)/ to surplus</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>(2.5)</b>	<b>(14.5)</b>	<b>(7.4)</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>(17.2)</b>
(Deficit) / Surplus cfwd at 1 <sup>st</sup> April	17.2	20.1	24.4	21.9	7.4	0.0	
<b>(Deficit) / Surplus cfwd at 31<sup>st</sup> March</b>	<b>20.1</b>	<b>24.4</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	

*Note 1: On-Street operating expenditure relates to direct staffing costs, repair & maintenance of pay & display machines, Indigo contractor costs, fees & services (covering cash collection, pay by phone, postage & legal), IT software costs for enforcement systems, provision for bad debts for on-street income and central support recharges.*

11. A noticeable increase in income generated from 2017-18 to 2019-20 is a result of the Bank Junction Experimental Safety Scheme. Depending upon future motorist's compliance and possible extensions to the current trial scheme timeframe, these income streams may need refining.
12. There is now a combined service for 'Civil Parking & Traffic Enforcement, including the Cash Collection Contract' which has resulted in on-going savings to the operating costs of the On-Street Parking Account.

### **Conclusion**

13. So that the City Corporation can meet its requirements under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended), it is requested that the Court of Common Council notes the contents of this report and approves its submission to the Mayor of London.

All of which we submit to the judgement of this Honourable Court.

DATED this 21<sup>st</sup> day of November 2017.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

**Christopher Michael Hayward**  
Chairman, Planning and Transportation Committee

## Report – Planning & Transportation and Port Health & Environmental Services Committees

### Update to the Scheme of Delegations

*To be presented on Thursday, 7<sup>th</sup> December 2017*

*To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled.*

#### SUMMARY

The Court of Common Council has previously delegated some of its functions to the Planning and Transportation and the Port Health and Environmental Services Committees. To facilitate the administration of these functions, some matters relating to transportation and public realm, town planning, and building control have been delegated to the Director of the Built Environment and the District Surveyor, as set out in the Scheme of Delegations previously approved by the Court of Common Council.

Minor modifications are now required to reflect responsibilities relating to Crossrail and changes to job titles. These are reflected in the revised section of the Scheme of Delegations set out in the Appendix, which is presented to the Court of Common Council for consideration in accordance with Standing Orders.

#### RECOMMENDATION

It is **recommended** that the revised delegations to the Director of the Built Environment and the District Surveyor, as set out in the Appendix, be approved by the Court of Common Council.

#### MAIN REPORT

##### **Background**

1. The Court of Common Council has delegated the exercise of various statutory functions to its Port Health & Environmental Services Committee (including responsibility for environmental health) and to the Planning and Transportation Committee.
2. To facilitate the carrying out and administration of these functions, some of them have been delegated down to Chief Officers as set out in the Scheme of Delegations (last approved by the Court of Common Council in their entirety in May 2014, with various amendments approved since, most recently in December 2016).

##### **Issue**

3. Further minor amendments are now sought. These are principally to include a previously omitted paragraph concerning Crossrail and to take account of

changes made to post titles. All changes have been marked in the appended document, with proposed additions in italics and deletions struck-through.

**Conclusion**

4. The proposed minor amendments to the Scheme of Delegations to Officers are considered appropriate and are presented for your approval.

**Appendices**

- Appendix – Revised Scheme of Delegations to the Director of the Built Environment and District Surveyor

All of which we submit to the judgement of this Honourable Court.

DATED these 14<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> days of November 2017.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committees.

**Christopher Michael Hayward**

Chairman, Planning and Transportation Committee

**Jeremy Lewis Simons**

Chairman, Port Health and Environmental Services Committee

## **DEPARTMENT OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT**

### **DIRECTOR OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT**

The following powers are delegated to the Director of the Built Environment.

#### **Authority**

1. To authorise duly appointed officers to act under any enactments, regulations or orders relating to the functions within the purview of the Committee and of the Department.
2. To sign the necessary warrants of authorisation for the above officers.

#### **Charges**

3. Setting miscellaneous hourly-based charges subject to agreement with the Chamberlain.

### **Transportation & Public Realm**

4. To implement, waive or vary charges relating to traffic management and /or the Public Highway and/or pipe subways such as parking dispensations, private apparatus in the highway, temporary road closures and traffic orders, scaffolding, hoarding and fencing licences, and charges for pipe subways (including under S.73 of the London Local Authorities Act 2007) .
5. To grant permission or consent with or without conditions or refusing to grant permission or consent as the case may be with respect to applications made to the City of London Corporation:
  - a. under Part II of the Road Traffic Act 1991, relating to dispensations from, or, the temporary suspension of, waiting and loading regulations or parking places regulations made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
  - b. under Section 7 of the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1973, relating to new buildings;
6. To sign appropriate notices indicating that consent or refusal has been given, as the case may be under (a) above.
7. To sign and serve notices or granting of consents under the Highways Act 1980, City of London (Various Powers) Act 1900 and the City of London Sewers Act 1848 relating to the management and maintenance of streets within the City.

8. To exercise powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 in respect of temporary traffic orders.
9. To issue notices and, as necessary discharge the City of London Corporation's obligations under Part III of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991, relating to the co-ordination and execution of street works by public utility companies and other licensed operators.
10. To enter into agreement with companies and statutory companies to allow the placement of plant within the pipe subways inherited from the Greater London Council in accordance with the London County Council (General Powers) Act 1958 and to determine applications for consent to place electricity substations in the street pursuant to the Electricity Act 1989
11. To enter into agreements with other traffic authorities to jointly exercise the City of London Corporation's traffic order making functions or to delegate those functions to them or to accept their delegations of those functions in accordance with S.101 Local Government Act 1972.
12. To enter into agreements with other highway authorities under section 8 of the Highways Act 1980.

### **Water and Sewers**

13. The requisition of sewers under Sections 98 to 101 inclusive of the Water Industry Act 1991 (relating to the powers to exercise and discharge the functions of the Undertaker within the City to provide and adopt sewers).
14. The adoption of sewers under Sections 102 to 105 inclusive of the Water Industry Act 1991 (relating to the powers to exercise and discharge the functions of the Undertaker within the City to adopt sewers).
15. To authorise and/or approve works under Section 112 of the Water Industry Act 1991 (relating to the power to exercise and discharge the requirements of the Undertaker within the City).
16. The closure or restriction of sewers under Section 116 of the Water Industry Act 1991, relating to the powers to exercise and discharge the functions of the Undertaker within the City to close or restrict the use of a public sewer.
17. The alteration or removal of pipes or apparatus of the Undertaker under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991, relating to the power to exercise and discharge the functions of the Undertaker within the City to alter or remove any relevant pipe or apparatus.

### **Highways and Transport**

18. To make all Traffic Orders under sections 6, 9, 10, 23 and 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, and to make modifications to or to revoke any experimental Traffic Regulation Order (following consultation with the Commissioner of Police for the City of London) where deemed necessary



in the interests of safety, convenience or the expeditious movement of traffic.

19. To exercise powers under Part V of the Highways Act 1980 dealing with highway improvements.
20. To make representation or lodge objection, as appropriate, to applications for a Public Service Vehicle Operator's Licence, under Section 14A of the Public Passenger Vehicles Act 1981 or for a London Local Service Licence, under section 186 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 and authorising in writing the appropriate officers in his Department to put forward objection or recommendation on behalf of the City of London Corporation at any Inquiry or Appeal arising out of an application for either of the recited licences.
21. To agree details of railway works in the City of London under the Transport and Works Act 1992.
22. To issue projection licences on, over or under streets pursuant to schemes where planning permission has already been agreed or renewing existing licences.
23. To be responsible for all functions under the Traffic Management Act 2004 and Regulations made thereunder that relate to the City of London Corporation as a local highway and local traffic authority.
24. To agree consents for temporary highway activities pursuant to the Crossrail Act 2008.
25. To exercise through Civil Enforcement amongst other things, parking management and parking enforcement functions, under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the Road Traffic Act 1991, the London Local Authorities Acts 1995 – 2012 (LLAA), and the Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA).

### **City Walkway**

26. Power to licence the temporary hoarding or enclosure of City Walkway pursuant to Section 162 of the City of London Sewers Act 1848 and Section 21 and Schedule 2 Part II to the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1967.

### **Cleansing**

27. The institution of proceedings and other enforcement remedies in respect of offences under the Environmental Protection Act 1990, Part II, Part III and Part IV.
28. To institute proceedings and other enforcement remedies in respect of the Health Act 2006, section 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10.
29. To institute proceedings and other enforcement remedies in respect of offences under the Refuse Disposal (Amenity) Act 1978.

30. To institute proceedings and other enforcement remedies in respect of offences under the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1987.
31. To institute proceedings and enforcement remedies in relation to Part VI of the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003.
32. To institute proceeding and enforcement remedies in relation to Part I-IV of the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.
33. To serve notices and institute enforcement remedies in relation to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 sections 225A - 225K.
34. To institute proceedings in relation to the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000.
35. To institute proceedings in relation to the Control of Pollution Act 1974.
36. To issue notices under section 6 London Local Authorities Act 2004 (abandoned vehicles). [See my previous comments.]
37. To institute proceedings in relation to the Environment Act 1995.
38. To institute proceedings in relation to the London Local Authorities Act 1995.
39. To institute proceedings in relation to the London Local Authorities and Transport for London Act 2003.
40. To institute proceedings in relation to the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976.
41. To institute proceedings in relation to the Highways Act 1980.

### **Delegations to other Officers**

The following authorities are also delegated to the specified Deputies or Assistants:

Transportation and Public Realm Director – Items 4 - 41

Assistant Director (Highways) – Items 5 -17 and Items 23 – 26

Assistant Director (City Transportation) – Item 18

## **TOWN PLANNING**

The following functions are delegated to the Chief Planning Officer & Development Director:

### **A) Development Management**

42. To determine applications for outline, full and temporary planning permission under Part III of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 subject to the applications being in accordance with policy, not being of broad interest and there being no more than 4 planning objections.
43. To make non-material changes to planning permission pursuant to Section 96A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
44. To determine applications for Listed Building Consent under the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990; subject to the applications not being of broad interest and there being no more than 4 relevant objections.
45. To advise the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government of what decision the City of London Corporation would have made on its own applications for listed building consent if it had been able to determine them, subject to the same criteria as 43.
46. To determine submissions pursuant to the approval of conditions, under the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 and the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and in relation to clauses set out in approved Section 106 Agreements.
47. To make minor changes to conditions in respect of planning permissions and listed building consents which have been conditionally approved by the Planning & Transportation Committee.
48. To determine applications for planning permission and listed building consent to replace an extant permission/consent granted on or before 1<sup>st</sup> October 2010, for development which has not already begun with a new permission/consent subject to a new time limit pursuant to Article 20 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 and Regulation 3 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990 as amended and provided no more than 4 planning objections have been received.
49. To determine applications for Certificates of Lawfulness of existing and proposed use or development in accordance with sections 191 and 192 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
50. To determine applications for Advertisement Consent pursuant to Regulations 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 of the Town & Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

51. To determine applications for prior approval under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015.
52. To make observations in respect of planning and related applications submitted to other Boroughs, where the City of London Corporation's views have been sought and which do not raise wider City issues.
53. To serve notices under Article 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015.
54. To determine the particulars and evidence to be supplied by an applicant for planning permission pursuant to section 62 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
55. To serve Planning Contravention Notices under Section 171C of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
56. To issue and serve Enforcement Notices under Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 38 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
57. To issue a letter of assurance under Section 172A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
58. To serve notices under Section 215 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
59. To serve Breach of Condition Notices under Section 187A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
60. To decline to determine a retrospective application for planning permission under Section 70C of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
61. To seek information as to interests in land under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and as applied by Section 89 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas Act) 1990, and Section 16 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976.
62. To institute proceedings pursuant to Section 224 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
63. To serve Notice of Intention to remove or obliterate placards and posters pursuant to Section 225, of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.  
[This has been amended as the other enforcement remedies contained in sections 225A to K are the subject of a separate delegation.]
64. To agree minor variations to agreements pursuant to sections 106 and 106A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to authorise section 106 covenants in respect of planning applications (and where the planning application is such that it may be determined by the Chief Officer (or other appropriate officer authorised by them) under this Scheme of Delegation).

65. To agree minor variations to agreements pursuant to section 278 of the Highways Act 1980.
66. To make payments to other parties where required by the terms of an agreement made under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 or section 278 of the Highways Act 1980.
67. To determine City Community Infrastructure Levy contributions pursuant to the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended).
68. To pass Community Infrastructure Levy contributions to other parties pursuant to section 216A of the Planning Act 2008 and regulations made thereunder.
69. To determine applications to discharge requirements and approve details pursuant to the Thames Tideway Tunnel Development Consent Order and other similar Development Consent Orders, and to discharge conditions and approve details pursuant to deemed planning permission granted by Transport and Works Act Orders and statutes in respect of infrastructure projects subject to the applications being in accordance with policy, not being of broad interest, and there being no more than 4 planning objections.

#### **B) Trees**

70. To authorise works, including their removal, to trees in Conservation Areas and works in relation to a tree the subject of a Tree Preservation Order (T.P.O.)
71. To determine applications made under sections 206 (2) and 213 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to dispense with the duty to plant replacement trees

#### **C) Churches**

72. To respond to consultation made under the provisions of the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011, the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015, the Care of Churches and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1991, the Care of Cathedrals Measure 2011 and the Code of Practice relating to exempted denominations procedures agreed by the Secretary of State.
73. The City of London Corporation's functions under the City of London (St. Paul's Cathedral Preservation) Act 1935.

#### **D) Environmental Impact**

74. To carry out the following functions under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (as amended) :
  - a. formulating "screening opinions" under Regulation 5;
  - b. requiring developers to submit an environmental statement to validate an application under Regulation 10;

- c. formulating “scoping opinions” under Regulation 13;
- d. providing relevant information to developers who propose to prepare an environmental statement under the provisions of Regulation 15 (4);
- e. requiring the submission of further information pursuant to regulation 22
- f. requiring the local authority to submit an environmental statement in respect of applications for local authority development under Regulation 25;
- g. formulating a “screening opinion” in matters of planning enforcement under Regulation 32.

#### **E) Crossrail**

- 75. To agree Crossrail contributions, agree viability assessments and instruct the Comptroller & City Solicitor to secure any necessary planning obligations in respect of Crossrail contributions pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 76. To make payments of Crossrail contributions received by the City of London Corporation to the Mayor and/or Transport for London on the basis of the Implementation Protocol between the Mayor, Transport for London and the local planning authorities, subject to such payment being agreed by the Chamberlain.
- 77. *Delegated authority be granted to the Chief Planning and Development Director to determine such applications as outlined in the report relating to the programme for requests for approval;*
- 78. This authority would not be exercised in respect of more major applications or where objections have been received, without prior consultation with the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman; and
- 79. It be noted that any proposals in respect of over-station development would not be subject to these provisions and would be the subject of the normal planning application process.
- 80. The following functions are delegated to the Policy & Performance Director:

#### **F) Local Plans, Naming and Numbering**

- 81. To carry out sustainability appraisal of Local Development Documents under Section 19(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to exercise functions under the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 including carrying out strategic environmental assessment (including assessments under the Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC)), preparing, publishing and consulting upon screening reports, scoping reports, sustainability commentaries and sustainability appraisal reports.

82. To carry out public consultation in the preparation of Local Development Documents in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement and the duty to cooperate in Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
83. To carry out surveys under Section 13 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
84. To provide any documents necessary to support consultations on Local Development Documents and submission of Local Plans.
85. To prepare and publish monitoring reports on an annual basis in accordance with Section 35 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
86. To make observations on consultation documents issued by central and local government, statutory bodies etc., where the observations are in accordance with the City's general policy position.
87. To carry out public consultation in the preparation or revision of the Community Infrastructure Levy, in accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and the Statement of Community Involvement.
88. To exercise powers under the London Building Acts (Amendment) Act 1939 – Part II relating to street naming and numbering of property.

#### **G) Land Charges**

89. To maintain a register and index of Local Land Charges pursuant to section 3 of the Local Land Charges Act 1975, including the amendment and cancellation of registrations pursuant to the Local Land Charges Rules 1977 and to set search fees pursuant to Section 8 of the Local Land Charges Act 1975 and Section 150 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 and relevant Rules and Regulations made there under.
90. To make searches and issue search certificates pursuant to section 9 of the Local Land Charges Act 1975.

#### **H) Lead Local Flood Authority**

91. To exercise the City of London Corporation's functions as Lead Local Flood Authority in relation to the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 (other than the functions delegated to the District Surveyor).

#### **Delegations to other Officers**

~~In addition the following functions are also delegated to the following Officers:~~

~~Director of the Built Environment – Section A to H~~

~~Chief Planning Officer & Development Director – Sections A to E and  
Paragraph 85 of this document  
Sections F-H in the absence of the Policy & Performance Director~~

~~Assistant Director (Development Management) – Sections A to E  
—  
Policy & Performance Director – Sections F-H and in the absence of  
the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director; and Assistant  
Director (Development Management), Sections A to E~~

*In addition the following functions are also delegated to the following  
Officers:*

*Director of the Built Environment – Section A to H*

*In the absence of the Chief Planning & Development Director sections A  
to E, and Paragraph 85 are delegated to Assistant Directors  
(Development).*

*Then to: The Policy & Performance Director.*

*In the absence of the Policy & Performance Director Sections F – H are  
delegated to the Assistant Director (Policy).*

*Then to: Chief Planning & Development Director.*

## **Statutory Authorities**

Officers of the department are authorised to exercise the following  
powers in accordance with the responsibilities of the post:

- a. Sections 178(1), 196A(1), 196B, 209(1), 214B(1), 214B(3),  
214C, 219(1) and 225, 324 and 325 of the Town and Country  
Planning Act 1990 (as amended),
- b. Sections 42(1), 88(2), (3), (4) and (5) and 88(A) of the Planning  
(Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as  
amended)
- c. Sections 36 and 36A of the Hazardous Substances Act 1990.



## **DISTRICT SURVEYOR**

The following functions are delegated to the District Surveyor:

92. To grant permission or consent, with or without conditions or, refuse to grant permission or consent, as the case may be, with respect to applications made to the City of London Corporation under the London Building Acts 1930-1982, The Building Act 1984 and The Building Regulations 2010 (as amended).
93. To sign and serve any notices required to be given by the City of London Corporation under the London Building Acts (Amendment) Act 1939, Part VII, Section 62 relating to dangerous structures within the City of London.
94. To exercise the City's Lead Local Flood Authority function as a statutory consultee to the local planning authority on surface water drainage issues.
95. To sign and serve any notices and consents required to be given by the City of London Corporation under the London Building Acts (Amendment) Act 1939, Part IV, Section 30 relating to special and temporary structures etc. erected within the City of London.
96. In accordance with the Party Wall etc. Act 1996, Section 10 (8) select the third surveyor if required to do so.

### **Delegation to other Officers**

The functions of the District Surveyor are also delegated to the Director of the Built Environment and the ~~Deputy District Surveyor~~ *Assistant District Surveyors*.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Report – Audit and Risk Management Committee

### Re-appointment of External Member (third term)

*To be presented on Thursday, 7<sup>th</sup> December 2017*

*To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons of  
the City of London in Common Council assembled.*

#### SUMMARY

At its meeting on 9 September 2011, the Court agreed a procedure for appointing External (Independent) Members to the Audit and Risk Management Committee. Subsequent to this, on 16 January 2014 the Court agreed a variation to this procedure such that it would allow for existing External Members to be appointed for a second term on the Committee.

On 8 December 2016, the Court agreed a further variation to permit the appointment of an external Member, Kenneth Ludlam, for a third term. The second term of another existing external Member, Ms Caroline Mawhood, is now due to expire and the Committee wishes to reappoint her similarly for a third term.

Ms Mawhood has served on the Audit and Risk Management Committee, as an External Member, since its inception in 2011 and her contributions to both the Committee and the Police Performance and Resource Management Sub Committee, on which she also serves, as well as the recent Auditor Appointment Panel, have been invaluable. Ms Mawhood has expressed a wish to serve for a third term and the Audit and Risk Management Committee would like to recommend this to the Court.

Members of the Court are also asked to note that the UK Corporate Governance Code (Guidance on Audit Committees) states that appointments can be extended by no more than two additional three-year periods, so long as Members continue to be independent.

#### RECOMMENDATION

We **recommend** that Ms Caroline Mawhood be appointed to the Audit and Risk Management Committee for a third term, expiring in 2021.

#### MAIN REPORT

##### Background

1. At its meeting on 9 September 2011, the Court agreed the procedure for appointing External (Independent) Members to the Audit and Risk Management Committee. Subsequent to this, on 16 January 2014, the Court agreed that the procedure be varied to allow existing External Members to be appointed for a further term, with a

maximum of two terms being served as the norm. All three External Members of the Audit and Risk Management Committee have now been appointed for a second term and one Member, Kenneth Ludlam, has been appointed for a third term.

2. Members are asked to note that the UK Corporate Governance Code (Guidance on Audit Committees) states that appointments can be extended by no more than two additional three-year periods, so long as Members continue to be independent. It is not unusual for Local Authorities to appoint External Members to both their Audit and Risk and Standards Committees for three terms.

### **Current position**

3. Caroline Mawhood's appointment as an External, Independent Member to the Audit and Risk Management Committee is due to expire in March 2018 and Ms Mawhood has expressed a wish to serve for a further term.
4. Ms Mawhood was CIPFA's President in 2008/2009, spent her professional career in central government auditing and, before her recent retirement, was Assistant Auditor General at the National Audit Office. Caroline has served on the Audit and Risk Management Committee, as an External Member since its inception in 2011 and her contributions to both the Committee, the Police Performance and Resource Management Sub Committee and the recent Auditor Appointment Panel have been invaluable.
5. Ms Mawhood has also served as an external member of various public sector audit committees including the Department of Energy and Climate Change (until June 2016) the Debt Management Office (current) and the European Commission (current). She was also a trustee and treasurer of a breast cancer research charity for 9 years (until September 2016) and is currently a trustee of the Wimbledon Guild Charity. She is a member of the Charities and Public Benefit Entities Board of the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy.

### **Options**

6. If Ms Mahwood is appointed for a further three-year term, this will have an additional benefit in that the terms of all 3 external members will expire at staggered intervals; i.e. 2019, 2020 and 2021.
7. In the longer term, Members of the Audit and Risk Management Committee have asked the Town Clerk to prepare for the appointment of new External Members and follow the good practice of other City of London Corporation Boards and Committees which appoint External Members; i.e. via the introduction of a Nominations Sub Committee and maintaining a portfolio of potential future External Members.

### **Conclusion**

8. Ms Caroline Mawhood is a highly valued, skilled and experienced External Member of the Audit and Risk Management Committee and has served since its inception in 2011. The UK Corporate Governance Code (Guidance on Audit Committees) states that appointments can be extended by no more than two additional three-

year periods, so long as Members continue to be independent. However, in order to keep a fresh perspective and to prepare for future appointments, the Town Clerk will follow the good practice of other City of London Corporation Boards and Committees which appoint External Members; i.e. via the introduction of a Nominations Sub Committee and maintaining a portfolio of potential future External Members.

All of which we submit to the judgement of this Honourable Court.

DATED this 10<sup>th</sup> day of October 2017.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

**Ian David Luder J.P., Alderman**  
Chairman, Audit and Risk Management Committee

This page is intentionally left blank

## Report – Community and Children’s Services Committee

### Gateway 4b: Windows Replacement & Common Parts Redecorations Programme – Golden Lane, Holloway, Southwark, Dron House, Sydenham Hill, William Blake and Windsor House

*To be presented on Thursday, 7<sup>th</sup> December 2017*

*To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled.*

#### **SUMMARY**

Gateway 2 approval had previously been provided for the commissioning of condition surveys across several City of London Housing Estates. This was given to identify areas where repair, refurbishment or replacement of windows or other common parts was required, with recommendations then to be produced for Members’ consideration.

These surveys have now been completed and the overall scope of the windows replacement and redecorations programme is significant, given that it covers multiple Estates, with estimated total programme costs of £16,905,452.

It is intended that a single design team be appointed to undertake the works across all Estates; however, pursuant to the City Corporation’s project management procedures, whilst works across the vast majority of Estates will proceed on the regular route, the Golden Lane Estate works will be progressed along the complex route (and thus also be considered by Members at the detailed design stage) due to that Estate’s listed status.

The Court’s approval is now sought to appoint the design team and to progress the project on the Golden Lane Estate to Gateway 4c to allow the requisite works to be undertaken, and to progress the programme to Gateway 5 on the wider estates at Holloway, Southwark, Dron House, Sydenham Hill, William Blake and Windsor House.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

That approval be given to:-

- the progression of the programme of works across the Holloway, Southwark, Dron House, Sydenham Hill, William Blake and Windsor House Estates to Gateway 5;
- the progression of the programme of works at the Golden Lane Estate to Gateway 4c; and,

- the allocation of £1,087,967 for the procurement of a single design team, of which £449,854 being allocated to Golden Lane and £638,113 is to be allocated across the other Estates.

## **MAIN REPORT**

### **Background**

1. Following approval for the undertaking of surveys across the several City Corporation Estates, an options appraisal was undertaken in 2015 to determine individual requirements at all blocks. This was to be done taking into account current Building Regulations, local planning requirements and listed building status on certain estates (such as Golden Lane), with a view to making recommendations around repair, refurbishment and replacement.
2. At this options appraisals stage, the scope of the programme was expanded to address a wider remit of estates/blocks (and in some cases additional works) with a view to achieving further economies of scale, whilst at the same time providing a basis upon which to develop a cyclical maintenance and replacement programme in line with the Asset Management Strategy.
3. The options appraisal included a number of considerations around the viability of repair as opposed to replacement. Replacement and refurbishment options provide best value for money as opposed to continued repair and maintenance, especially when considered over a typical 25 to 40 year life expectancy of the windows (dependent upon the type of materials used). Furthermore, improvement in the Standard Assessment Procedure energy rating of our housing assets was also a major consideration that would be addressed through this approach within the programme of works.
4. The intention of the overall windows replacement and common parts repair programme is to split the programme into a number of distinct works packages, which would be procured under a Framework approach but likely form separate contracts for procurement of services and window contract works, with Golden Lane Estate proceeding separately through the Gateway process along the complex route (due to its listed status) while the remaining Estates progress along the regular route.

### **Proposal**

5. It is recommended that the City Corporation go out to market for these works via a framework approach and identify a single design team that will have the expertise and experience to deliver all elements of the project; the benefits of which include:
  - Opportunity to retain knowledge and lessons learnt from other requirements.
  - Opportunity for economies of scale in unit costs associated with retaining a single design team for a higher value programme of work.
  - Avoidance of future opportunity costs and programme time to re-procure new design teams for subsequent requirements.
  - Option most likely to generate longer term investment by the design team.



- Less resource requirement, as the design team can work on multiple requirements concurrently.
6. Works will be procured separately via a framework approach once detailed designs and specifications have been produced. It is anticipated that to develop the proposals to a full planning application the estimated total full life project costs for consultancy (design team) are likely to be in the region of £1,509,415, of which approximately £749,757 will be apportioned to the Golden Lane Estate (due to the specialisms required). As such, while we have a single design team working across the programme, Golden Lane will essentially be treated as a separate project from a works perspective.
  7. When procuring the single design team, a breakdown of their estimated costs across each of the various work streams will be sought as part of the invitation to tender. Separate budgets will be allocated for Golden Lane and a combined budget for the remaining estates so that costs for services and works can be apportioned accordingly to the appropriate budget.

#### **Financial Implications**

8. Cost analysis undertaken by the appointed Quantity Surveyors across a sample of blocks suggest the latest estimates for total project cost (all estates) is £16,905,452; of which Golden Lane accounts for £8,397,278 and the wider Estates account for £8,508,174.

#### **Conclusion**

9. The Court is asked to approve this Gateway 4b report to enable the programme of works across the several Estates to proceed.

All of which we submit to the judgement of this Honourable Court.

DATED this 17<sup>th</sup> November 2017.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

**Dhruv Patel**  
Chairman, Community and Children's Services Committee

This page is intentionally left blank

## Report – Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee

*To be presented on Thursday, 7<sup>th</sup> December 2017*

*To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons  
of the City of London in Common Council assembled.*

### SUMMARY

The City of London Corporation's current cultural strategy expires at the end of 2017. It came into effect during the 2012 Cultural Olympiad but no longer reflects the full extent of the organisation's activities across arts, culture, heritage and learning or its new and emerging ambitions. Following a successful tender process, Global Cities Limited were appointed in May to assist the organisation in developing a new cultural strategy and, working with officers, undertook engagement across the City of London Corporation and key partners to inform the new strategy. It is a collaborative document that sets an ambitious vision for the organisation over the next five years.

The draft strategy was approved by your Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee on 4 September 2017 and your Policy and Resources Committee on 16 November 2017. A number of other Committees and Boards which have an interest in the delivery of arts, culture, heritage and learning have also received and fed into its development.

The draft strategy, including its two-page executive summary is attached for your consideration at Appendix A.

### RECOMMENDATION

Members are asked to approve the draft City of London Cultural Strategy 2018-22.

### MAIN REPORT

#### Background

1. The City of London Corporation remains the fourth largest funder of arts, culture and heritage in the UK, with an annual contribution of over £100m per annum to the sector. Culture is now widely recognised as a core component of a thriving global city, important to attracting investment, workers, creating vibrant neighbourhoods and making a positive contribution to the happiness and wellbeing of our communities. It is against this backdrop that the organisation seeks to refresh its strategy for the next five years.
2. A key aim for the new strategy was that it should be a more strategic forward-looking document that reflected the strong ambitions of the City of London Corporation across arts, culture and heritage.

#### Strategy

3. A two-page executive summary is included at the beginning of the Strategy which sets out the aims, values and strategic objectives for the organisation's cultural offer up to 2022.

4. The Strategy is deliberately high level and ambitious and will be delivered by departments across the City of London Corporation and key partners. Whilst there are objectives and priority actions which readers will recognise as supporting existing activity there are also new objectives designed to challenge the organisation over the coming years. These ambitions reflect conversations and feedback received throughout the strategy's development. Subject to its approval, a cross-organisational structure will be put in place to oversee the delivery of an action plan for the strategy.

**Conclusion**

5. We **recommend** that the draft City of London Cultural Strategy 2018-22 be approved.

All of which we submit to the judgement of this Honourable Court.

DATED this 4<sup>th</sup> day of September 2017.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

**Graham David Packham**  
Chairman, Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee

**We want to:**

Seize a once in a generation opportunity to reposition the City as a world capital for commerce and culture, harnessing the power of arts, heritage, learning and libraries to make the Square Mile far more open, creative, resilient and entrepreneurial. We will work collaboratively with cultural partners to drive social and economic change and contribute to a thriving city.

**The City of London Corporation has a unique combination of roles:**

- A major investor in an extraordinary cluster of diverse cultural organisations with considerable profile, reach and influence in London, the UK and abroad
- A convening power that brings together cultural partners in the City with other stakeholders to achieve social and economic impact – being greater than the sum of our parts
- A landowner and planning body which can embed creativity into the urban fabric and act as a beacon of place-based regeneration
- A long-term custodian of heritage but also a facilitator of innovation, creative talent and new entrepreneurial ideas
- An independent voice speaking about the role of culture at regional, national and international levels

**Our values:**

- We believe in the power of innovation and creativity to generate wealth for people and communities in a long term, sustained way – commerce and culture are intertwined throughout the City of London Corporation's history
- We expect the City of London Corporation and our cultural partners to be open, communicative, responsive and welcoming to a diverse range of people, businesses and visitors
- We are a global, flexible and cosmopolitan City yet have a strong sense of pride in our place, history, neighbourhoods and identity
- We value cultural learning and engagement as an essential part of the cultural experience, but also for the transformative personal, social and economic impact this can have.
- We recognise and embrace the diversity of London's culture and champion the excellence and innovation that this brings
- We prioritise areas under our direct control but are mindful of our responsibility to work with others to support the wider needs of the capital and the UK
- We seek to be joined up, agile, experimental and generous in our approach as a catalyst and convener at the forefront of cultural, economic and social change

## **Our Strategic Objectives:**

Between 2018-22 we want to...

1. Transform the City's public realm and physical infrastructure, making it a more open, distinct, welcoming and culturally vibrant destination
2. Develop Culture Mile in the north west of the City which will become an exciting destination for London and act as a catalyst for change across the rest of the Square Mile
3. Support cultural excellence in a range of fields and champion an ethos of innovation, creative risk taking and artistic citizenship
4. Support the City of London's Education Strategy through the nurturing of an exemplary Cultural Education Partnership, Culture Mile Learning, and enable our world-leading institutions to cultivate the creativity, skills and knowledge of the next generation
5. Become a leading centre of the digital and creative economy and unlock the creative potential and resilience of individuals and businesses using our estate and resources
6. Promote our cultural, heritage and creative strengths in the UK and abroad
7. Better promote our world class culture and heritage offer and use our wealth of outdoor spaces to widen its appeal to a more diverse audience, enabling communities in the City and beyond
8. Support our cultural organisations to build their capacity to engage with City businesses and employees, so that they can become more resilient
9. Play our part as a catalyst and convener in supporting and connecting with the wider cultural ecology of the capital and the rest of the UK
10. Develop clear leadership on culture: working in collaboration with cultural partners to develop our skills, align our objectives, develop performance measures, communicate our impact and build our capacity to be more than the sum of our parts

## **Vision**

Throughout history, the City of London has been a place where commerce and creativity have thrived side by side. As well as being one of the world's oldest and most important trading hubs the Square Mile has fostered over centuries the long-term growth of arts and crafts, learning, public entertainment, green spaces, marketplaces, fairs, and pageantry. Since the late twentieth century the City has become a world class centre for culture, with an extraordinary concentration of institutions like the Barbican, the Museum of London, the London Symphony Orchestra and the Guildhall School of Music and Drama, as well as a range of heritage assets, libraries, exciting outdoor events and cutting edge contemporary art programmes like Sculpture in the City. Investing over £100m every year, the City of London Corporation is the fourth largest funder of culture in the UK.

The City's support for culture is intrinsic to its strategy because of the core belief that the free exchange of commerce is intertwined with the free exchange of creative ideas. The City has always been a unique meeting place in the world for entrepreneurs, ideas and talent - the original co-working space. Our support for culture also reflects a strong belief in a richer kind of wealth, which includes people's wellbeing, quality of life and sense of place and community.

The City today has the most vibrant ecology of cultural organisations, creative businesses and practitioners anywhere in the UK. We may be a global city but our cultural organisations are also grounded in a strong sense of place and want to serve the diverse people of the city they inhabit.

Our definition of culture is broad and inclusive; it exists in both the buildings and heritage of our great institutions as well as our streets and the informal cultural spaces in between. It is for everyone, not just a narrow elite, and is a powerful driver of social mobility.

However, in recent years, the City's physical infrastructure and ways of working have not kept pace with our needs. Too often our cultural buildings have felt closed and hidden away. We have a rich and varied range of cultural assets and programmes, but we could do much more to promote them in the UK and abroad. We want to cultivate a deeper engagement with communities on our doorstep, enabling them to lead enriched lives and reach their full potential. Our cultural organisations are pioneers in research and experiment, but this is not visible in our streetscape. In short, we need to restate our role as a world capital of both commerce *and* culture.

At the start of the twenty-first century the City is also at a pivotal moment in its history. London is a global leader in finance, creative industries and technology. Despite politically uncertain times, there is a will to reach out to new trading partners and open up to more investment and talent. At home, the arrival of the Elizabeth Line (Crossrail) in 2018 will transform the City's connectivity with the South East and bring an entirely new population into the area. Culture will play an important part in these changes.

In light of these factors, there is a once in a generation opportunity to open up the City in radical new ways so that we can welcome more people, stimulate more creative interactions and in doing so, build a sustainable long-term future. We want to create a future for the arts, culture and heritage in the City because they are vital to developing our Society, Economy and Environments.

Between 2018-22, we will work with our cultural partners to transform the physical and social environment of the City and make it far more open, creative, resilient and entrepreneurial. We

intend to invest significantly in the urban fabric of the Square Mile to make it more inviting to visitors and reveal the special cultural and historic character of the area. We want to energise people of all ages, especially the young, and inspire them to engage with the learning opportunities all around them and perhaps pursue careers in the creative and tech sectors. We want to reflect the remarkable international quality of our businesses, people and cultural offer in our built environment. Above all, we want to champion excellence and innovation in all that we do.

All this requires purposeful leadership as well as working collaboratively. This strategy sets out the key objectives of our work, the values underpinning our approach, and the practical steps to realise them.

**Catherine McGuinness**

**Lord Mayor**

**We want to:**

Seize a once in a generation opportunity to reposition the City as a world capital for commerce *and* culture, harnessing the power of arts, heritage, learning and libraries to make the Square Mile far more open, creative, resilient and entrepreneurial. We will work collaboratively with cultural partners to drive social and economic change and contribute to a thriving city.

**The City has a unique combination of roles:**

- A major investor in an extraordinary cluster of diverse cultural organisations with considerable profile, reach and influence in London, the UK and abroad
- A convening power that brings together cultural partners in the City with other stakeholders to achieve personal, social and economic impact – being greater than the sum of our parts
- A landowner and planning body which can embed creativity into the urban fabric and act as a beacon of place-based regeneration
- A long-term custodian of heritage but also a facilitator of innovation, creative talent and new entrepreneurial ideas
- An independent voice speaking about the role of culture at regional, national and international levels

**Our values:**

- We believe in the power of innovation and creativity to generate wealth for people and communities in a long term, sustained way – commerce and culture are intertwined throughout the City's history.
- We expect the City and our cultural partners to be open, communicative, responsive and welcoming to a diverse range of people, businesses and visitors
- We are a global, flexible and cosmopolitan city yet have a strong sense of pride in our place, history, neighbourhoods and identity
- We value cultural learning and engagement as an essential part of the cultural experience, but also the transformative personal, social and economic impact this can have



- We recognise and embrace the diversity of London's culture and champion the excellence and innovation that this diversity brings
- We prioritise areas under our direct control but are mindful of our responsibility to work with others to support and connect with the wider needs of the capital and the UK
- We seek to be joined up, agile, experimental and generous in our approach as a catalyst and convener at the forefront of cultural, economic and social change

## **Our Strategic Objectives**

Between 2018-22 we want to...

1. Transform the City's public realm and physical infrastructure, making it a more open, distinct, welcoming and culturally vibrant destination
2. Develop Culture Mile in the north west of the City which will become an exciting destination for London and act as a catalyst for change across the rest of the Square Mile
3. Support cultural excellence in a range of fields and champion an ethos of innovation, creative risk taking and artistic citizenship
4. Support the delivery of the City of London's Education Strategy by nurturing an exemplary Cultural Education Partnership, Culture Mile Learning, and enable our world-leading institutions to cultivate the creativity, skills and knowledge of the next generation
5. Become a leading centre of the digital and creative economy and unlock the creative potential and resilience of individuals and businesses using our estate and resources
6. Promote our cultural, heritage and creative strengths in the UK and abroad
7. Better promote our world class culture and heritage offer and use our wealth of outdoor spaces to widen its appeal to a more diverse audience, enabling communities in the City and beyond
8. Support our cultural organisations to build their capacity to engage with City businesses and employees, so that they can become more resilient
9. Play our part as a catalyst and convener in supporting and connecting with the wider cultural ecology of the capital, the rest of the UK and globally
10. Develop clear leadership on culture: working with cultural partners to develop our skills, to align our objectives, develop performance measures, communicate our impact and build our capacity to be more than the sum of our parts

## **Strategic Objectives**

- 1. Transform the City's public realm and physical infrastructure to make it a more open, distinct, welcoming and culturally vibrant destination**

The City has long been recognised as the financial and business district of London and for over a century the physical infrastructure of the Square Mile has grown up to serve this primary function. However, there is a strong desire today to reposition the City as a centre for both commerce *and* culture, recognising that the area is also the historic centre of the capital and a vibrant cultural destination. There is a need to renew and reconfigure the public realm and make the City more open, welcoming, and conducive to all users' needs.

### Priority actions

- Major investment in public realm improvements across the Square Mile, including better wayfinding and improving physical infrastructure
- Strengthening the visibility of cultural organisations and sense of welcome
- Integrating digital and creative ideas into the urban fabric and creating more connected routes for visitors that reveal the cultural and heritage offer
- Continuing to invest in the City's broad range of cultural assets and partners, drawing on their expertise and entrusting them collectively to deliver world class programmes that keep the City at the forefront of cultural change
- Developing, enhancing and animating open and green spaces
- Emphasise the international character of the City's environment in order to attract businesses and serve their needs

## **2. Develop Culture Mile in the north-west of the City which will become an exciting cultural destination for London and act as a catalyst for change across the rest of the Square Mile**

The north-west area of the Square Mile contains an extraordinary cluster of diverse and collaborative cultural organisations. However, for decades the area has suffered from a particularly poor quality public realm and lack of wayfinding, especially by comparison to the neighbouring areas of St Paul's and Tower Bridge. The original design for the Barbican estate deliberately envisaged a separation between its residents and the street level; as a result, there is little outward sign of the rich culture and heritage of the area or sense of welcome. As other parts of London have developed or are developing distinct cultural identities (Southbank, South Kensington Quarter, and more recently, the Olympic Park and the Knowledge Quarter), this weak visibility is even more unsatisfactory. In 2013 the City decided to develop the idea of a new cultural hub (Culture Mile) to improve the quality of public spaces, create a distinct sense of identity and arrival, improve visitor experience, encourage more tourism, and facilitate new forms of collaboration between organisations. There is now a collective aspiration to enhance the cultural offer and invite more participation from visitors, residents and businesses. Whilst Culture Mile will be a distinct spatial area with unique licensing and planning conditions, it will act as a centre of energy, activating a similar cultural transformation for the entire Square Mile.

### Priority actions

- Reinforce the partnership of cultural, creative and corporate organisations within and outside Culture Mile, sharing resources and working together to create an 'internationally renowned, distinct, welcoming and vibrant centre for arts, heritage and learning'.
- Make cultural activity and heritage visible in the streetscape, lighting and environment, and ensure the public realm is designed to be conducive to shared programming by Culture Mile members.
- Develop a wider spatial masterplan for the area which recognises 'zones' for particular activities, e.g. an evening economy, protected residential areas.
- Progress unique licensing and planning agreements, to support the delivery of Culture Mile aspirations
- Plan for a new leisure/evening economy and engage with residents and businesses on their views

- Work with cultural partners to develop a world class food offer to enhance the visitor economy
- Learn from best UK and international practice and be inspired to experiment with new ideas and partners

### **3. Support cultural excellence in a range of fields and champion an ethos of innovation, creative risk-taking and artistic citizenship**

It is vital that our investment in culture recognises its intrinsic power and the transformative effect it has on audiences and participants. For our cultural organisations, the belief in risk-taking is core to their business and requires strong investment. We believe cultural excellence can take many diverse forms and this is reflected in the sheer range of cultural venues, activities and programmes we fund; cinema, theatre, music, visual arts, architecture, heritage, street art, libraries, learning and engagement, open spaces, outdoor events, and more. In order to achieve this, there is a need to engage and support the very best creative professionals including artists, educators, librarians, curators, programmers. In addition, there is a need to enable research, experimentation, international and national touring, and joint working to ensure the organisations we fund remain as cutting edge, internationally relevant and as creative as the City in which they are based.

#### Priority Actions

- Supporting our existing cultural organisations with sustained investment and resources, working closely to help them realise their ambitions
- Encouraging new partnerships and international touring to stimulate new thinking and create new income streams
- Facilitate joint working and new programming ideas to capitalise on the potential of Culture Mile and other opportunities in the public realm in the Square Mile

### **4. Support the delivery of the City of London's Education Strategy by nurturing an exemplary Cultural Education Partnership, Culture Mile Learning, and enable our world-leading institutions to cultivate the creativity, skills and knowledge of the next generation**

The City is a centre of world class culture with millions of people enjoying performances, events and opportunities every year. However equally important, it is the site of possibly the largest collection of cultural learning opportunities for people of all ages. Every day we are building the audiences, artists and creative professionals of the future. As a network, the City's cultural partners reach millions of people through school visits, large-scale off-site participatory events, learning resources, on-site classes and workshops, and world-class conservatoire education. Our School Visits Fund provides travel grants to enable schools in London to visit cultural organisations in the Square Mile. The Museum of London and Barbican-Guildhall Creative Learning have well-respected schools programmes, outreach events and concerts, the Guildhall School has the largest under-18s offer for specialist music training of any organisation in the UK, and the LSO has pioneered high quality music education in the ten east London boroughs, setting the standard for music hubs around the country. These organisations work with City academies and independent schools but also with schools in the surrounding boroughs, spreading their professional excellence and expertise. They also work with local socially disadvantaged residents, addressing issues of mental health, wellbeing, social cohesion

and lifelong learning. Our learning and engagement programmes bring together people from all walks of life and help support social mobility as well as engender a sense of community.

To strengthen the link between the City's Education Strategy and cultural organisations, a new Cultural Education Partnership known as Culture Mile Learning will be created. This will deliver against the Education Strategy and work to encourage deeper collaboration and develop shared programmes and digital resources for greater impact. As the pressure on cultural education in school grows, it will be even more important to engage with headteachers and provide simple and effective routes for support. It is also a priority to offer world-leading higher education and training to future performers, creative professionals, technicians, leaders and teachers, fulfilling their potential as creative citizens. All of this will help the City to achieve its ambition of enriching the lives of people from all walks of society.

#### Priority Actions

- Support initiatives that encourage London schools, especially in disadvantaged areas, to engage with the cultural life of the City; for instance, the Schools Visits Fund.
- Develop a single 'front door' for under-18s offering a mix of formal and informal high quality vocational training across creative skills and performing arts areas.
- Develop a series of innovative initiatives to be delivered as part of Culture Mile Learning, which develop the combined skills needed for 21<sup>st</sup> century success and position the Culture Mile as a learning destination
- Support Culture Mile Learning to develop a sustainable business model and their capacity to work intensively with other London boroughs to address social mobility
- Create a unified digital strategy that amplifies and enhances the world-class offer available to schools and families across the City's cultural organisations and programmes
- Develop the wider physical and digital infrastructure that will enable access to cultural experiences and progression of fusion skills
- Create a strengthened music and performing arts education programme to support London's Music Hubs and local Cultural Education Partnerships, in preparing the ground for the proposed Centre for Music's, Museum of London and wider Culture Mile Learning ambitions
- Develop fast-track programmes to develop new local leadership in City-supported cultural organisations
- Strengthen the role of music and the performing arts across the City of London academies and schools
- Make full use of the rich cluster of creative expertise in the City, particularly through higher education and the world leading training at the Guildhall School.

#### **5. Become a leading centre of the digital and creative economy and unlock the creative potential and resilience of individuals and businesses using our estate and resources**

The City is known for being home to one of the world's largest and most dynamic financial sectors. However, a significant majority of the area's businesses are small and medium enterprises and there is a growing presence of technology and creative start-ups. For centuries the Square Mile has thrived and remained resilient because of its mix of businesses. Increasingly many employers (and their employees) want to be situated in a stimulating and attractive environment, with convenient amenities but also the buzz of independent retailers and creative enterprises. However, there is a need to keep pace in order to maintain the area's appeal and accessibility. Many small start-ups

need affordable space to grow and incubate. The cost of operating in London means that maintaining this diverse base is increasingly difficult to achieve and there is a need for the City to manage and 'curate' its own estate in order to support a variety of business types. This can enhance the vibrancy of the area, grow the creative and digital economy and unlock greater value in the longer term.

#### Priority Actions

- Identify underutilised parts of the estate – especially in the Barbican area - for creative and independent use, as part of a 'curated' strategy; making the City more vibrant but also addressing affordability for creative organisations in central London
- Develop a City-led programme of support for emerging creative entrepreneurs which includes access to financial expertise and business advice in the Square Mile
- Integrate the local digital economy into the broader Culture Mile offer

### **6. Promote our cultural, heritage and creative strengths in the UK and abroad**

In 2016 London was rated number one in the Global Power Index for the fifth consecutive time, driven partly by its cultural offer. Increasingly cities and regions are aware of the 'soft power' of culture and heritage and harness it to attract tourists, workers and businesses. Whilst London overall has a recognised strength in this area, the Square Mile could work harder to promote its particular character and assets through press activity and profile-raising events. There is also potential to join up more effectively on international engagement, foreign tours and foreign delegation visits which could be coordinated with the Lord Mayor's Office and other external organisations like London and Partners. In the UK, the City could do more to demonstrate its support for cultural activity across the UK, for instance, developing regional partnerships and reach through Guildhall School Young Artists, which includes the Centre for Young Musicians, Junior Guildhall and Barbican Guildhall Creative Learning programmes.

#### Priority Actions

- Develop a more coordinated international promotions plan which includes culture and joins up on the key messages
- Work proactively with London and Partners, the Mayor of London's promotional agency, and other organisations such as Arts Council England, DCMS (Department of Digital, Culture, Media and Sport) and the British Council to promote the City's cultural offer abroad

### **7. Better promote our world class culture and heritage offer and use our wealth of outdoor spaces to widen its appeal to a more diverse audience, enabling communities in the City and beyond**

The success of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games showed how powerful culture could be in promoting the City. The stunning events held in key London landmarks generated significant news coverage and positive feedback. The City has always been home to major public events and shows, for instance the Lord Mayor's Show but in recent years it has also sponsored a number of one-off 'cultural spectacles' to commemorate key events or anniversaries; for instance, commissioning one of the UK's most well-regarded arts producers, Artichoke, to create an event on the Thames to

mark the 350<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Great Fire of London. Such events can be an effective way to both capture the attention of the international media, but also engage diverse audiences and act like a 'communal campfire', bringing Londoners' together around a shared moment. Similarly, City workers, visitors and residents are positive about street animation, temporary art installations and outdoor programming on a more regular basis; for instance, lunchtime events in the public squares and parks and outdoor music performances. The City is developing a new outdoor programme to address this ambition. The Sculpture in the City programme has engaged millions of people in high quality art who might not ordinarily visit an art gallery, and it grows bigger each year through partnerships with local businesses and galleries. Culture Mile can also be a focal point for more ambitious outdoor programming which also acts like a 'shop window' for the cultural organisations in the area and attracts new audiences. Crucially, any investment in programming needs a strong marketing and communication strategy to ensure more people are aware of the offer.

#### Priority Actions

- As part of the Visitor Strategy, develop a City-wide marketing and communications strategy to drive visitors', learners' and residents' awareness of the cultural offer, specifically anticipating the increase in visitors with the Elizabeth Line in 2018 and working to engage the existing working population
- Create a commissioning fund to support one-off 'major spectacles' as well as a new outdoor cultural programme to animate the streets and create a vibrant weekend, early evening and lunchtime environment
- Ensure cross-City departmental support for cultural activity in public spaces (e.g. planning, licensing, policing, etc.)
- Support our cultural organisations, to appeal to a wider audience base through outreach and learning initiatives and working outdoors
- Support outdoor programmes to grow and actively encourage sponsorship and participation from neighbouring commercial partners
- Provide opportunities for our communities to engage with and inform cultural output – engendering a strong sense of ownership, pride of place and widening participation

#### **8. Support our cultural organisations to build their capacity to engage with City businesses and employees, so that they can become more resilient**

The City has a strong relationship with its many businesses but could do even more to engage them with the cultural dimensions of its work. In the future, the City could play a stronger convening role, bringing together businesses and cultural organisations around shared interests and ideas. Ultimately, it is for the cultural organisations to raise their own funds, but a collaborative approach could yield effective results. Culture Mile will also generate a large number of joint projects and promotional opportunities which could create new income generation models across sectors. A strategic, collaborative approach could unlock value for culture and catalyse sustainable long-term business models in partnership with the private sector.

#### Priority Actions

- Use our convening power to encourage more networking and collaboration between cultural organisations and businesses
- Create more marketing and promotion opportunities within the City estate and marketing channels to maximise value and achieve shared objectives across cultural and corporate sectors



- Work with cultural organisations to develop new and innovative models of income generation and sustainable corporate partnerships

**9. Play our part as a catalyst and convener in supporting and connecting with the wider cultural ecology of the capital, the rest of the UK and globally.**

The City of London has long supported cultural sites in London beyond the Square Mile, such as the green spaces of Hampstead Heath or heritage landmarks like Tower Bridge and Keats' House. As the funding climate becomes more challenging, this responsibility for the wider region will become even more important. The City's focus will be strategic initiatives which will enhance London as a whole and bolster the City's own cultural offer. For example, the City has been an early sponsor of two schemes led by the Mayor of London; the Illuminated River project to light the central London bridges with an environmentally sustainable artist-led scheme, and the London Borough of Culture competition which will choose its first winner in 2018. Both projects will enhance the capital's attraction to visitors and also benefit Londoners. The City also supports music education in cities and towns throughout the UK through funding for the Guildhall School Young Artists programme (Centre for Young Musicians, Junior Guildhall, Creative Learning), allowing them to extend their unique expertise.

Priority Actions

- Support selected strategic initiatives for London which increase tourism and provide benefits for Londoners, connecting with other relevant cultural destinations such as Knowledge Quarter, North Bank, South Bank
- Engage with local, national and international stakeholders such as the Mayor of London's Office, the Arts Council and DCMS on existing support and opportunities for potential future collaboration

**10. Develop clear leadership on culture: working with cultural partners to develop our skills, align our objectives, develop performance measures, communicate our impact and build our capacity to be more than the sum of our parts**

Whilst the City has the smallest geographical area of any local government unit, it is by far the largest investor in culture. As a key funder, the Corporation plays a key role in the governance and strategic direction of the numerous cultural organisations in the area. This situation means that the Square Mile has the potential to be the most collaborative and strategically coherent network of cultural organisations in the country. It can be a powerful voice in London, the UK and the world.

To be effective in its implementation, however, the cultural strategy will need clear leadership and direction. The responsibility for culture currently sits in the Town Clerk's department and a senior official from either within the Corporation itself or one of the cultural partners will be nominated to lead on the strategy. This nominee will be tasked with monitoring the strategy objectives, but also speaking to external stakeholders and developing partnerships. Whilst it is important to respect the individual autonomy of organisations and recognise their distinct characteristics and priorities, there is also much to be gained from a more collaborative approach based on a set of strategic objectives that can be measured and communicated widely.

The cultural success of the City can only be as good as the people within it – developing their capacity and leadership skills is also a priority.

#### Priority Actions

- Nominate a senior official from within the Corporation or a cultural organisation to lead on the implementation of the cultural strategy
- Communicate our leadership more clearly to others - publicise the key people working on different aspects of the strategy, and ensure all external and internal stakeholders are aware
- Produce a short annual cultural summary for internal and external stakeholders to publicise activity and achievements
- Build a reputation as a key London partner for developing leading cultural programmes and initiatives, attending events and holding regular stakeholder meetings
- Address the skills and training requirements of our cultural leaders in order to ensure they can realise the ambitions of the Cultural Strategy

**This strategy complements a number of existing and emerging corporate strategies across the City of London Corporation including:**

Corporate Plan – 2018-2023

Visitor Strategy – 2018-2022

The Local Plan

Open Spaces Strategy 2015

Cultural Hub Brand & Identity Strategy

Cultural Hub Property Strategy

Culture Mile Look and Feel Strategy



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 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