



Policy and Resources Committee

Date: THURSDAY, 19 MARCH 2020

Time: 1.45 pm

Venue: COMMITTEE ROOMS, 2ND FLOOR, WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members:

Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chair)	Alderman Vincent Keaveny
Simon Duckworth (Deputy Chairman)	Alderman Ian Luder
Sheriff Christopher Hayward (Vice-Chair)	Jeremy Mayhew
Deputy Tom Sleigh (Vice-Chair)	Andrew McMurtrie
Randall Anderson (Ex-Officio Member)	Wendy Mead
Douglas Barrow (Ex-Officio Member)	Deputy Alastair Moss (Ex-Officio Member)
Nicholas Bensted-Smith (Ex-Officio Member)	Deputy Joyce Nash
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Graham Packham (Ex-Officio Member)
Tijs Broeke	The Rt Hon.the Lord Mayor,Alderman William Russell (Ex-Officio Member)
Karina Dostalova	Alderman Baroness Scotland (Ex-Officio Member)
Anne Fairweather	Deputy Dr Giles Shilson
Marianne Fredericks	Jeremy Simons (Ex-Officio Member)
Alderman Timothy Hailes	Sir Michael Snyder
Deputy Tom Hoffman (Chief Commo-ner) (Ex-Officio Member)	Mark Wheatley
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark	Deputy Philip Woodhouse
Shravan Joshi	Alderman Sir David Wootton
Deputy Edward Lord	

Enquiries: Gregory Moore
tel. no.: 020 7332 1399
gregory.moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk

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

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

Part 1 - Public Agenda

1. **APOLOGIES**

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

3. **MINUTES**

To consider minutes as follows:-

- a) To agree the public minutes of the Policy and Resources meeting held on 20 February 2020.

For Decision

(Pages 1 - 10)

- b) To note the draft public minutes of the Members' Privileges Sub-Committee meeting held on 18 February 2020 and consider the recommendation set out under item 4 therein.

For Decision

(Pages 11 - 16)

- c) To note the public minutes of the Public Relations and Economic Development Sub-Committee meeting held on 19 February 2020.

For Information

(Pages 17 - 22)

- d) To note the draft public minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 24 February 2020.

For Information

(Pages 23 - 30)

4. **COVID-19**

The Town Clerk to be heard.

For Discussion

5. **RESOLUTION OF THE MARKETS COMMITTEE**

To consider a resolution of the Markets Committee, concerning the Markets Consolidation Programme Working Party.

For Decision

(Pages 31 - 32)

6. **COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE AND COMPOSITIONS**

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Decision

(Pages 33 - 44)

7. **ANTI-TERRORISM TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER**

Report of the Director of the Built Environment.

For Decision

(Pages 45 - 52)

8. **CITY OF LONDON COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY NEIGHBOURHOOD FUND COMMENCEMENT**
Joint report of the Director of the Built Environment and the Chief Grants Officer & Director of The City Bridge Trust.
For Information
(Pages 53 - 56)
9. **LONDON MESSAGING RESEARCH**
Report of the Director of Communications.
For Decision
(Pages 57 - 60)
10. **CITY OF LONDON ACADEMIES TRUST - EXPANSION BY THE TRANSFER OF THE TWO CO-SPONSORED ACADEMY TRUSTS**
Report of the Director of Community & Children's Services.
N.B. To be considered in conjunction with the non-public appendices at Item 19.
For Decision
(Pages 61 - 68)
11. **SUMMER ENRICHMENT PILOT 2019 EVALUATION**
Report of the Director of Community & Children's Services.
For Information
(Pages 69 - 92)
12. **CORPORATE SPONSORSHIP GUIDANCE ON FOOD AND DRINK**
Report of the Director of Community & Children's Services.
For Information
(Pages 93 - 100)
13. **CAPITAL FUNDING UPDATE**
Report of the Chamberlain.
For Decision
(Pages 101 - 110)
14. **POLICY INITIATIVES FUND AND COMMITTEE CONTINGENCY**
Report of the Chamberlain.
For Decision
(Pages 111 - 134)
15. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
16. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
17. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**
MOTION - That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda

18. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

To consider non-public minutes of meetings as follows:-

- a) To agree the non-public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 20 February 2020.

For Decision
(Pages 135 - 142)

- b) To note the draft non-public minutes of the Public Relations and Economic Development Sub-Committee meeting held on 19 February 2020.

For Information
(Pages 143 - 144)

- c) To note the draft non-public minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 24 February 2020.

For Information
(Pages 145 - 150)

19. **COLAT EXPANSION: NON-PUBLIC APPENDICES**

Non-public appendices to be considered in conjunction with Item 10.

For Information
(Pages 151 - 172)

20. **SUPPORT FOR A NEW GREEN FINANCE INDEX**

Joint report of the Chamberlain and the Director of Innovation & Growth.

For Decision
(Pages 173 - 178)

21. **CHARITIES RATIONALISATION**

Report of the Comptroller & City Solicitor.

For Decision
(Pages 179 - 184)

22. **CYCLICAL WORKS PROGRAMME (CWP) AND ADDITIONAL RESOURCES FOR CITY FUND PROPERTIES (ARCFP) REQUEST FOR FUNDING FOR 2020/2021**

Report of the Chamberlain.

For Decision
(Pages 185 - 200)

23. **DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY OR URGENCY POWERS**

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information
(Pages 201 - 202)

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

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

Part 3 - Confidential Agenda

26. **CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES**

To note the confidential minutes from the informal meeting of Members of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee held on 5 March 2020.

For Information

27. **FUNDAMENTAL REVIEW**
Report of the Town Clerk (TO FOLLOW).

For Decision

This page is intentionally left blank

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Thursday, 20 February 2020

Minutes of the meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee held at Committee Rooms, 2nd Floor, West Wing, Guildhall on Thursday, 20 February 2020 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chair)
Simon Duckworth (Deputy Chairman)
Sheriff Christopher Hayward (Vice-Chair)
Deputy Tom Sleigh (Vice-Chair)
Randall Anderson (Ex-Officio Member)
Douglas Barrow (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Keith Bottomley
Tijs Broeke
Anne Fairweather
Marianne Fredericks
Alderman Timothy Hailes
Deputy Tom Hoffman (Chief Commoner) (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Deputy Edward Lord
Alderman Vincent Keaveny
Alderman Ian Luder
Jeremy Mayhew
Andrew McMurtrie
Wendy Mead
Deputy Alastair Moss (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Joyce Nash
Graham Packham (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Dr Giles Shilson
Jeremy Simons (Ex-Officio Member)
Sir Michael Snyder
Mark Wheatley
Deputy Philip Woodhouse

In attendance:

John Chapman

Officers:

Peter Lisley	- Assistant Town Clerk & Director of Major Projects
Angela Roach	- Assistant Town Clerk & Director of Member Services
Emma Cunningham	- Town Clerk's Department
Greg Moore	- Town Clerk's Department
Kate Smith	- Town Clerk's Department
Peter Kane	- Chamberlain
Caroline Al-Beyerty	- Deputy Chamberlain
Paul Double	- City Remembrancer

Carolyn Dwyer	- Director, Built Environment
Bob Roberts	- Director of Communications
Sir Nick Kenyon	- Managing Director, Barbican Centre
Giles French	- Department of Innovation & Growth
Eugenie de Naurois	- Communications Team
Paul Chadha	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Chris Pelham	- Department of Community and Children's Services
Peter Young	- City Surveyor's Department

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Nicholas Bensted-Smith, Karina Dostalova, Shravan Joshi, The Rt Hon The Lord Mayor Alderman William Russell, and Alderman Sir David Wootton.

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

Alderman Tim Hailes and Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark declared an interest in Item 25 as Churchwardens at St Lawrence Jewry. Simon Duckworth declared a similar interest as a Member of the Guild Church Council.

Alderman Hailes also declared an interest in Item 20 as Vice Chairman of Governors, King Edwards School Witley.

3. **MINUTES**

- a) The public minutes of the Policy & Resources Committee meeting held on 23 January 2020 were approved.
- b) The draft public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 23 January 2020 were noted.
- c) The draft public minutes of the Joint Resource Allocation Sub-Committee and Efficiency & Performance Sub-Committee meeting held on 23 January 2020 were noted.
- d) The public minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 27 January 2020 were noted.

4. **COMMON COUNCIL ELECTIONS IN MARCH 2021**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk concerning activities to be undertaken in advance of the March 2021 elections relating to encouraging voter registration and a diverse range of candidates standing for election.

During discussion, the following points were made:

- The importance of working with businesses to help them understand voter allocation arrangements was emphasised, with it urged that consideration be given as to ways in which to share guidance and best practice more effectively.

- It was also urged that thought be given to ways in which voters could be issued a reminder immediately prior to, or on the day of, the election, so as to facilitate greater turnout.
- Activity should also be undertaken to clarify that business voters were eligible to vote both in City elections and their own local elections, as this was often a point of confusion which affected turnout levels.
- It was observed that it would be helpful to receive a report some six months after the election, assessing the success of the various initiatives being undertaken and outlining lessons learned for future campaigns.
- In relation to the current allocation of Members across Wards, there was significant debate in relation to representation and voter figures at the present time as opposed to potential voter numbers. The intentions of the most recent Ward Boundary Review were noted, together with a number of specific instances of businesses who were eligible to register large numbers of voters but had not yet done so. The Chair observed that any consideration in respect of this matter would need detailed exploration and careful thought, suggesting that this item would best be discussed with the Town Clerk and Elections Office outside of the meeting in the first instance.

RESOLVED: That Members:-

1. Agree the proposed promotional activities as set out in paragraph 8 of this report in relation to increasing registration numbers.
 2. Agree a budget of up to £72,000 be met from the Committee's contingency for 2020/21 and charged to City Fund to undertake these various activities.
 3. Agree a further budget of up to £55,000 be met from the Committee's contingency for 2020/21 and charged to City's Cash to fund an advertising campaign to encourage as diverse a range of candidates as possible to stand for elections (up to £45,000) and host an early evening reception during Inclusion Week (28th September – 4th October 2020) (up to £10,000).
 4. Note that a progress report on the activities outlined in this report be submitted to the Committee's meeting in November 2020.
5. **MARKETS CONSOLIDATION PROGRAMME GOVERNANCE: WORKING PARTY CREATION**

The Committee considered a joint report of the Town Clerk and the City Surveyor proposing the creation of a Working Party to provide more focussed strategic direction and oversight to the Markets Consolidation Programme.

The Deputy Chairman of the Markets Committee, who was in attendance at the meeting, asked if consideration might be given to altering the composition of the Working Party such that both the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Markets Committee were Members. After discussion, the Committee was minded that this would not be appropriate, but agreed that it might be appropriate for the Deputy Chairman to attend on those occasions where the Chairman was not able to.

RESOLVED: That Members:-

1. Approve the creation of a Markets Consolidation Working Party, with terms of reference and composition as set out at Appendix A.
2. Note that a report will be submitted in October 2020 recommending the submission of the private bill and budget, which will address how the governance of the programme should continue once the private bill has been submitted.

6. **BARBICAN CENTRE BOARD GOVERNANCE**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk concerning a proposed amendment to the constitution and terms of reference of the Barbican Centre Board.

RESOLVED: That approval be granted to amendment to the Barbican Centre Board's Constitution and Terms of Reference, waiving the nine-year maximum service rule on a temporary basis in respect of Deputy Shilson, to allow for the possibility of the incumbent Chairman to extend his term on the Board for one additional year.

7. **MUSEUM OF LONDON GOVERNOR APPOINTMENT**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk which proposed the reappointment of the Rt Hon the Lord Paul Boateng for a further term as a City of London Corporation Governor of London.

RESOLVED: That approval be granted to the reappointment of the Rt Hon the Lord Paul Boateng to the Board of Governors of the Museum of London for a 14-month term expiring 31 March 2021.

8. **SPORT & PHYSICAL ACTIVITY STRATEGY**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk presenting a draft Sport & Physical Activity Strategy for 2020-25.

Several Members raised concerns in relation to oversight, with it suggested that a Working Party should be established to provide more focussed strategic direction. It was also suggested that there was insufficient clarity in relation to the structures and processes for taking the strategy forward. Following discussion, on balance, the Committee took the view that it would not be appropriate to establish a Working Party at this point in time, with it argued that it would be prudent to wait for the governance review to establish appropriate structures for sport governance moving forwards.

It was also observed that it would be beneficial for some sort of measurement mechanism to be associated the various success measures set out in the strategy, so as to allow progress and performance to be measured.

RESOLVED: That Members:-

1. Approve that the draft strategy set out in the report be used for the purposes of setting out the ambition of the City of London Corporation in relation to Sport & Physical Activity.
2. Agree to commission the Town Clerk to produce a brief and set out costs (expected to be c. £60,000) for a specialist, independent audit and assessment of the existing sport and physical activity provision at all types of open spaces and facilities under the stewardship of the City Corporation, to include an independent assessment of the quality of supply, their condition and expected future (5-10 year) demand for facilities.
3. Agree to commission the Town Clerk to oversee stakeholder research, expected to consist of surveys and focus groups, into stakeholder (including user) views in relation to the assets and activities we currently provide (except for those provided by schools for students, which are assessed and funded separately).
4. Agree to commission the Town Clerk to produce a brief and set out costs (estimated at around £50,000) for a review of the current, future and potential commercial value of our assets, including the scope for generating income that could be used to fund our ambitions.

9. **DRAFT PAY POLICY STATEMENT**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Human Resources presenting the draft Pay Policy Statement for 2020/21.

RESOLVED: That the Pay Policy Statement for 2020/21 be approved for submission to the Court of Common Council.

10. **HEART OF THE CITY**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Innovation & Growth regarding funding for Heart of the City.

The Vice Chairman advised that he had recently met with representatives of Heart of the City who had articulated their future plans in respect with closer engagement with Members and at the Ward level, which was welcome. The support for and engagement with Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) was also noted as being of high value to the City, with it suggested that this could be articulated better in future.

Members discussed the appropriate level of grant in the context of the debate at January's meeting and the desire to avoid funding dependence, as well as an assessment of Heart of the City's level of reserves and use of unrestricted funds. Following discussion, it was felt that Option 1, i.e. a figure of £202,000, would be the most appropriate sum, albeit with the proviso that it was made clear that Heart of the City would need to demonstrate what they would be doing to increase funding from other sources in the coming period.

RESOLVED: That Members:-

1. Agree one-year's funding for 2020/21 as outlined in the report at option one, totalling £202,000, to be met from City's Cash.

2. Note that a review will be undertaken in 2020 to assess the value and return on investment that Heart of the City generates.
11. **CENTRAL LONDON FORWARD JOINT VENTURE AGREEMENT**
The Committee considered a report of the Director of Innovation & Growth concerning the City Corporation's involvement with Central London Forward (CLF).
- RESOLVED: That the proposed CLF Joint Venture Agreement, as set out at Appendix 1, be approved alongside a contribution of £40,000 per annum for the four-year period, 2020 to 2024, to be met from the Innovation and Growth budget.
12. **SUPPORT FOR FUTURE.NOW**
The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk concerning support for the *future.now* initiative.
- Members took the opportunity to note the importance of ensuring that Mayoral initiatives were aligned with corporate priorities and adopting a more strategic approach moving forwards.
- RESOLVED: That an allocation of £17,000 be approved from the Committee's 2020/21 Policy Initiatives Fund, to cover the costs of four events outlined in the report associated with the *future.now* initiative.
13. **TOKYO 2020 GAMES**
The Committee considered a report of the Director of Communications concerning proposed engagement in respect of the upcoming Olympic and Paralympic Games in Tokyo.
- RESOLVED: That an allocation of £40,000 be agreed, to be met from the 2020/21 Policy Initiatives Fund, to cover costs of the City Corporation's engagement around the Tokyo 2020 Olympic and Paralympic Games.
14. **POLICY INITIATIVES FUND AND COMMITTEE CONTINGENCY**
The Committee received a report of the Chamberlain relative to the Policy Initiatives Fund, Committee Contingency Fund, Brexit Contingency Fund and the Committee's Projects Reserve.
- RESOLVED: That the report be received and its contents noted.
15. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
- Section 618 of the Housing Act 1985**
A Member made reference to a resolution passed at the November 2019 meeting of the Committee, which had asked that the Remembrancer explore the potential repeal of section 618 of the Housing Act 1985 and report back to the Committee for a decision in relation to next steps. The Member asked that this report be brought to Committee as soon as was practicable.

Green Investment Index

The Vice Chair made reference to an approach from the FTSE Russell Group, who had invited the City Corporation to sponsor and invest in a new Green Investment Index, asking if a report could be brought to the next meeting exploring this issue.

Responding, the Chair agreed that such a report would be extremely welcome and advised that she had asked officers in Innovation & Growth and Chamberlain's to collaborate on a report setting out options and proposals.

16. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

Coronavirus – Gresham Lecture

It was advised that the Chief Medical Officer, Professor Chris Whitty, had offered to provide a lecture on coronavirus through Gresham College. Professor Whitty was one of the Gresham College Professors and an expert in epidemiology.

It had been suggested that Guildhall be offered to host the lecture on 27 April and Members expressed support for this initiative.

China events – Coronavirus

The Committee was also advised that the City Corporation had been approached by the China Chamber of Commerce to host an event in the Old Library as a gesture of solidarity with the Chinese people affected by coronavirus.

17. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

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

18. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

- a) The non-public minutes of the Policy & Resources Committee meeting held on 23 January 2019 were approved.
- b) The draft non-public minutes of Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 23 January 2020 were noted.
- c) The draft non-public minutes of the Joint Resource Allocation Sub-Committee and Efficiency & Performance Sub-Committee meeting held on 23 January 2020 were noted.
- d) The non-public minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 27 January 2020 were noted.

- e) The non-public minutes of the Hospitality Working Party meeting held on 28 January 2020 were noted.
19. **CENTRE FOR MUSIC AND LONDON WALL SITE MASTERPLANNING**
The Committee considered and approved a joint report of the Director of Major Projects, the City Surveyor, and the Managing Director of the Barbican Centre which provided an update on the masterplanning of the current Museum of London site at 140 – 150 London Wall.
20. **TOMLINSON REVIEW**
The Committee received the latest findings in respect of the ongoing Tomlinson Review into the City's education provision.
21. **(A) BRIDGE HOUSE ESTATES: RESERVES POLICY AND ALLOCATION OF FUNDING FOR 'BRIDGING DIVIDES' ACTIVITIES**
The Committee received a report of the Chamberlain which served to introduce the two subsequent items on the agenda, relating to recommendations concerning the Bridge House Estates (BHE) arising from the current BHE Strategic Governance Review.
21. **(B) BRIDGE HOUSE ESTATES: RESERVES POLICY**
The Committee received a report of the Chamberlain concerning the reserves policy for Bridge House Estates.
21. **(C) BRIDGE HOUSE ESTATES: ALLOCATION OF FUNDING FOR 'BRIDGING DIVIDES'**
The Committee considered and approved a report of the Chamberlain concerning the allocation of funding for Bridging Divides.
22. **CITY OF LONDON SCHOOL - MASTERPLAN LOAN APPLICATION**
The Committee considered and approved a report of the Headmaster of the City of London School concerning funding arrangements for phases 1 to 4 of the School's Masterplan.
23. **CITY'S WHOLESALE MARKETS - INTERIM MAINTENANCE STRATEGY, EXISTING SITES LEASING STRATEGY, FUTURE LEASING STRATEGY AND RELOCATION PRINCIPLES**
The Committee considered and approved a joint report of the Director of Markets & Consumer Protection and the City Surveyor concerning the maintenance and leasing strategies associated with the Markets Consolidation Programme.
24. **MARKETS CONSOLIDATION PROGRAMME: FOOD SCHOOL**
The Committee considered and approved a joint report of the Director of Markets & Consumer Protection and the City Surveyor concerning proposals relating to a Food School associated with the Markets Consolidation Programme.

25. **ST LAWRENCE JEWRY: MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING**
The Committee considered and approved a report of the City Surveyor concerning a Memorandum of Understanding in relation to St Lawrence Jewry.
26. **20/21 ALDERMANBURY**
The Committee received a report of the City Surveyor concerning 20/21 Aldermanbury.
27. **DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY OR URGENCY POWERS**
The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk which set out action taken under urgency procedures since the last meeting.
28. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
There were no questions.
29. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED.**
There were two urgent items, one concerning a Memorandum of Understanding with a third party and one concerning a financial matter.
30. **CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES**
The confidential minutes of the meeting held on 23 January 2020 were approved.

The meeting ended at 3.30 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Gregory Moore
tel. no.: 020 7332 1399
gregory.moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

MEMBERS PRIVILEGES SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 18 February 2020

Minutes of the meeting of the Members Privileges Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee held at Committee Rooms, 2nd Floor, West Wing, Guildhall on Tuesday, 18 February 2020 at 10.00 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Tom Hoffman (Chief Commoner) (Chairman)
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Deputy Edward Lord
Deputy Catherine McGuinness
Jeremy Simons
Tom Sleigh

Officers:

Dorian Price	- Assistant Director, Guildhall Manager
Peter Ochser	- Guildhall Complex Buildings and Hospitality Manager
Chris Rumbles, Clerk	- Town Clerk's Department

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Christopher Hayward, Ann Holmes, Richard Regan and Brian Mooney.

2. DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS OF PERSONAL OR PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS IN RESPECT OF ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED AT THIS MEETING

A Member questioned whether it would be appropriate for the Chief Commoner to remain in the Chair for item 3 given it related to the Chief Commoner's flat. Following discussion, it was agreed that any proposed changes would be for the benefit of the incoming Chief Commoner and that, as such, it would be appropriate for the Chief Commoner to remain in the Chair for this item.

3. MINUTES

The public minutes of the meeting on 3 June 2019 were approved as an accurate record.

4. ANNUAL REFURBISHMENT AND REPLENISHMENT OF CHIEF COMMONER'S FLAT

The Sub-committee considered a report of the City Surveyor setting out the scope, frequency, specifications and renewal of items to be considered as part of an annual refurbishment of the Chief Commoner's flat.

The Guildhall Complex Buildings and Hospitality Manager explained the intention being to establish a framework and budget position in relation to refurbishment of both the Chief Commoner's and Chair of Policy's flats. The framework would provide a structure for purchasing items and allow for these to be bought at the right time and to an appropriate standard.

A Member, also Chairman of Corporate Asset Sub-committee, explained how the Cyclical Works Programme addressed maintenance issues on a priority basis and against a framework of agreed criteria. Concern was raised regarding certain elements in the Chief Commoner's Flat e.g. sofa being renewed after only one year of use.

Members agreed that, unless there were exceptional circumstances, all items should be included within the Cyclical Works Programme and replaced on a priority basis against approved criteria. A Member, also Chair of Policy and Resources Committee, suggested refurbishment of the Chair's flat could be undertaken in line with the term of office for this post.

It was accepted that both flats would benefit from an annual light refresh of circa £1k and it was agreed these works could be undertaken through provision in the City Surveyor's local risk budget.

RESOLVED, that it be recommended to the Policy and Resources Committee that refurbishment and renewal of items in the Chief Commoner's and Chair of Policy's flats form part of the Cyclical Works Programme going forward and; that an annual light touch refresh take place to a value of circa £1k and with this being funded through the City Surveyor's local risk budget.

5. PROVISION OF ACCOMMODATION FOR CHAIRMEN AND DEPUTY CHAIRMEN

The Sub-committee considered a report of the Town Clerk regarding provision of dedicated office space within Guildhall for the position of Chairman of Finance and seeking views on how provision of accommodation was working more widely.

Members agreed that it was not the right time to begin looking at provision of dedicated office space for Chairmen given the City Corporation was in the midst of a Governance Review and the future committee structure was unknown at this time. It was proposed awaiting the outcome of the Governance Review to understand the future committee structure and taking a holistic view at this point of any Chairmen that would benefit from dedicated office space.

RESOLVED, that any review of dedicated office space for Chairmen be delayed until the conclusion of the Governance Review.

6. MEMBER ACCOMMODATION

The Sub-committee considered a report of the Town Clerk seeking views on whether to extend the approved list of users of the Member accommodation to include additional City of London Police colleagues in support of them during

their operational duties. The Town Clerk explained that a Member had proposed the Sub-committee consider this issue.

A Member referred to their regular use of the Member accommodation and suggested it was very rare to find a situation where accommodation was not available, noting that Members were always given priority to the bedrooms. It was suggested that the statistics on use of the bedrooms were surprising; it was thought a key period of usage was Monday-Thursday and that this period would show a much higher usage rate.

A Member referred to the City of London Police having previously had a fully equipped section house at Bernard Morgan House and having declared this surplus to requirements as part of the Police Accommodation Strategy. As such, it was not thought necessary to extend usage of the Member accommodation to additional City of London Police staff.

It was suggested that guidance on use of the bedrooms along with remuneration and other benefits for Members be looked as part of the governance review.

A Member referred to the list of those entitled to use the bedrooms and suggested this needed reviewing given the optic of the City Corporation providing subsidised accommodation. The Member suggested that Masters of Livery Companies, Clerks of Livery Companies and Immediate Past Masters of Livery Companies be removed from the list of preferred users, but Members agreed that statistics on these types of bookings should be sourced and considered before any decision was taken. It was agreed that this information would be circulated before the next meeting.

A Member, also Chair of Policy and Resources Committee, suggested a hotel style card system could be introduced for the bedrooms requesting a change of sheets in the bedrooms rather than changing these on a daily basis.

RESOLVED, that City of London Police usage of the Member Accommodation would continue under the current arrangement and; that a breakdown on other users of the accommodation would be provided to the Sub-committee.

7. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

There were no questions

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There were no additional items of business.

9. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED – That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Item No.	Paragraph No.
10-12	3

10. MINUTES

The non-public minutes of the meeting on 3 June 2019 were approved as an accurate record.

Matters arising

Representatives at City Events

A Member referred to guest lists for events and information on guests being circulated to Members in advance of each event and it was agreed that a resolution would be passed to Hospitality Working Party requesting this be arranged.

The Town Clerk referred to oversight of City Hospitality being the responsibility of the Hospitality Working Party and confirmed a report was being prepared for the next meeting setting out the current arrangements and presenting options going forward.

Members were in agreement that it would be good to review the guidance for Committee dinners to see if this needed adapting in any way.

A Member, also Chair of Policy and Resources Committee, suggested this was an issue that could be raised as part of her regular informal meetings with Chairmen.

11. NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

There were no non-public questions.

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

Aldermanic Meetings

A Member noted from the recent Informal Court of Common Council meeting that minutes relating to Aldermanic meetings were not generally available to Members and it was proposed this Committee formally ask for sight of these.

A Member, also Chair of Policy and Resources Committee, acknowledged the Aldermanic meetings were technically different to other City Corporation committees and it was proposed asking for sight of the minutes rather than putting in a formal request from this Sub-committee.

Dogs in the workplace

A Member referred to organisations in the City allowing dogs to be brought into the workplace. It was highlighted that a significant number of Members were dog owners and it was questioned whether some form of provision of an on-site

facility could be arranged by the City Corporation to allow for dogs to be brought onto the premises.

A Member, also Chairman of Establishment Committee, acknowledged that this issue would impact staff as well as Members, and agreed that a report be produced looking at best practice in the marketplace and highlighting issues of bringing pets into the workplace.

Private telephone calls

A Member, also Chair of Policy and Resources Committee, referred to the number of staff seen in corridors making private telephone calls. It was questioned whether PODs could be located on the premises to allow staff a private space to make these calls. A Member, also Chair of Establishment Committee, acknowledged the issue and suggested this would be looked at as part of the ongoing work looking at agile working.

Arrangements at Committee Dinners

The Chairman referred to an issue that had been raised regarding arrangements for Committee dinners and whether these should be in honour of retiring Chairmen.

The Town Clerk reminded Members of this Sub-committee's terms of reference, with it having responsibility for Members' privileges other than those relating to City Hospitality which was dealt with by Hospitality Working Party. Members noted that a report was being prepared for Hospitality Working Party to consider current arrangements and also looking at options for committee dinners going forward.

It was questioned whether committee dinners were intended to be in honour of individuals or whether they were about the work of the Committee. Members agreed that it would be good for the guidance to be reviewed to understand if it required adapting in any way.

A Member, also Chair of Policy Resources Committee, suggested she could raise this issue as part of her regular informal meetings with Committee Chairmen.

The meeting ended at 10.43am

Chairman

Contact Officer: Chris Rumbles Tel : 020 7332 1405
christopher.rumbles@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Wednesday, 19 February 2020

Minutes of the meeting of the Public Relations and Economic Development Sub (Policy & Resources) Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 3.00 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chairman)	Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Simon Duckworth (Deputy Chairman)	Alderman Vincent Keaveny
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Deputy Edward Lord
Tijs Broeke	Andrew Mayer
Anne Fairweather	Jeremy Mayhew
Alderman Prem Goyal	Deputy Tom Sleight
Sheriff Christopher Hayward	

Officers:

Paul Double	- Remembrancer
Bob Roberts	- Director of Communications
Sam Hutchings	- Sport Engagement Manager
Tom Regan	- Corporate Affairs
Colin Buttery	- Director of Open Spaces
Giles French	- Innovation and Growth
Bruce McVean	- Built Environment
Abhi Thakor	- Remembrancers
Jaysen Sharpe	- Remembrancers
Jeremy Blackburn	- Mansion House
Emma Cunnington	- Town Clerk's

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Dominic Christian, Karina Dostalova, Simon Duckworth, James Tumbridge and Alderman Sir David Wootton.

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

There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the public minutes and summary of the meeting held on 3 December 2019 be approved as a correct record.

4. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Town Clerk outlining outstanding actions. Relating to the first action concerning reports on cross-cutting issues, Members wished for the action to be updated so that it reflected the desire for Members' interests to be fully recorded in CRM and for Members to have sight of the information that was held on them in this way. The Policy Chair also reported that she was keen to engage Members in their areas of interest as much as possible.

RESOLVED, that:

- The report be noted.

5. **EPHING FOREST EVENTS TENDER REPUTATIONAL RISK**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of Open Spaces outlining potential reputational risks associated with a public tender to invite large scale event proposals for venues in Epping Forest and on the Buffer Land.

There was some discussion as to whether the report gave Members a robust risk assessment of the decision, but it was felt that Open Spaces Committee would be able to take forward the arrangements for this.

RESOLVED, that:-

- The Open Spaces Committee take forward the arrangements of the public tender to invite large scale event proposals for venues in Epping Forest and on the Buffer Land.

6. **CORPORATE AFFAIRS UPDATE**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of Communications providing Members with an update of the Corporate Affairs Team's activities in supporting the City of London Corporation's strategic political engagement.

The Policy Chair gave details of the planned correspondence with incoming and outgoing ministers and committed to sharing the substantive letter to the Chancellor to this Sub-Committee. Members then discussed what the political priorities of the City Corporation could be over the next few years. One Member made the point that many Members of the Court had relationships with senior politicians, and these could be utilised more effectively.

Members also discussed the Prime Minister's commitment that his government would lead a 'levelling up' of prosperity across the UK, and what that could mean for London. A Member requested more analysis on London's reaction to the recent General Election result. Another Member also requested that longer lead-in times were given ahead of the London Government Dinner, in future, to ensure that the seating plan was strategic and thematic.

The Policy Chair also informed the Sub-Committee that the City Corporation was engaging with all the candidates for the London Mayoral elections from mainstream parties. It was discussed that some Members have a mandate to have existing relationships with key political figures. It was also stated that,

particularly during election periods, it was important that Members made clear that if they were meeting with political figures, it was in a personal capacity. Equally, if Members were using City Corporation premises to host external stakeholders privately, it was made clear that this was not endorsed by the City Corporation.

RESOLVED, that:

- The report be noted.

7. PARTY CONFERENCES

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of Communications concerning the City Corporation's programme of engagement at the annual Liberal Democrat, Labour, Conservative, Scottish National Party (SNP) and Green party conferences.

The Sub-Committee heard that a further report setting out a more detailed plan and options on Member attendance would be considered at a future meeting. It was also felt that it would be useful for Members to have time to debrief during the conference season.

RESOLVED, that:-

- The suggested format of events for this year's Party Conference season be noted.

8. SPORT ENGAGEMENT

8.1 Sport Engagement - Progress Update

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of Communications concerning an update on sport engagement. It was received very positively by Members who were very appreciative of the work undertaken by the Sport Engagement Manager.

Members heard that approximate spend on sport engagement since Summer 2019 stood at £160,000, and that for 2020/21, spending on sport events was likely to increase with Euro 2020 and Tokyo Olympic and Paralympic engagement.

RESOLVED, that:-

- The report be noted.

8.2 Tokyo 2020 Games

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of Communications setting out the City Corporation's plans to engage and celebrate the upcoming Olympic and Paralympic Games in Tokyo this Summer.

Members were supportive of the plans although it was recognised that contingency plans were needed should the COVID-19 outbreak affect the Olympic and Paralympic Games generally. Officers confirmed that discussions were ongoing about senior representation at the Games and a further update

would be provided to Members in the next sport engagement report due in June.

RESOLVED, that:-

- It be recommended to the Policy and Resources Committee to agree that £40,000 be allocated from the 2020/21 Policy Initiatives Fund to cover costs of the City Corporation's engagement around the Tokyo 2020 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

9. **SIX-MONTH MEDIA UPDATE**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of Communications summarising the City Corporation's media output over the past six months. Members heard that the figure in paragraph 11 of the report was erroneous and should read, '*Commercial filming has brought £311,571 into the City Corporation over the last six months.*'

Members discussed in detail their concerns regarding recent negative coverage, particularly concerning the Aldermanic appraisal system, and feared that Members of the Court were openly briefing the press on private matters. The Director of Communications opined that if the City Corporation is portrayed as an organisation which did not value diversity and inclusion, this would be reinforced by not attracting those who wish to push forward the diversity and inclusion agenda. He advised that change could happen best through persuasion, leadership and rationale rather than through briefing the media.

It was also discussed how it could be useful to have a report looking at the qualitative data of media output with a strategic look at key messaging with trend analysis and comparators to last year. However, Members heard that there would be a significant cost to this work and so the suggestion was not supported.

Finally, a Member asked the Director of Communications to look into consolidating the City Corporation and City of London Police weekly press cutting emails.

RESOLVED, that:-

- The report be noted.

10. **PARLIAMENTARY TEAM UPDATE**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Remembrancer updating Members on the main elements of the Parliamentary Team's activity in support of the City Corporation's political and parliamentary engagement.

RESOLVED, that:-

- The report be noted.

11. **EUROPEAN UNION (WITHDRAWAL AGREEMENT) ACT 2020**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Remembrancer updating Members on the EU (Withdrawal Agreement) Act 2020, which received Royal Assent on 23rd January 2020.

RESOLVED, that:-

- The report be noted.

12. INNOVATION & GROWTH UPDATE

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of Innovation and Growth providing Members with highlights of the key activity undertaken by the Innovation & Growth Directorate (IG) since its last meeting.

RESOLVED, that:-

- The report be noted.

13. WORLD ECONOMIC FORUM, DAVOS, 21-24 JANUARY

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Director of Innovation and Growth concerning the Lord Mayor and Chair of Policy and Resources' attendance at the World Economic Forum's annual meeting in Davos from 21 – 24 January.

RESOLVED, that:-

- The report be noted.

14. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE

There were no questions.

15. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There were no urgent items.

16. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

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

Item	Paragraph
17-18	3

17. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

The non-public minutes and summary of the meeting held on 3 December 2019 were approved.

18. NON-PUBLIC APPENDIX: EPPING FOREST EVENTS TENDER

The Sub-Committee received an appendix to be read in conjunction with Item 5: Epping Forest Events Tender.

19. BEECH STREET

The Sub-Committee received an oral update of the Director of the Built Environment.

20. NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE

There were no questions.

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

There were no items of urgent business.

The meeting closed at 4.30 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Emma Cunnington
emma.cunnington@cityoflondon.gov.uk

PROJECTS SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Monday, 24 February 2020

Minutes of the meeting of the Projects Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 11.00 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Keith Bottomley (Chairman)
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark (Deputy Chairman)
Randall Anderson
Karina Dostalova
Sheriff Christopher Hayward

Deputy Edward Lord
Andrew McMurtrie
Deputy Catherine McGuinness
James de Sausmarez
Deputy Philip Woodhouse

Observing:

Oliver Sells QC

Officers:

Peter Lisley	- Assistant Town Clerk & Director of Major Projects
Rohit Paul	- Town Clerk's Department
Sarah Baker	- Town Clerk's Department
James Aggio-Brewe	- Town Clerk's Department
Alistair MacLellan	- Town Clerk's Department
Julie Smith	- Chamberlain's Department
Ola Obadara	- City Surveyor's Department
Zahur Khan	- Department of the Built Environment
Clarisse Tavin	- Department of the Built Environment
Leah Coburn	- Department of the Built Environment
Tom Noble	- Department of the Built Environment
Gillian Howard	- Department of the Built Environment
Sam Lee	- Department of the Built Environment
Jason Hayes	- Department of Community and Children's Services
Michael Gwyther-Jones	- Department of Community and Children's Services
Patrick Hegarty	- Department of Open Spaces

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Rehana Ameer.

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

There were no declarations.

3. GATEWAY APPROVAL PROCESS

RESOLVED, that the Gateway Approval Process be received.

4. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED, that the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 27 January 2020 be approved as a correct record.

5. **PUBLIC ACTIONS**

Members considered a report of the Town Clerk regarding public actions and the following points were made.

41/2019/P – Housing Revenue Account Commitments

- The Town Clerk noted that the planned briefing note for Members on HRA commitments would be ready for circulation from 27 February 2020.

43/2019/P – Transport Strategy Overview

- The Town Clerk noted that the briefing note regarding Transport Strategy-related projects would be circulated in advance of the March 2020 meeting.

RESOLVED, that the report be received.

6. **GATEWAY 2 - CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT EAST WING GROUND MEZZANINE COOLING AND HEATING REPLACEMENT**

Members considered a Gateway 2 report of the City Surveyor regarding the Central Criminal Court East Wing Ground Mezzanine Cooling and Heating Replacement and the following points were made.

- The City Surveyor noted that the project was scheduled to be funded as of April 2020, and that no project costs would be incurred in advance of that date.
- The Town Clerk agreed to clarify whether the spending committee decision lay with Corporate Asset Sub (Finance) Committee or the Courts Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee (1/2020/P).
- The Chairman requested a report to a future meeting providing an overview of all current and planned projects at the Central Criminal Court, with a view to ensuring effective scrutiny and oversight of projects at that site (2/2020/P).

RESOLVED, that Members

- Approve the budget of £81,000 to reach the next gateway, noting estimated costs based on similar survey costs for comparable projects.
- Note the total estimated cost of the project range of £800,000 to £1,000,000 plus an estimated risk allowance of £120,000 to £150,000.

- Note that this includes the cost of temporary alternative living arrangements for the Sheriffs and Consorts, and that temporary office accommodation for affected staff is expected to be managed locally.

7. GATEWAY 3/4 - BERNARD MORGAN HOUSE PUBLIC REALM

Members considered a Gateway 3/4 report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding Bernard Morgan House Public Realm and the following points were made.

- In response to comments made by a Member, the Director of the Built Environment confirmed that Option 1 set out within the report (reparations as per s278 including repaving of footways and works to Golden Lane zebra crossing) was satisfactory from a health and safety perspective.
- Members expressed concern that the project did not appear to be effectively linked with wider works in the area, and that the s278 agreement had yet to be signed by the developer. The Director of Built Environment confirmed that this presented a low risk to the project and that, ultimately, the developer was obliged to enter into the s278.

RESOLVED, that Members,

- Authorise officers to invoice the developer for £85,361 to undertake work to progress to Gateway 5 (set out at section 3 table 1), in advance of the full S278 payment to avoid delays to the programme. The amount would be deducted from the full S278 payment.
- Approve Option 1 at a cost of up to £725,505, fully funded by a Section 278 agreement with Taylor Wimpy, the developer of Bernard Morgan House.
- Authorise officers to publish proposals in relation to any necessary traffic orders or other consents to implement the project as described in this report.

8. GATEWAY 3/4 - ST MARY AXE EXPERIMENTAL TIMED CLOSURE (WITHIN CITY CLUSTER VISION PHASE 1 - ACTIVATION, GREENING AND EXPERIMENTS PROGRAMME)

Members considered a Gateway 3/4 report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding St Mary Axe Experimental Timed Closure (within City Cluster Vision Phase 1 – Activation, Greening and Experiments Programme) and the following points were made.

- In response to a question from a Member, the Director of the Built Environment agreed to confirm the number of persons underpinning the reported percentage within the report who made consultation responses (3/2020/P).

RESOLVED, that Members,

- Agree that St Mary Axe experimental timed closure project be established as part of the City Cluster phase 1 programme.
- Approve an additional budget of **£41,699** to reach the next Gateway (G5) giving a total budget of **£46,699** for the St Mary Axe experimental timed closure project, and to be set up using a separate cost code to the main Phase 1 project code.
- Agree the total estimated maximum cost of the St Mary Axe experimental timed closure project is **£270,000** (excluding risk).
- Approve to proceed to detailed design stage **Option 2**, trial the closure of St Mary Axe to motor traffic at peak periods through an Experimental Traffic Order and maintain the existing motorcycle bays.
- Delegate authority to the Director of the Built Environment to approve budget adjustments, above the existing authority within the project procedures and in consultation with the Chamberlain, between budget lines if this is within the approved total project budget amount; and
- That the next Gateway report proceeds under delegation to the Director of the Built Environment, in consultation with the Chairmen, subject to:
 - project cost not exceeding the maximum of **£270,000** and
 - the Director of the Built Environment and Chairmen being satisfied with the equality implications after considering the review currently being prepared.

9. **GATEWAY 5 ISSUE - GREENING CHEAPSIDE: SUNKEN GARDEN (PHASE 1B) ST. PAUL'S TUBE STATION AREA IMPROVEMENTS (PHASE 1)**

Members considered a Gateway 5 Issue report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding Greening Cheapside: Sunken Garden (Phase 1B) and St Paul's Tube Station Area Improvements (Phase 1).

- Members welcomed the engagement with and contribution from C Hoare & Co regarding the design of the Sunken Garden, and the installation of a Blue Plaque. Members were mindful that it would be appropriate for a letter of thanks to be sent to C Hoare & Co from the Chairman of the Streets and Walkways Sub (Planning and Transportation) Committee.

RESOLVED, that Members,

- Approve an additional budget of £200,000 for delivering Phase 1b of which an initial sum of £55,000 is allocated to reach the next Gateway, noting that the full amount is to be funded from C Hoare & Co through a voluntary S278 contribution.

- Approve the revised total project budget of **£580,154** (£380,154 allocated for Phase 1, and £200,000 allocated for Phase 1b) subject to receipt of funding.
- Authorise completion of one or more agreements between the City and C Hoare & Co for the provision of funding by C Hoare & Co for enhancements to the Sunken Garden.

10. GATEWAY 5 - 55 MOORGATE SECTION 278 PUBLIC REALM AND HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS

Members considered a Gateway 5 report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding 55 Moorgate s278 Public Realm and Highway Improvements.

RESOLVED, that Members,

- Approve an additional budget totalling **£299,385** to progress with the implementation of the project, funded by a Section 278 Agreement with the developer and to reach the next Gateway. This is inclusive of any underspends from the previous gateway.
- Grant authority to start work subject to completion of the Section 278 Agreement and receipt of full funding from the developer.
- Approve that City officers publish proposals in relation to any necessary traffic orders or other consents to implement the project as described in this report (Traffic orders will be necessary to relocate parking bays outside the development on Coleman Street);
- Delegate authority to the Director of Transportation and Public Realm to consider any objections to the traffic orders detailed in this report given the minor infraction of relocating existing traffic bays a few metres south of their current location.
- Delegate authority to the Assistant Director of City Public Realm and Head of Finance to adjust the project budget between staff costs, fees and works providing the overall budget is not exceeded beyond standard tolerances in accordance with the Section 278 agreement.

11. GATEWAY 5 - 150 BISHOPSGATE (HERON PLAZA)

Members considered a Gateway 5 report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding 150 Bishopsgate (Heron Plaza).

RESOLVED, that Members,

- Authorise officers to update the existing Section 278 agreement via exchange of letters.
- Approve the budget of £954,856 for implementation of the works, to be funded through a Section 278 agreement.

- Approve the revised total estimated cost of the project at £1,273,528 (excluding risk).
- Authorise the extension of the Section 8 agreement and the making of a Traffic Management Order to amend parking, waiting and loading restrictions, subject to addressing any objections

12. **GATEWAY 6 - 72 FORE STREET**

Members considered a Gateway 6 report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding 72 Fore Street.

RESOLVED, that Members,

- Authorise closure of the project.
- Note the reallocation of £16,390 project underspend to the Moorgate Crossrail Station Links project as previously approved in the Department of Built Environment prioritisation report.

13. **GATEWAY 6 - MIDDLESEX STREET SOCIAL HOUSING AND LIBRARY**

Members considered a Gateway 6 report of the City Surveyor regarding Middlesex Street Social Housing and Library.

RESOLVED, that Members approve that the project be closed.

14. **GATEWAY 6 - SOUTHWARK ESTATE, NEW DOOR ENTRY INSTALLATION - STOPHER AND PAKEMAN HOUSES AND SUMNER BUILDINGS 2012/13**

Members considered a Gateway 6 report of the Director of Community and Children's Services regarding Southwark Estate New Door Entry Installation – Stopher and Pakeman Houses and Sumner Buildings 2012/13,

RESOLVED, that the projects Southwark Estate New Door Entry Installation – Stopher and Pakeman Houses and Sumner Buildings 2012/13 be closed.

15. **GATEWAY 6 - ST BOTOLPH BISHOPSGATE CHURCHYARD IMPROVEMENTS**

Members considered a Gateway 6 report of the Director of Open Spaces regarding St Botolph Bishopsgate Churchyard Improvements.

RESOLVED, that the project be closed.

16. **GATEWAY 5 PROJECT STATUS - CITY CYCLEWAYS PROGRAMME - PHASE 1 (Q11 UPGRADE AND OTHER QUICK WINS)**

Members considered a Gateway 5 Project Status report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding City Cycleways Programme Phase 1 (Q11 Upgrade and Other Quick Wins) and the following points were made.

- The Director of the Built Environment noted that the project was undergoing delays following a request from Transport for London (TfL) that elements on the project be put on hold pending further design work. A further report would be made to the April 2020 meeting.

- The Town Clerk agreed to liaise with the Chairman of the Streets and Walkways Sub (Planning and Transportation) Committee over whether the report could be tabled as an urgent item at that Sub-Committee's meeting on 25 February 2020 (4/2020/P).

RESOLVED, that the report be received.

17. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE

Contractor Lighting

In response to a question, the City Surveyor agreed to clarify the assessment process through which appropriate levels of lighting were arrived at in projects at Guildhall (5/2020/P).

18. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There was no other business.

19. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

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

20. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

RESOLVED, that the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 27 January 2020 be approved as a correct record.

21. NON-PUBLIC ACTIONS

Members considered a report of the Town Clerk regarding non-public actions.

22. PORTFOLIO OVERVIEW

Members considered a Portfolio Overview report of the Town Clerk.

23. REPORT ON ACTION TAKEN

Members considered a report of the Town Clerk regarding action taken since the last meeting.

24. GATEWAY 3/4 - BARBICAN PODIUM WATERPROOFING, DRAINAGE AND LANDSCAPING WORKS (BEN JONSON, BRETON & CROMWELL HIGHWALK) PHASE 2 - 1ST PRIORITY

Members considered a Gateway 3/4 report of the Director of Community and Children's Services regarding Barbican Podium Waterproofing, Drainage and Landscaping Works (Ben Jonson, Breton and Cromwell Highwalk) Phase 2 – 1st Priority.

25. GATEWAY 5 ISSUE - CITY OF LONDON PRIMARY ACADEMY ISLINGTON

The Town Clerk noted that this item had been withdrawn.

26. **GATEWAY 5 PROGRESS - SECURITY ENHANCEMENTS/SECURITY CROSS CUTTING - MANSION HOUSE, GUILDHALL, CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT AND BARBICAN CENTRE**
Members considered a Gateway 5 Progress report of the City Surveyor regarding Security Enhancements/Security Cross Cutting – Mansion House, Guildhall, Central Criminal Court and Barbican Centre.
27. **GATEWAY 4 ISSUE - 20 / 21 ALDERMANBURY - FUTURE USE AND BUILDING OPPORTUNITIES**
Members considered a Gateway 4 Issue report of the City Surveyor regarding 20/21 Aldermanbury – future use and building opportunities.
28. **GATEWAY 6 - GREAT ARTHUR HOUSE RECLADDING PROJECT**
Members considered a Gateway 6 report of the City Surveyor regarding Great Arthur House Recladding.
29. **GATEWAY 6 - THE LORD MAYOR'S STATE COACH: CONSERVATION AND REPAIR**
Members considered a Gateway 6 report of the City Surveyor regarding The Lord Mayor's State Coach: Conservation and Repair.
30. **GATEWAY 6 - GUILDHALL WEST WING BARRIERS**
Members considered a Gateway 6 report of the City Surveyor regarding West Wing Barriers.
31. **GATEWAY 6 - CITY OF LONDON FREEMEN'S SCHOOL SWIMMING POOL**
Members considered a Gateway 6 report of the City Surveyor regarding City of London Freeman's School Swimming Pool.
32. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**
There were no questions.
33. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB-COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
There was no other business.

The meeting closed at 12.15 pm

Chairman

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

TO: **POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

19 March 2020

FROM: **MARKETS COMMITTEE**

4 March 2020

**MARKETS CONSOLIDATION PROGRAMME GOVERNANCE UPDATE:
WORKING PARTY CREATION**

The Committee considered a joint report of the Town Clerk and the City Surveyor outlining proposals to establish a dedicated Working Party of the Policy & Resources Committee to advise on options and make decisions on certain practicalities.

The Chairman welcomed the establishment of this group following the cessation of the previous Relocation of the Markets Working Party. The Chairman and Deputy Chairman suggested that given the key input required from the Markets Committee, both the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman of the Markets Committee (or nominated representative) should be appointed to the new Working Party and this suggestion was endorsed by Members. Concerns were also raised in respect of the lack of detail on governance and reporting arrangements for the new working party.

It was moved, seconded, and

RESOLVED – That

1. That the report be noted.
2. That it be noted that whereas on 20th February 2020, the Policy & Resources Committee resolved to establish a working party based on the Chairman meetings initiated at the original request of the Markets Committee, this new working party is not something that was discussed with the Markets Committee in advance of the Policy & Resources Committee resolution.

Recommendation to Policy & Resources Committee

3. The Markets Committee is naturally keen to provide input to the work on the Markets Consolidation Programme, and whilst welcoming the inclusion of the Markets' Committee Chairman in the working party, the Markets Committee asks that it be allowed to nominate another member in addition to the Chairman of the Markets Committee, to the working party, to ensure there is always someone with knowledge of the Markets Committee available to participate in any meetings, and to reflect the significant interests of the Markets Committee as the service committee that initiated this programme and will oversee the future market.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee:	Date:
Policy and Resources	19 March 2020
Subject: Committee Terms of Reference and Compositions	Public
Report of: Town Clerk Report Author: Greg Moore	For Decision

Summary

1. The Policy and Resources Committee is responsible for the City Corporation's governance arrangements, including the composition and terms of reference of the various committees of the Court of Common Council. As a consequence, any material changes need to be considered by this Committee, prior to them being considered by the Court of Common Council as part of the annual "White Paper" process in April of each year. All Committees are required to review their terms of reference on an annual basis.
2. With respect to this Committee's terms of reference, a minor amendment is proposed in respect of clarification around responsibilities associated with Business Improvement Districts (BIDs), whereby the Comptroller & City Solicitor has advised that it would be beneficial to incorporate reference to this Committee having responsibility for the functions of the BID Proposer and BID Body (as approved by the Court of Common Council in October 2014), for the purposes of clarity in managing BID processes moving forwards. A copy of the Committee's current constitution and terms of reference with the proposed amendment is attached at Appendix D.
3. This report substantively focuses on the changes suggested by other committees which are of a material nature. The report does not cover minor changes such as the insertion of certain words for greater clarity, or where Committees are altering or introducing staggering arrangements in respect of terms of service (to assist with a managed turnover of membership).
4. The following Committees have proposed amendments to their composition, terms of reference and/or governance arrangements of sufficient scope to merit consideration by this Committee.
 - Education Board
 - Board of Governors of the City of London Freemen's School
 - Markets Committee

Details of the proposed amendments are set out in the body of this report and in the attached appendices.

The Culture Heritage & Libraries Committee and the Community & Children's Services Committee are also currently considering minor amendments to their Terms of Reference. It is suggested that these be considered under delegated

authority, should they be forthcoming and of a degree to require consideration by this Committee.

Recommendations

5. It is recommended that, subject to any comments made this day, one minor change be made to the terms of reference of this Committee (Appendix D) and that, in respect of other Committees, consideration be given to the following:-
 - amendments to the wording of the Education Board's terms of reference to reflect more accurately its role (Appendix A);
 - a change to the quorum of the Board of Governors of the City of London Freeman's School, together with an amended descriptor in respect of co-opted Governors (Appendix B);
 - a request from the Markets Committee to reinstate the wording removed from its terms of reference in April 2019 (Appendix C).
6. It is also recommended that authority be delegated to the Town Clerk, in conjunction with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, to consider any further changes requested by Committees in advance of the next meeting.

Main Report

Background

1. The Policy and Resources Committee is responsible for the City Corporation's governance arrangements which, amongst other things, include committees. Any material changes to committee constitutions or terms of reference therefore need to be considered by this Committee prior to them being considered by the Court of Common Council in April.
2. As far as this Committee is concerned no change has been made to its constitution or terms of reference since they were last considered. Whilst a copy of the Committee's constitution, membership (which is subject to change from 23 April 2020) and terms of reference is attached as Appendix D for consideration, this report focuses on the changes suggested by other committees which are of a material nature. It does not cover minor changes such as the insertion of certain words for greater clarity or to reflect changes to job titles.

Education Board

3. The Education Board is seeking approval for wording in respect of its role in the oversight of skills and work-related learning and cultural and creative learning, as well as in respect of ensuring that education promotes healthy lifestyles. A collection of further, minor amendments are also sought.
4. The requested amendments are set out in Appendix A, with additions underlined and deletions struck-through.

Board of Governors of the City of London Freeman's School

5. The Board of Governors is requesting an amendment to its quorum to allow for up to one co-opted Governor to count for the purposes of establishing a quorum. A

small amendment is also sought in respect of the descriptor for co-opted Governors.

6. The requested amendments are set out in Appendix B, with additions underlined and deletions struck-through.

Markets Committee

7. The Markets Committee is requesting that its terms of reference be amended such that they revert to their 2018/19 form.
8. As Members will recall, in April 2018 the Court agreed an amendment to the Markets Committee's terms of reference such that they provided for "Oversight of the ***provision and*** management of all matters relating to Smithfield Market, Billingsgate Market and New Spitalfields Market and the letting of all premises therein."
9. In April 2019, the Court subsequently removed the words "provision and", undoing the amendment made in April 2018. This was in view of concerns in relation to confusion arising around reporting lines for the Markets Consolidation Programme (MCP) and the need for clear lines of accountability and decision-making, given the size of the programme and the significant policy and cost implications.
10. The Markets Committee is now seeking the re-insertion of the words "***provision and***", as it feels that the current wording prevents the Committee from having overall oversight of the developing MCP. They feel that this had also led to key information not always being communicated to the Chairman, Deputy Chairman and Markets Committee Members in a timely manner.
11. The views of the Markets Committee, together with the proposed amendment (underlined), are set out at Appendix C.

Conclusion

12. The Committee is asked to consider the proposed amendments to Terms of Reference and Constitutions set out above, as requested by various committees. Those which are approved will be submitted to the Court of Common Council in April for final approval.

Contact:

Gregory Moore

Telephone: 020 7332 1399

Email: gregory.moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Education Board 2020/21 Proposed Terms of Reference:

Terms of Reference

- (a) To monitor and review the City of London Strategies for Education, Cultural and Creative Learning, and Skills and to oversee their implementation (including skills and work related learning, and cultural and creative learning) in consultation, where appropriate, with Policy and Resources Committee and the relevant Service the appropriate City of London Committees; referring any proposed changes to the Court of Common Council for approval;
- (b) To oversee generally the City of London Corporation's education activities (including, where relevant, the City Corporation's commitment to ensuring education promotes healthy lifestyles); consulting with those Committees where education responsibilities are expressly provided for within the terms of reference of those Committees and liaising with the City's affiliated schools and co-sponsors; post school learning providers, and cultural organisations but excluding Gresham College and any responsibilities of the Gresham (City Side) Committee;
- (c) To be responsible for the oversight and monitoring of the City of London Corporation's sponsorship of its Academies, including the appointment of academy governors and, where relevant Members, Directors and Trustees;
- (d) ~~To The~~ management of The City of London Corporation Combined Education Charity (registered charity no. 312836), subject to consulting with the Community and Children's Services Committee as to any policy to be adopted for the application of the charity's funds;
- (e) ~~To The~~ management of the City Educational Trust Fund (registered charity no. 290840), subject to consulting with the Community and Children's Services Committee as to any policy to be adopted for the application of the charity's funds;
- (f) To constitute Sub-Committees in order to consider particular items of business within the terms of reference of the Board, including:-

Education Charity Sub (Education Board) Committee*
- (g) To recommend to the Court of Common Council candidates for appointment as the City of London Corporation's representative on school governing bodies where nomination rights are granted and which do not fall within the remit of any other Committee;
- (h) To monitor the frameworks for effective accountability, challenge and support in the City Family of Schools**;
- (i) To be responsible for the distribution of funds specifically allocated to it for education purposes, in accordance with the City of London Corporation's strategic policies;
- (j) ~~Oversight of Assist with promotion of skills training and the City of London Corporation's education-business link activities. in line with the City of London Corporation's Skills Strategy.~~

* The constitution of The Education Charity Sub-Committee is set by the Court of Common Council and comprises four Members appointed by the Education Board and four Members appointed by the Community and Children's Services Committee.

** The expression "the City Family of Schools" means those schools for which the City has either direct responsibility as proprietor, academy sponsor or local authority, or historic links. These include but are not restricted to: The Sir John Cass Foundation Primary School, The City Academy, Hackney; the City of London Academy Islington; the academies managed by the City of London Academies Trust; the City of London School; the City of London School for Girls; the City of London Freeman's School (the latter three all being institutional departments of the City Corporation); and ~~the academies managed by the City of London Academies Trust.~~

NB – The wording under subsection (b) of the Terms of Reference is currently the subject of review and it is intended that amended wording will be presented to the Court for consideration in due course.

This page is intentionally left blank

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE CITY OF LONDON FREEMEN'S SCHOOL

1. **Constitution**
A Non-Ward Committee consisting of,
 - up to two Aldermen nominated by the Court of Aldermen
 - up to 12 Commoners elected by the Court of Common Council at least one of whom shall have fewer than five years' service on the Court at the time of their appointment
 - the following ex-officio Members:-
 - the Chairman of the Board of Governors of City of London School
 - the Chairman of the Board of Governors of City of London School for Girls
 - up to six co-opted non-City of London Corporation Governors with skills relevant to the needs of the School experience of education.

The Chairman of the Board shall be elected from the City Corporation Members.

2. **Quorum**
The quorum consists of any five Common Council Governors, of which not more than one of whom may be co-opted.

Any decision taken by the Board of Governors shall require the agreement of a majority of Common Council Governors present at the meeting and voting.

3. **Membership (until July 2019)**

ALDERMEN

- 2 Susan Langley, O.B.E.
- 1 Bronek Masojada

COMMONERS

- 14 (4) John Alfred Bennett, M.B.E., Deputy
- 10 (4) Michael Hudson
- 7 (3) Stuart John Fraser, C.B.E.
- 6 (3) Graham David Packham
- 15 (2) Roger Arthur Holden Chadwick, O.B.E, Deputy
- 10 (2) Vivienne Littlechild, M.B.E., J.P.
- 6 (2) Hugh Fenton Morris, Deputy
- 10 (1) Elizabeth Rogula, Deputy
- 6 (1) Philip John Woodhouse, Deputy
- Vacancy
- Vacancy
- Vacancy

together with :-

Nicholas Goddard

Brian Harris

Andrew McMillan

Chris Townsend

Lady Gillian Yarrow

Vacancy

together with the ex-officio Members referred to in paragraph 1 above.

4. **Terms of Reference**
To be responsible for:-
 - (a) all School matters;
 - (b) the management of the School land and buildings belonging to the City of London Corporation;
 - (c) the appointment of the Headmaster/Headmistress and, where appropriate, the deputies and the bursar.

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTE EXTRACT: MARKETS COMMITTEE**5. MARKETS COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE AND FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk seeking the views of Members on the Committee's terms of reference and proposed frequency of meetings for 2020/21 and the Committee supported the current frequency of meetings being held 6 times a year.

The Committee considered the existing terms of reference and felt that they were not fit for purpose. Members felt very strongly that the changes made to the Committee's terms of reference by the Policy & Resources Committee in April 2019 had resulted in the Markets Committee not having overall oversight of the developing MCP. This had also led to key information not always being communicated to the Chairman, Deputy Chairman and Markets Committee Members in a timely manner.

The Chairman stated that the Markets Committee was integral to the developing MCP and it was essential that the Markets Committee was retained with a higher profile to facilitate meaningful input onto the evolving MCP aspirations and to retain oversight of the management of the largest wholesale markets in the UK which were crucial to supplying traders and businesses across the country.

The Chairman urged Members to make representations as part of the Governance Review and it was felt that the Markets Committee should be retained as a Ward Committee with a more significant role in leading the MCP, in close dialogue with the Chairmen of the Finance and Policy & Resources Committees and that the existing terms of reference be updated to reflect this.

The Chairman moved, the Deputy Chairman seconded, and it was

RESOLVED –

1. That the report be noted.
2. That in light of the deliberations of the Markets Committee, the Policy & Resources Committee be recommended to alter the terms of reference of the Markets Committee to read as follows: ***(additional wording in emboldened italics)***

“To be responsible for:

- (a) Oversight of the ***provision and*** management of all matters relating to Smithfield Market, Billingsgate Market and New Spitalfields Market and the letting of all premises therein.
- (b) The appointment of the Director of Markets and Consumer Protection (acting jointly with the Port Health and Environmental Services and

Licensing Committees).”

3. That in light of the deliberations of the Markets Committee, the Policy & Resources Committee be recommended to retain the Markets Committee as a Ward Committee with a more significant role in leading the MCP, given that the Committee is integral to the management of the largest wholesale markets in the UK and the supply of traders and business nationally.

MARKETS COMMITTEE: PROPOSED TERMS OF REFERENCE AMENDMENT

Terms of Reference

To be responsible for:-

- (a) oversight of the provision and management of all matters relating to Smithfield Market, Billingsgate Market and New Spitalfields Market and the letting of all premises therein;
- (b) the appointment of the Director of Markets and Consumer Protection (acting jointly with the Port Health and Environmental Services and Licensing Committees).

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

4. Terms of Reference

To be responsible for:-

General

- (a) considering matters of policy and strategic importance to the City of London Corporation including matters referred to it by other Committees and/or Chief Officers;
- (b) the review and co-ordination of the governance of the City of London Corporation including its Committees, Standing Orders and Outside Bodies Scheme, reporting as necessary to the Court of Common Council, together with the City Corporation's overall organisation and administration;
- (c) overseeing, generally, the security of the City and the City of London Corporation's security and emergency planning;
- (d) the support and promotion of the City of London as the world leader in international financial and business services and to oversee, generally, the City of London Corporation's economic development activities, communications strategy and public relations activities;
- (e) the use of the City's Armorial bearings and the Bridge Mark;
- (f) the appointment of the City Surveyor (in consultation with the Investment Committee);
- (g) general matters not otherwise expressly provided for within the terms of reference of any other Committee;
- (h) approving the City Corporation's annual contribution to the London Councils' Grants Scheme and agreeing, alongside other constituent councils, the proposed overall budget;
- (i) making recommendations to the Court of Common Council in respect of:
 - (i) the appointment of the Town Clerk & Chief Executive, Comptroller & City Solicitor and Remembrancer;
 - (ii) the Corporate Plan, Community Strategy, and other corporate strategies, statements or resolutions;
 - (iii) the issuing of levies to all the constituent councils for their contributions to the London Councils' Grants Scheme, for which the Court of Common Council is a levying body; and
 - (iv) the promotion of legislation and, where appropriate, byelaws;

Resource Allocation

- (j) determining resource allocation in accordance with the City of London Corporation's strategic policies;

Corporate Assets

- (k) (i) determining the overall use of the Guildhall Complex; and
 - (ii) approving overall strategy and policy in respect of the City Corporation's assets;

Projects

- (l) Scrutiny and oversight of the management of major projects and programmes of work, including considering all proposals for capital and supplementary revenue projects, and determining whether projects should be included in the capital and supplementary revenue programme as well as the phasing of any expenditure;

Hospitality

- (m) arrangements for the provision of hospitality on behalf of the City of London Corporation;

Privileges

- (n) Members' privileges, facilities and development;

Sustainability

- (o) strategies and initiatives in relation to sustainability;

City Courts

- (p) for a period of five years, from June 2016 to April 2021, to be responsible for oversight of the management of all matters relating to the City Courts;

Business Improvement Districts

- (q) responsibility for the functions of the City where it is BID Proposer and BID Body (as approved by the Court of Common Council in October 2014);

Sub-Committees

- (r) appointing such Sub-Committees as are considered necessary for the better performance of its duties including the following areas:-

* Resource Allocation

Projects

Outside Bodies

Public Relations and Economic Development

Courts

†Hospitality

†Members' Privileges

* The constitution of the Resource Allocation Sub Committee is set by the Court of Common Council and comprises the Chairman and Deputy Chairmen of the Grand Committee, past Chairmen of the Grand Committee providing that they are Members of the Committee at that time, the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen, the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Finance Committee, the Chairman of the Establishment Committee, the Senior Alderman below the Chair and six Members appointed by the Grand Committee.

† the Working Parties or Sub Committees responsible for hospitality and Members' privileges shall be able to report directly to the Court of Common Council and the Chief Commoner able to address reports and respond to matters in the Court associated with these activities.

Committee(s)	Dated:
Streets & Walkways Sub Committee (For Decision) Police Committee (For Information) Policy & Resources Committee (For Decision)	25 February 2020 27 February 2020 19 March 2020
Subject: Anti-Terrorism Traffic Regulation Order	Public
Report of: Director of the Built Environment	For Information / For Decision
Report Author: Ian Hughes, Assistant Director (Highways)	

Summary

This report reviews the use of the City's permanent Anti-Terrorism Traffic Regulation Order (ATTRO) in 2019, as well as whether it should be retained more generally going forward.

The ATTRO authorises the City Police to potentially control the movement of pedestrians and vehicles on City streets for counter terrorism purposes and was originally requested as part of a package of measures aimed at both improving the security of people in crowded places & preventing damage to buildings from a potential terrorist attack.

Members approved the ATTRO in 2016 on the basis that the City Corporation's area was particularly vulnerable to terrorism due to its highly dense nature and the concentration of high profile, historic, prestigious and financial targets that can be found throughout the Square Mile.

Matters since would suggest this assessment has not changed, albeit the use of the ATTRO has been limited to a small number of high-profile special events. In 2019, it was only used for the New Year's Eve celebrations as part of the wider Metropolitan Police-led operation, but from a City Police perspective, retaining the permanent ATTRO remains important because it affords them the ability to react quickly, if the intelligence necessitates it, to protect the public.

When the ATTRO was written, it did not have a specific end or review date, but in response to the last annual summary report in January 2019, Members requested that this year's report decide upon the continuing need for the ATTRO to remain in place. As a result, this year's report is For Decision by the Streets & Walkways and Policy & Resources Committees.

Recommendation(s)

Members are recommended to approve the continued use of the ATTRO subject to a further review in three years' time.

Main Report

Background

1. In September and October 2016, the Planning & Transportation Committee (for decision), the Police Committee (for information) and the Policy & Resources Committee (for decision) discussed and agreed to the creation of an Anti-Terrorism Traffic Regulation Order (ATTRO) in the City Corporation area.
2. This was in response to a request from the Commissioner of the City Police in July 2015 to introduce such an order and followed a statutory public consultation.
3. The Commissioner's request was informed by advice received from his counter-terrorism security advisors, including the Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure (CPNI). The advice related to the whole administrative area of the City and was in the context of the potential impact of terrorism due to the City's intensely crowded nature and its role as a high-profile world centre of economic activity.
4. The ATTRO is a counter terrorism measure pursuant to the provisions of the Civil Contingencies Act 2004, which allows traffic orders to be written by the Traffic Authority under s6, s22C and s22D of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. These orders can only be made on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Police, and are for the purposes of:
 - Avoiding or reducing the likelihood of, or danger connected with, terrorism, or;
 - Preventing or reducing damage connected with terrorism.
5. On the basis of a security assessment or an intelligence threat, the ATTRO gives a City Police Inspector or above the discretion to restrict traffic and / or pedestrians to all or part of any street in the City. That discretion must be exercised in accordance with an agreed protocol so that any interference is proportionate and that such restrictions are in place for the minimum extent and time necessary.
6. The Commissioner requested the ATTRO be put in place on a permanent basis, but that its use be contingent on it only being used as a proportional counter terrorism response to the needs of an event, incident or item of intelligence. Transport for London also agreed to allow the City Corporation to include their streets within the Square Mile as part of the ATTRO area.
7. The permanent ATTRO allows the controls to be activated at any time, albeit in accordance with an agreed protocol that reflects the statutory requirements for making such an order. Nevertheless, its permanent nature enables speedier activation of security measures to meet operational requirements given the unpredictability of the current terrorist threat.

8. Members agreed to making the ATTRO on two key conditions, namely that an annual review be presented to Members, and as part of that review, there should be confirmation that the ATTRO had been used in a proportionate way.

Current Position

9. The protocol established for using the ATTRO allowed for two main types of scenario, namely for intelligence-based Police led urgent situations and for pre-planned special events. In terms of the former scenario, the permanent City ATTRO has yet to be used to implement controls as a result of advance intelligence.
10. In terms of special events, it was agreed that the ATTRO could be used to supplement the City Corporation and TfL's existing event planning process. This process would typically include a separate pre-advertised temporary traffic regulation order (TTRO) granted to the organiser to close roads just to facilitate the event. In such circumstances, the ATTRO could be used to authorise additional protective security measures, such as the control of pedestrian movements which would not typically form part of the standard event TTRO, and / or additional road closures that might be deemed appropriate nearer the event.
11. Since its introduction in 2016, the City Police Commissioner has only requested that the ATTRO be used on eight separate occasions, all in relation to a particular special event. Four of those requests involved the annual New Year's Eve celebrations as part of the Metropolitan Police-led operation across Central London. The other four were all in 2017 and related to:
 - The funeral of PC Keith Palmer at Southwark Cathedral
 - The IAAF Marathon
 - The Lord Mayor's Show & Fireworks
 - The Grenfell Tower Memorial Service at St Paul's Cathedral
12. Post-event feedback would suggest the additional powers contained in the ATTRO were used sparingly and there was no noticeable or negative impact on the general public. In accordance with the agreed protocol, none of the uses of the ATTRO exceeded 48 hours, which would otherwise have triggered a review by the Town Clerk & Commissioner.

Proposal

13. Given the ATTRO has only been used for New Year's Eve in the last two years and had limited consequential impact both times, it would appear the ATTRO powers continue to be used proportionately and that a fair balance is being struck between the public interest and an individual's rights.
14. Nevertheless, despite its infrequent use, the City Police and City Corporation believe the ATTRO should be retained as it gives the City of London Police the ability to respond quickly to an emerging terrorist threat, providing enhanced protection (if needed) and reassurance to the public.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

15. Counter Terrorism is graded as a tier one threat against our country as per the National Strategic Policing Requirements set by the Home Office. Nationally and locally, there is an appropriately strong expectation that the threat of terrorism is met by an equally appropriate and proportionate response by the police and our partners.
16. The Government's Contest Strategy aims to reduce the risk to the UK and its interests overseas from terrorism, so people can go about their daily lives freely and with confidence. The City of London Police, part of the London counter terrorism region, supports the Contest Strategy through the four P's approach of Pursue, Prevent, Protect and Prepare. Protective Security as a theme, and therefore the ATTRO, fits firmly under Protect element of the Government's Contest Strategy.
17. The number one ambition of the City of London Police's Corporate Plan is 'to make the City of London the safest place in the world'. This includes having all the tools available to rapidly mitigate risk and to protect the public.
18. The City of London's historical, cultural and economic importance means it will always be an attractive target for those who are intent on causing high profile disruption. By continuing to protect the City of London from terrorism we will continue to protect the UK's interests as a whole. In terms of prevention, the City of London Police plan states 'we will continue to develop different ways to engage and work with partners in a coordinated way to deter, detect and disrupt terrorist activity'.
19. The City of London Local Plan 2015 aims to ensure that the City remains a safe place to live, work and visit. Core Strategic Policy CS3 makes specific provision for implementing measures to enhance the collective security of the City against terrorist threats, applying measures to broad areas, including the City as a whole. The Policy also encourages the development of area-based approaches to implementing security measures.
20. The risk of terrorist attack remains at the top of the current Corporate Strategic Risk Register because of the City's concentration of high profile, historic, prestigious and financial targets. In addition, the City's Corporate Plan 2018-2023 reiterates the key aims of ensuring people are safe & feel safe and that we protect the users of our buildings, streets & public spaces.
21. Otherwise, the legal implications on the use of the ATTRO remain unchanged from the original 2016 report and are repeated in Appendix 1 for reference.

Conclusion

22. Given the limited number of occasions on which the ATTRO has been used since 2016 and the limited impact on the general public's freedom of movement on each occasion, the evidence would suggest the ATTRO powers have been used

proportionately and to the minimum extent necessary in accordance with both the statutory requirements and Members' wishes.

23. However, due to the exceptional environment of the Square Mile, the City of London remains particularly vulnerable to terrorist attack, and as a result, the City's permanent ATTRO should be retained as an appropriate measure to enable the Commissioner of Police to more readily and better protect the City community.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – ATTRO Legal Considerations

Appendix 2 – ATTRO Uses in 2019

Ian Hughes
Assistant Director (Highways)
Department of the Built Environment

T: 020 7332 1977

E: ian.hughes@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Appendix 1: ATTRO Legal Considerations

1. Statutory power to make the ATTRO – Sections 6, 22C and 22D of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended by the Civil Contingencies Act 2004) enables traffic orders to be put in place by the traffic authority for the purposes of avoiding or reducing the likelihood of danger connected with terrorism, or preventing or reducing damage connected with terrorism.
2. Statutory duties of traffic authority - As traffic and highway authority, the City Corporation has the duty to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic (having regard to the effect on amenities) (S122 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984) and the duty to secure the efficient use of the road network avoiding congestion and disruption (S16 Traffic Management Act 2004). The Schedule to the ATTRO sets out requirements aimed at meeting these duties by ensuring that any restrictions will be the minimum necessary to remove or reduce the danger and are consistent with the statutory requirements for making such Orders. In implementing the ATTRO the traffic impacts of restricting or prohibiting traffic to roads within the City, including, potentially, pedestrian traffic, should be considered. In the event of a threat, the disruption to traffic flow would also have to be weighed against the threat of more severe disruption and greater risk being caused due to failure to prevent an incident.
3. Further controls - The Schedule to the draft ATTRO requires that in most cases at least seven days' notice of any restrictions must be given to persons likely to be affected (unless this is not possible due to urgency or where the giving of notice might itself undermine the reason for activating the ATTRO), and notice must also in any event be given to the City, TfL and other affected traffic authorities.
4. Human Rights and Proportionality - In considering the request for the ATTRO, there is a duty to act in accordance with the European Convention on Human Rights. In relation to possible restriction of access to property, any interference with Article 1 rights to enjoyment of property must be justified. Interference may be regarded as justified where it is lawful, pursues a legitimate purpose, is not discriminatory, and is necessary. It must also strike a fair balance between the public interest and private rights affected (i.e. be proportionate). It is considered that the public interest in being protected by the existence and operation of the ATTRO can outweigh interference with private rights which is likely to occur when restrictions are in operation. The scope of restrictions must be proportionate and should only last until the likelihood of danger or damage is removed or reduced sufficiently in the judgment of a senior police officer. The Schedule to the ATTRO sets out arrangements (further expanded in the Protocol) for ensuring that any interference is proportionate. Given the risks to life and property which could arise if an incident occurred, and the opportunity provided by the ATTRO to remove or reduce the threat of and/or impacts of incidents, it is considered that the ATTRO can be justified and any resulting interference legitimate.

Appendix 2 – ATTRO Uses in 2019

Date	Event	Justification	Impact
31 Dec / 1 Jan	New Year's Eve celebrations	New Year's Eve celebrations impact both the City of London and the wider London area, policed by all three London police forces. The overall command for the New Year's Eve event in London is the responsibility of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS), with the City of London taking geographical command. The celebrations in London attract well over 100,000 people, all descending on specific, predictable locations. This report has already highlighted the threat from terrorism and New Year's Eve is a high profile, crowded event. The MPS requested the use of the ATTRO for New Year's Eve to protect the public by ensuring stronger controls were in place to prevent vehicles entering crowded areas. This was not based on specific intelligence but on the current national threat from terrorism, highlighted further by a number of attacks in the UK since 2017.	The ATTRO still facilitated the event and the movement of people and therefore it can be concluded that it had little negative impact on the members of the public who attended.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s): Policy & Resources	Date(s): 19/03/2020
Subject: City of London Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund Commencement	
Report of: David Farnsworth, Chief Grants Officer and Director of City Bridge Trust Carolyn Dwyer, Director of the Built Environment	For Information
Report author: Jack Joslin, Central Grants Unit Peter Shadbolt, Department of the Built Environment	

Summary

The City Corporation adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in 2014. National CIL Regulations require that 15% of CIL receipts be reserved for neighbourhood funding. Local authorities are required to engage with communities on how this neighbourhood funding should be used. A public consultation on draft proposals took place between December 2018 and January 2019. An amended the CIL Neighbourhood Fund was agreed by this Committee in May 2019.

Since May 2019, further work has been undertaken to prepare the back-office functions for the Neighbourhood Fund. The Fund's application process will be managed by the City Corporation's Central Grants Unit (CGU) which is co-located with City Bridge Trust (CBT) to ensure consistency of quality in grant-making practice. Officers will assess applications and provide support to Committee in the consideration of larger applications. The administrative cost incurred in operating the Fund is recoverable from the 5% of City CIL funds allowed to cover such costs in Regulations.

Recommendation

Members are recommended to:

1. To note the opening date of the CIL Neighbourhood Fund as 1st April 2020.
2. To note the process for the CIL Neighbourhood Fund.

Main Report

Background

1. Under the 2008 Planning Act and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), a local authority may adopt a CIL setting out how it will require contributions from development towards the cost of providing new infrastructure. A local authority adopting a CIL must set out the infrastructure it will fund through the CIL through an annual Infrastructure Funding Statement, the first one of which must be published by the end of 2020. CIL regulations allow for up to 5% of CIL receipts to be used to fund the administrative costs incurred in operating a CIL. Regulations require that 15% of CIL receipts shall be reserved for neighbourhood funding, or 25% where there is a neighbourhood plan.

Neighbourhood funding must be passed to a neighbourhood forum, parish or town council, where they exist. Where they do not exist (as in the City of London), the local authority will retain CIL neighbourhood funds but should engage with communities where development has taken place and agree with them how best to spend this element of CIL.

2. Regulations require that the neighbourhood fund must be used to support the development of the local council's area, or any part of that area. CIL Regulation 59F allows a wider scope of projects to be funded through CIL neighbourhood monies than that allowed for other CIL funding, including:
 - a) the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure; (the same criteria as for other CIL funds) or
 - b) anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area (additional flexibility for neighbourhood fund).

In delivering against (b) above, the neighbourhood fund does not have to be spent in accordance with the local authority's CIL spending priorities.

3. Local authorities are required to report annually on the collection and use of CIL funds, identifying separately the amount of CIL neighbourhood funds and how they have been used.

Current Position

4. The City of London CIL came into effect on 1 July 2014. At January 2020, the neighbourhood portion of the City CIL stood at £5.6 million.

Process

5. Proposals for managing the City CIL Neighbourhood Fund were considered and approved by the Policy & Resources Committee on 2 May 2019. Management of the City CIL Neighbourhood Fund process will be aligned with the City's existing grant allocation process, through the CGU.
6. The CGU is co-located with the CBT team in order to facilitate consistency of approach and harmonise service standards across grant-making activities by the City Corporation (in its various capacities, including as trustee of a number of charities which form part of the Central Grant Programme). The Chief Grants Officer, responsible for the grant-making activities of CBT is also responsible for maintaining an overview of the CGU (and broader charity matters), with relevant input from the Charity Finance Team (Chamberlain's Department), with the work being delivered by the Head of Central Grants Unit.
7. Since the May 2019 meeting of this Committee the CGU has prepared the back-office functions for the CIL Neighbourhood Fund and recruited a CIL Neighbourhood Fund Programme Manager who started in post at the beginning of March. It is proposed that the CIL Neighbourhood Fund will launch on 1 April 2020 with applications accepted on a rolling basis.
8. Applications for funding will be made using an online application form on the CIL page of the City Corporation's website. The CGU will assess applications for

funding and carry out the necessary due diligence checks, in line with best practice. Visits to organisations applying for funding will be undertaken where required. A comprehensive monitoring and evaluation process will be implemented to track the progress of successful proposals.

9. The CGU will provide information and advice to potential applicants to the Fund. The CIL Neighbourhood Fund Programme Manager will deliver workshops and a programme of outreach to let City communities know about the programme and how to apply for funding.
10. The CIL Neighbourhood Fund will have a normal minimum level of funding for which applications can be made, of £1,000, to ensure that very small applications do not lead to disproportionate administrative cost. A normal upper limit of 15% of CIL Neighbourhood Funds available at the time of application will be applied to ensure that this funding source is not exhausted on a small number of large schemes. Applications in excess of 15% can be considered in exceptional circumstances where there is demonstrable benefit to more than one of the City's communities and the proposal aligns with published City Corporation strategies.
11. The agreed Neighbourhood Fund provides for delegated authority to determine a proportion of applications, whilst retaining the requirement for Committee approval for larger value applications. Delegated provision is outlined as follows:
 - i. Applications under £25,000 – to be determined by officer delegation
 - ii. Applications between £25,000 and £50,000 – to be delegated to officers, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee.
 - iii. Applications over £50,000 – determined by the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee, with advice from the officer Priorities Board.
12. Delegated funding decisions and advice to Committee will be made by an officer panel, chaired by a Director level officer and drawn from the CGU and Corporation Departments as required. Applications over £50,000 will be brought to the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee for decision on a quarterly basis.
13. When proposals are submitted that take place in a specific Ward, it is proposed that the CGU will contact the Alderman/Alderswoman and Ward Members to consult on proposals. An email will be sent outlining the intended proposal and giving a two-week timescale to provide comments. Comments will be consolidated and taken into consideration as part of the assessment and decision-making process.
14. Payment of funds and management of financial procedures will be handled by the CGU. Costs incurred by the CGU in fulfilling this function and by service Departments will be recovered from the 5% of all CIL funds that are available to fund the administrative costs of delivering CIL.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

15. Corporate Plan Implications: Adoption of a mechanism enabling City communities to bid for funding from the City CIL Neighbourhood Fund will enable community-

led infrastructure improvements across the City and contribute towards meeting the 3 aims of the Corporate Plan 2018-23, particularly Contribute to a Flourishing Society and Shaping an Outstanding Environment.

16. Security Implications: There are no direct security implications, though future funded projects may bring security benefits.
17. Financial Implications: The proposed City CIL Neighbourhood Fund would make use of that proportion of City CIL monies which are required by statute to be used to assist in the delivery of new infrastructure to meet community needs (15% of CIL funds). The costs of management of the grant application process and delivery of the Fund will be met through the 5% of CIL funds set aside by statute to cover CIL administration and through existing staff resources.
18. Equalities and resourcing implications: The proposed City CIL Neighbourhood Fund has been subject to an Equality Analysis Test of Relevance. This has concluded that there are no impacts arising from these proposals for protected groups and that a full Equality Analysis is not required.

Conclusion

19. Community Infrastructure Levy legislation requires local authorities to reserve between 15% and 25% of CIL receipts for neighbourhood funding. Where there is no recognised parish or town council or neighbourhood forum, the local authority will retain the neighbourhood fund but must spend it on infrastructure which meets community needs. The local authority must consult the community on how these funds will be used.
20. The Neighbourhood Fund application process will be managed by the City Corporation's CGU, with officers assessing applications and providing support to Committee in the consideration of larger applications. The administrative cost incurred in operating the Fund is recoverable from the 5% of City CIL funds allowed to cover such costs in Regulations. An opening date for the fund will be 1 April 2020.

Background Papers

Report to Policy & Resources Committee 02/05/2019: City of London Community Infrastructure Levy –Approval of Neighbourhood Fund

Jack Joslin

Funding Manager

T: 020 7332 3712

E: jack.joslin@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Peter Shadbolt

Assistant Director (Planning Policy)

T: 020 7332 1038

E: peter.shadbolt@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committee: Policy and Resources – For decision	Date: 19/03/2020
Subject: London Messaging Research	Public
Report of: Director of Communications	For Decision
Report author: Peter Cannon, Speechwriter	

Summary

It is proposed that the City of London Corporation work with London Councils to commission an external organisation to help develop effective messaging about London for UK audiences.

There is little research to show what language and imagery is most effective in conveying that a vibrant and thriving City helps a globally-successful UK.

Our aim would be to develop and test constructive and credible messages about London which could be used by business leaders, the voluntary sector and political figures when speaking about the capital to audiences across the UK.

We would intend to share this research with other London organisations.

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- Approve £40,000 of funding from the 2020/21 Policy Initiatives Fund to support this research.

Main Report

Background

1. In 2017, the City Corporation worked with London & Partners and the Greater London Authority to test and develop key messages about London for target audiences in overseas markets.
2. Those messages were tested amongst businesses, tourists and students in France, the USA, China, India & UK.
3. In summary these found the four strongest ways to portray London were;
 - a. A City of Old and New - This worked best for tourists and visitors, highlighting unique qualities of London.
 - b. A City of Discovery - This conveyed the richness of experience in a compelling but less unique way for tourists.
 - c. A City of Opportunity - A motivating story of personal and professional growth worked well for business and student audiences but did suffer from lack of differentiation from other cities.

- d. A City of Creative Energy – This was the message with broadest cross-audience appeal and impact portraying London as a city with a strong cultural history, diversity of ideas, a free-thinking mindset and a centre of talent.
- 4. This messaging has informed our engagement since then with international audiences, including in our online presence, our overseas visits and our participation in international events.

Current Position

- 5. The City Corporation is now engaging in a more strategic way with other cities across the UK, particularly but not exclusively with the six partner cities identified in our UK strategy: Belfast, Birmingham, Cardiff, Edinburgh, Leeds and Manchester.
- 6. Following the political developments of recent years, the issue of the relationship between London and the rest of the UK has also risen up the political agenda, most notably through the Government's stated commitment to 'levelling up' those parts of the UK outside London and the South East.

Proposals

- 7. As the City Corporation has developed messages for speaking about London to international audiences, we believe it would therefore also be beneficial for the City Corporation to develop and test messages for speaking about London to domestic audiences within the UK.
- 8. It is proposed that the City Corporation work with London Councils to commission an organisation to conduct research into constructive and credible messages which business leaders, the voluntary sector and political figures could use to speak about London across the UK. The results of the research would be shared with London Councils, the Greater London Authority and other partner organisations.
- 9. Members are asked to approve a contribution of £40,000 from the Policy Initiatives Fund to support this project, which would also be supported by separate funding from London Councils.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

- 10. This will help the City Corporation to achieve its central vision (as set out in the Corporate Plan) of creating a vibrant and thriving City, supporting a diverse and sustainable London within a globally successful UK, by helping to maintain and improve positive relationships between London and other parts of the UK.
- 11. It will also help the Communications Team to meet its Business Plan objectives of promoting positive media coverage and delivering effective political engagement.

Implications

12. It is proposed that the required funding of £40,000 is drawn from your Committee's 2020/21 Policy Initiatives Fund, categorised under 'Research' and charged to City's Cash. The current uncommitted balance available within your Committee's Policy Initiatives Fund 2020/21 amounts to £722,365 prior to any allowance being made for any other proposals on today's agenda.

Conclusion

13. Working with London Councils to support this project to develop and test messages about London for UK audiences would help the City Corporation and other London organisations to communicate and engage more effectively with other parts of the UK, helping to develop a more positive relationship between the capital city and the country it serves.

Peter Cannon

Communications Team, Town Clerk's Department

T: 020 7332 1758

E: peter.cannon@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s) Education Board – For information Policy and Resources – For decision Court of Common Council	Date(s): 05 March 2020 19 March 2020 23 April 2020
Subject: City of London Academies Trust – Expansion by the transfer of the two Co-Sponsored Academy Trusts	Public
Report of: Andrew Carter, Director of Community & Children’s Services	For Decision
Report author: Gerald Mehrtens, Director of Academy Development	

Summary

This report seeks approval for the transfer of The City Academy, Hackney (TCAH) and the City of London Academy Islington (COLAI) (co-sponsored by the City of London Corporation (CoLC)), to the City of London Academies Trust (CoLAT) (the CoLC being sole sponsor).

On 16 January 2020 Members of the Education Board supported the recommendation that the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, provide the CoLC’s written consent as required under the CoLAT Sponsorship Agreement to the expansion of CoLAT by the transfer of TCAH and COLAI to CoLAT, subject to the Town Clerk being satisfied of the outcome of the Due Diligence in each case.

At the time of writing this report, it is anticipated the CoLAT Board will also have given its approval for TCAH and the COLAI to transfer to CoLAT on 11 March 2020.

These proposals have the support of the two co-sponsors of TCAH and COLAI (KPMG and the City, University of London, respectively), the Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC), and local authorities for the areas in which the secondary schools are located, Hackney and Islington.

In order to secure the arrangements being in place by September 2020, the start of the new academic year, given the endorsement of the above key stakeholders, initial discussions/negotiations are already underway with the RSC and the Department for Education (DfE).

To further inform the CoLC’s decisions, Due Diligence Reports are provided at **Appendices 1 and 2 (non-public)**; and the key academic results of all CoLC sponsored secondary academies are provided **Appendix 3**.

Recommendation(s)

It is recommended that with the endorsement of the Education Board, that Policy and Resources Committee resolve to recommend to the Court of Common Council that:

- The City of London Corporation approve the transfer of The City Academy, Hackney and the City of London Academy Islington to the City of London Academies Trust.

- Funding of up to £20,000 be allocated for legal and professional services to protect the City Corporation's interests.
- Authority be delegated to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of both Policy and Resources Committee and the Education Board, to take any decisions or steps required to give effect to this decision.

Main Report

Background

1. The City of London Corporation (CoLC) first became an academy sponsor with the opening of City of London Academy, Southwark in 2003 (sole sponsored), followed by the City of London Academy Islington (COLAI) opening in 2008 (co-sponsored by City, University of London (City University)) and The City Academy, Hackney (TCAH) opening in 2009 (co-sponsored by KPMG). Each of these academies were established as companies limited by guarantee and are exempt charities.
2. Following the decision by CoLC to apply for and sponsor further Free Schools, the Court of Common Council resolved in January 2016 to support changes to the governance of the City of London Academies, Southwark (as it then was, having taken on another school since it was first incorporated) such that that academy trust company would become the legal vehicle for all subsequent CoLC sponsored academies. The company was renamed "The City of London Academies Trust". The CoLC now sponsors ten academies with only TCAH and COLAI operating outside of CoLAT.
3. On 2 December 2019 the Governing Body of COLAI resolved: "to support the proposal for the Academy to join the City of London Academies Trust (CoLAT) and for the Academy's Joint Sponsors to enter into formal discussions to that end". This proposal also has the support of City University as co-sponsor of the COLAI. On 22 January 2020 the governing body of TCAH resolved: "That it supports in principle the proposal for the Academy to join the City of London Academies Trust and for the Academy's joint sponsors to enter into formal discussions to that end." This proposal has the support of KPMG as co-sponsor for TCAH.

Current Position

4. Both the London Borough of Hackney in the case of TCAH, and the London Borough of Islington in the case of COLAI, are supportive of these proposals. In addition, the Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC), whose consent is required, has, on the advice of the Headteachers Forum at their meeting on 29 January 2020, also approved these academies joining CoLAT.
5. On 16 January 2020 the Education Board resolved that the Town Clerk be authorised, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of that Committee, to provide the CoLC's written consent (as required under the CoLC's Sponsorship Agreement with CoLAT) to the expansion of CoLAT by the transfer of TCAH and COLAI, subject to the Town Clerk being satisfied of the outcome of the Due Diligence exercise in each case. The Due Diligence Reports are attached as **Appendices 1 and 2**. In addition, on 11 March 2020 it is expected that the CoLAT Board will also give its approval to the transfer of TCAH and the COLAI to CoLAT.

6. Both KPMG and City University have given clear indications that they will continue to support the relevant academies should they join CoLAT. KPMG have written confirming their intention to continue supporting TCAH at an equivalent level to that presently provided should the school join CoLAT. Equally, City University has confirmed its intention to continue with its unchanged support should COLAI join CoLAT. This would be dependent on there being agreement between TCAH, COLAI and CoLAT as to any changes to CoLAT's governance, and/or the make-up of the new governing bodies for TCAH and COLAI, to provide for appropriate continued participation by KPMG and City University in the running of those schools. (Academy governing bodies are sub-committees of the CoLAT Board of Trustees/Directors.)
7. Having regard to the anticipated timetable for the transfers of TCAH and COLAI (by September 2020, the beginning of the academic year), and the endorsement of the proposals by key stakeholders as noted above, discussions/negotiations with the RSC and the Department for Education (DfE) have commenced. The process for transfer of both academy trust undertakings will next involve - new Supplementary Funding Agreements for each academy school under the CoLAT Master Funding Agreement (which may also require amendment); the novation of leases; and necessary staff consultations for Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) (TUPE), etc. The TCAH and COLAI companies will also need to be dissolved at the appropriate time.
8. Given the clear intention of our co-sponsors of TCAH and COLAI that they will continue to provide an equivalent level of assistance to that which they currently provide, and the broader benefits to the schools from the support and expertise of being part of CoLAT, from the CoLC's perspective as academy sponsor in each case there is a strong argument to support the proposed consolidation of the undertakings within CoLAT. There will be clear advantages in the delivery of education and in operating through one legal entity, achieved through economies of scale, consolidation of expertise and support (governance, teaching and administrative), and mitigation of risk. Furthermore, insofar as the CoLC is concerned, in delivering on our educational vision the new arrangements will enable more targeted and cohesive support to the academy trust itself and its schools (whether governance, financial, administrative or in-kind support).

Proposals

9. This report seeks approval of the CoLC as sponsor of CoLAT, and co-sponsor of TCAH and COLAI, for the transfer of the co-sponsored academies to CoLAT.
10. By giving our approval, the three academy trusts can continue the discussions/negotiations with the RSC and the DfE for a Supplementary Funding Agreement for TCAH and for the COLAI, progress changes to property/lease arrangements, and undertake the necessary staff consultations for Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) (TUPE), with an aim that arrangements will be in place by September 2020, the beginning of the next academic year.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

11. This proposal delivers on the following strategic objectives of the CoLC:

- a. to contribute to the outcomes within the CoLC's Corporate Plan to 'Promote effective progression through fulfilling education and employment', and 'to contribute to a flourishing society' as its aim;
- b. the CoLC Education Strategy for pupils in the City family of schools to have access to transformative education, enabling to achieve their potential, flourish and thrive.
- c. the Department of Community and Children's Services Business Plan's priority objective 'Potential', which states: "People of all ages can achieve their ambitions through education, training and lifelong learning", with the outcome to be achieved by "Delivering an outstanding education offer through the City of London family of schools".

Implications

12. All free schools are funded directly by the Education and Skills Funding Agency and there will be no financial liability to the CoLC from the proposed transfers as the schools would become part of CoLAT, a separate legal entity to the CoLC. However, consistent with its role in supporting the delivery of the Education Strategy, the Education Board may choose to make discretionary grants from its central risk budget to benefit any of the academy trusts and schools, and the proposed changes may impact upon how those funds are allocated.
13. The transfer of the TCAH and CoLAI undertakings (which will include assets and liabilities) is likely to involve:
 - TCAH, COLAI, CoLAT and the Secretary of State for Education entering into a deed of novation and variation in respect of existing funding agreements or entering into new Supplemental Funding Agreements for TCAH and COLAI;
 - A TUPE transfer of staff to CoLAT;
 - Transfer agreements between the parties in respect of assets and liabilities;
 - CoLAT and other relevant parties entering into land agreements so that the schools can continue to operate from their current sites
14. The existing TCAH and CoLAI companies will then be dissolved. Existing company members and Directors'/Trustees'/Governors' roles within those companies will then cease. The extent to which those individuals will continue to have a role within CoLAT will need to be considered, and will be a matter for agreement. As noted above, the extent to which the previous co-sponsors, KPMG and City University, will have an involvement in the governance of the schools they previously co-sponsored or otherwise in the governance of CoLAT will also need to be agreed with the co-sponsors in advance of any transfer. Changes may be required to CoLAT's governance, or otherwise formally agreed separately between the parties.
15. Due to the specialist nature of the arrangements external professional advice is likely to be required. Consistent with the previous approach adopted in reviewing academy trust governance, it is likely to be prudent for the CoLC as sponsor of CoLAT, and co-sponsor of TCAH and COLAI, to lead in obtaining such advice and for us to share it with other parties in a collaborative way. To the extent that any conflict or potential conflict arises, parties could then take separate advice. The CoLC will wish to ensure that the CoLC's interests and educational vision are protected, and specifically that its influence as sole sponsor of CoLAT is not eroded

in putting in place arrangements for the on-going support of KPMG to TCAH and City University to COLAI.

Conclusion

16. TCAH and COLAI are the only two of ten academies sponsored by the CoLC which are not within CoLAT. By joining CoLAT the benefits provided by the existing co-sponsors could be retained for each school, while also gaining the economies of scale, support and expertise CoLAT offers. From the CoLC's perspective, as sponsor, these academies will be better managed and supported by operating within CoLAT. It is recommended that the CoLC give its formal approval to the proposal to enable the three academy trust companies to progress the discussions/negotiations for the transfers, with the aim that arrangements will be in place by September 2020, the beginning of the next academic year.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – COLAI Due Diligence Report (non-public)
- Appendix 2 – TCAH Due Diligence Report (non-public)
- Appendix 3 – CoLC sponsored secondary academies - academic results 2019

Gerald Mehrtens

Director of Academy Development,
Department of Community and Children's Services
T: 020 7332 xxxx
E: gerald.mehrtens@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

CoLC sponsored academies - Key Stage 4 performance in 2019

Overall performance at end of key stage 4 in 2019 - all pupils ?

Showing 6 schools

School name ?	Type of school ?	Number of pupils at end of key stage 4 ?	Progress 8 ?		Entering EBacc ?	Staying in education or entering employment (2017 leavers) ?	Grade 5 or above in English & maths GCSEs ?	Attainment 8 score ?	EBacc average point score ?
			Number of pupils included in this measure ?	Score & description ?					
City of London Academy, Highgate Hill Add to My schools list	Academy	67	60	Average 0.23 ?	13%	=	48%	47.2	3.89
The City Academy, Hackney Add to My schools list	Academy	172	163	Average 0.08 ?	97%	96% (168 of 175 pupils)	37%	47.8	4.42
City of London Academy Islington View My schools list ✕ Remove	Academy	113	108	Average -0.07 ?	50%	93% (82 of 88 pupils)	31%	41.1	3.79
City of London Academy Highbury Grove ? Add to My schools list	Academy	196	189	Below average -0.41 ?	67%	=	37%	41.8	3.94
City of London Academy (Southwark) Add to My schools list	Academy	234	229	Below average -0.47 ?	79%	95% (180 of 190 pupils)	36%	44.7	3.85
City of London Academy, Shoreditch Park Add to My schools list	Academy	No data available or applicable for this school or college							
England - state-funded schools		542568	512912	-0.03	40%	94% (497037 of 528139 pupils)	43%	46.7	4.07
England - all schools		604907			37%		40%	44.7	3.87

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s) Education Board – For information Policy and Resources Committee – For decision	Dated: 5 March 2020 19 March 2020
Subject: Summer Enrichment Pilot 2019 Evaluation	Public
Report of: Andrew Carter – Director of Community and Children’s Services	For information
Report Author: Jessica Walsh – Corporate Strategy and Performance Officer	

Summary

In January 2019, the City of London Corporation (City Corporation) approved £100,000 for a summer enrichment pilot to tackle summer learning loss and summer hunger and offer meaningful and enjoyable activities for pupils and young people in the London Borough of Islington during July and August 2019. The pilot was part of a wider programme of work relating to the City Corporation’s Social Mobility Strategy for 2018-28 – in particular the strategic outcome that ‘*Opportunity is accessed more evenly and equally across society*’, by removing barriers, overcoming gaps and improving access and participation, in order to improve attainment for our pupils experiencing disadvantage or poverty¹. This paper presents the evaluation of the pilot and recommends the City Corporation does not continue to fund summer enrichment activity of this sort in 2020 but continues to be an advocate for enrichment activities aimed at boosting social mobility. The City of London Family of Schools will continue to be invited to apply for funding to support relevant enrichment opportunities through the City Premium Grants fund. This evaluation will inform the work of other organisations, such as the Mayor’s Fund for London who provide vital advocacy and leadership support in London on summer hunger, and those who are considering offering activities aimed at children and young people.

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- i. Note the report and its findings, namely that the City Corporation is best placed to advocate and fund enrichment activities aimed at boosting social mobility for young Londoners, but that schools and local organisations are best placed to design and deliver programmes related to the needs of young people.

¹ <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/business/responsible-city/Documents/social-mobility-strategy-2018-28.pdf>

Main Report

Background and Acknowledgements

1. The idea for the City Corporation to deliver a summer enrichment pilot aimed at tackling summer hunger and summer learning loss, whilst also supporting summer enrichment activities, was led on by Sir Mark Boleat, a former elected Member and Chairman of Policy and Resources for the City Corporation². The pilot was delivered in addition to a variety of enrichment activities including summer schools already offered by a number of the schools within the City Family of Schools, which are funded through the City Premium Grants the school receives.
2. During the school summer holidays, children from low-income families are thought to be at risk from hunger, boredom and social isolation and evidence suggests a gap in educational attainment between children from different socio-economic backgrounds during the holiday³. Therefore, the City Corporation chose to run the pilot in Islington, which is ranked in the most deprived 30 per cent of English local authorities in the 2019 Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) Index, with it also scoring 27.5 per cent in the IMD Index 2019 for the proportion of children living in income deprived households, ranking tenth in the country, and first across the London Boroughs⁴. The pilot intended to assess if the intervention trialled had any cumulative effect on summer hunger and educational attainment and was run in both a school-based (City of London Academy Highbury Grove (CoLAHG)) and non-school-based environment with a target to engage around 400 young people.
3. The design and delivery of the pilot was project managed and delivered by the City Corporation's Corporate Strategy Manager and Corporate Strategy Officer based in the Town Clerk's department, with expert input from the Strategic Education and Skills Director based in the Community and Children's Services department. The City Corporation extends gratitude to the following partners that were instrumental in designing the pilot:
 - a) **The Mayor's Fund for London Kitchen Social Programme Team** for providing advice and insights into the criteria that the projects, including their learning and evaluation, should meet.
 - b) **The Cripplegate Foundation** – for commissioning the two community-based project partners to deliver the pilot.
 - c) **The City of London Academy Highbury Grove** – for hosting the school-based pilot and commissioned the project partner to deliver the pilot based within the school, as well as providing their own staffing and resources to support the project's delivery.

²<http://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/documents/s108130/Summer%20Enrichment%20Pilot%20PR%20and%20PRED%20Paper%20-%20Jan%2019%20FINAL.pdf>

³ https://www.mayorsfundforlondon.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Mayors-Fund-for-London_Kitchen-Social_Evaluation-Report-1_Nov18.pdf

⁴https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/835115/IOD2_019_Statistical_Release.pdf

- d) **Northumbria University** – the delivery partner for the learning and evaluation report.
- e) **All Change** (registered Charity No. 293972) – for delivering a community-based pilot in Islington.
- f) **Global Generation** (registered Charity No. 1106420) – delivered a community-based pilot in Islington.
- g) **Future Foundations** – led the delivery of the school-based pilot at CoLAHG.

Learning and Evaluation

4. Due to the number of partners involved, five separate pieces of evaluation and learnings were organised to analyse the effectiveness of the pilot. Three of the projects were delivered through Northumbria University and Mayor's Fund for London (available on request). A further two studies were organised internally by City Corporation staff, and the findings of these are covered in the full evaluation report attached as **Appendix One**.
5. The practical findings of the reports are presented as the following:
 - The three pilots broadly met their stated aims:
 - To provide experiential learning, physical activity, workshops and team building exercises that promoted critical thinking, communication, collaboration and creativity.
 - To bridge the summer learning gap by developing new skills and confidence in participants, introducing participants to new experiences and opportunities, giving participants a chance to meet new people as well as helping to shape ideas about their own futures.
 - To bring young people, children and families together in the centre of the ward through the creation of a vibrant, shared, pop-up cooking, eating and making space - 'The Cally Table'.
 - To take young people out of their local area to experience something new.
 - To give a core group of young people the opportunity to develop a range of leadership skills, leading to the delivery through August of activities for the community.
 - Whilst a school-based environment was less appealing to participants, interestingly, mean attendance rates were higher at the school-based holiday than the community-based holiday club. However, it is not clear why this was the case. It is likely due to the fact that the school-based provision was only a weeklong and the community-based provision was often competing with other provision/activity being offered in the area. This highlights the issue of the crowded marketplace and many families had already arranged provision for their children affecting take up.
 - 122 young people engaged with the pilot - broken down as 56 participants at CoLAHG and 26 at B Creative and 40 at Global Generation Summer. The average age of participants at B Creative and Global Generation Summer was 17 years old.
 - More boys than girls registered to attend the school-based provision, with the reverse pattern observed in relation to community-based clubs.
 - Take up of the pilot was largely from children from better off families.

- The trips included in the projects were what engaged and interested children the most.
 - Hunger did not seem to be an issue for the children, and they did not particularly enjoy the healthy food provided.
 - The short lead in times from funding to delivery proved an issue to participation. For example, Global Generation recruited 35 people to the project, but only 17 participants who attended regularly. The providers felt had they had more time to promote the provision take up would have been better.
 - Offering provision at different times of the day, such as in the evenings, may benefit some children and young people more.
 - The involvement of teachers and sixth form mentors at the CoLAHG Summer School was helpful in supporting participants to build relationships and rapport with them.
 - Combining the learning and evaluation into one unified process, rather than having a programme of work that split into five areas would be more effective.
6. Evaluation of summer learning loss showed that fusion skills were retained and enhanced through the pilots, but there was no statistically significant evidence that the Year 6 participants who attended the pilot did better in terms of either academic attainment or behaviour and attendance during their first term of Year 7 than those that had not attended the programme.
7. Overall the delivery partners of the projects spoke positively about their experiences, as did the participants, but noted the potential reach and attendance of 122 was disappointing, effectively working out at £76 - £261 per child per day, though the cost per child per day would have been lower if attendance rates had been higher. The delivery partners also felt that the pilot would have been more impactful if it had focussed on either summer learning loss or summer hunger.

Proposals

8. Whilst the findings demonstrated some positive outcomes for participants in terms of their fusion skills, there is no compelling evidence that the pilots addressed summer learning loss or summer hunger. Furthermore, supporting 122 participants at a cost of circa £96,683.20 does not represent the best value for money. The City Corporation does have a City Premium Grants programme which is available to all of the City of London 'family of schools', including CoLAHG, and funding for summer activities aimed at pupils should be granted through this.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

9. This pilot supported the Social Mobility Strategy for 2018-28, which was adopted by the City Corporation in September 2019, and includes an outcome that states that 'Opportunity is accessed more evenly and equally across society', by removing barriers, overcoming gaps and improving access and participation in order to improve attainment for our pupils experiencing disadvantage or poverty⁵. It also links to outcome 3 in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan for 2018-23,

⁵ <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/business/responsible-city/Documents/social-mobility-strategy-2018-28.pdf>

which states that ‘People have equal opportunities to enrich their lives and reach their full potential’⁶.

Conclusion

10. Members are invited to share the findings outlined in this pilot to inform summer enrichment work aimed at young people to address issues of summer hunger and summer learning loss. The evaluation of the pilot proposes the City Corporation is best placed to advocate for summer enrichment activity aimed at boosting social mobility for young Londoners, where are schools and local organisations are best placed to lead the design and delivery of programmes. It is hoped that this evaluation will inform the work of other organisations, such as the Mayor’s Fund for London who provide vital advocacy and leadership support in London on summer hunger, and those who are considering offering activities aimed at children and young people over the summer. The findings of Northumbria University commend the ‘positive support and strong strategic direction given to the proposal from the City Corporation’. The City Corporation continues to be supportive of innovative programmes to boost social mobility.

Jessica Walsh

Corporate Strategy and Performance Officer

jessica.walsh@cityoflondon.gov.uk

0207 332 3965

Background paper

Summer Enrichment Pilot – Proposal – January 2019

<http://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/documents/s108130/Summer%20Enrichment%20Pilot%20PR%20and%20PRED%20Paper%20-%20Jan%2019%20FINAL.pdf>

Appendices

1. Summer Enrichment Pilot September 2019 – Learning Report

⁶ <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/business/responsible-city/Documents/social-mobility-strategy-2018-28.pdf>

This page is intentionally left blank



Executive Summary

In January 2019, the City of Corporation) approved a £100,000 pilot for a summer enrichment pilot tackling summer learning loss and summer hunger and offering meaningful and enjoyable activities for pupils and young people in the London Borough of Islington during July and August 2019. The pilot was part of a wider programme of work relating to the City Corporation's Social Mobility Strategy for 2018-28 – in particular the strategic outcome that '*Opportunity is accessed more evenly and equally across society*', by removing barriers, overcoming gaps and improving access and participation in order to improve attainment for our pupils experiencing disadvantage or poverty¹.

There is strong evidence that pupils from all backgrounds tend to make comparable achievement gains during the school year. However, during the long summer holiday, pupils experiencing poverty and socio-economic disadvantage make more learning losses, than their more advantaged counterparts, and this is exacerbated for pupils experiencing summer hunger². Summer enrichment programmes, which are a combination of learning, enrichment and meals, have may work effectively in tackling summer learning loss and summer hunger³.

The pilot took place as three separate projects delivered by:

1. **The City of London Academy Highbury Grove (CoLAHG) in partnership with Future Foundations**
2. **Global Generation** (registered Charity No. 1106420)
3. **All Change** (registered Charity No. 293972).

The three projects cost £96,683.20 to deliver, with the work of Global Generation and All Change taking place in community-based venues in Islington, and the work of Future Foundations taking place on-site at the CoLAHG. There is much that the three projects had in common in terms of the activities and quality of food offered, with many focussing on experiential learning, fusions skills, and creative and participatory projects. The projects lasted for one to six weeks, and many adhered to some, but not all of the design principles that were set out when the pilot was originally designed – namely the pilots being delivered as four hours a day, for four days a week, over four weeks.

It is recommended that based on the findings the City Corporation does not continue to fund summer enrichment activity of this sort in 2020, but the City of London family of schools is invited to apply for funding to support enrichment work through the City

¹ <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/business/responsible-city/Documents/social-mobility-strategy-2018-28.pdf>

² https://www.mayorsfundforlondon.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Mayors-Fund-for-London_Kitchen-Social_Evaluation-Report-1_Nov18.pdf

³ https://www.mayorsfundforlondon.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Mayors-Fund-for-London_Kitchen-Social_Evaluation-Report-1_Nov18.pdf

Premium Grants fund. The City Corporation should advocate for enriching summer-based activities aimed at young Londoners, but schools and local organisations are best places to design and deliver programmes. Likewise, it is hoped that this evaluation will inform the work of other organisations, such as the Mayor's Fund for London who provide vital advocacy and leadership support in London on summer hunger, and those who are considering offering activities aimed at children and young people over the summer. Ultimately, the City Corporation is supportive of enrichment opportunities.

Background and Acknowledgements

1. The idea for the City Corporation to deliver a summer enrichment pilot aimed at tackling summer hunger and summer learning loss, whilst also supporting summer enrichment activities, was led on by Sir Mark Boleat, a former elected Member and Chairman of Policy and Resources for the City Corporation⁴. It is evidenced and supported that pupils from all backgrounds tend to make comparable achievement gains during the school year. However, during the long summer holiday, pupils experiencing poverty and socio-economic disadvantage may make more learning losses than their more advantaged counterparts. This summer learning loss is suspected, in part, to be due to a paucity of stimulating and enriching summer activities, resources and investments for pupils, and tends to be exacerbated by summer hunger – again something that most impacts pupils on free school meals (FSM) and/or those experiencing other forms of poverty and disadvantage⁵. Summer hunger is also a UK Government priority, as evidenced through their launch of a £2 million fund by the Children and Families Minister in the Department for Education for pilots to provide free holiday activities and meals to disadvantaged families in the 2019 Easter and summer holidays⁶. This decision was motivated by evidence showing the positive impact of enrichment provision on children's educational, health and wellbeing outcomes, as well as continued campaigning on the summer hunger issue by Frank Field MP.
2. The design and delivery of the pilot required extensive levels of project management delivered by the City Corporation's Corporate Strategy Manager and Corporate Strategy Officer based in the Town Clerk's department, with expert input from the Strategic Education and Skills Director based in the Community and Children's Services department. The City Corporation extends deep gratitude to the following partners that were instrumental in designing the pilot:
 - a) The Mayor's Fund for London Kitchen Social Programme Team
 - b) The Cripplegate Foundation
 - c) The City of London Academy Highbury Grove
 - d) Northumbria University
 - e) Future Foundations

⁴<http://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/documents/s108130/Summer%20Enrichment%20Pilot%20PR%20and%20PRED%20Paper%20-%20Jan%2019%20FINAL.pdf>

⁵ https://www.mayorsfundforlondon.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Mayors-Fund-for-London_Kitchen-Social_Evaluation-Report-1_Nov18.pdf

⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/boost-to-support-disadvantaged-families-during-the-holidays>

- f) Global Generation (registered Charity No. 1106420)
- g) All Change (registered Charity No. 293972).

The Pilot – Design Principles

3. £100,000 of private City Corporation funding was allocated to the pilot, and a target to support 400-450 children and young people was set. The pilot was designed as a test and learn pilot, with Northumbria University engaged to deliver a learning and evaluation report on the work, alongside this learning report compiled by internal officers.
4. The pilot was carried out in the London Borough of Islington. Islington is ranked in the most deprived 30 per cent of English local authorities in the 2019 Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) Index, with it also scoring 27.5 per cent in the IMD Index 2019 for the proportion of children living in income deprived households, ranking tenth in the country, and first across the London Boroughs⁷.
5. The CoLAHG, which is part of the City Corporation's family of schools was chosen as a test site for the pilot as 70% of its pupils are on pupil premium, over half are on free school meals (FSM) and the school were keen to be selected as a pilot test site. Given that there is a range of research suggesting that the most socio-economically disadvantaged pupils and their families are less likely to engage with schools during the summer⁸, the community-based summer enrichment pilots were open to any and all children and young people with a connection to Islington, i.e. they do not have to be a pupil at one of the City Corporation's schools.
6. The design of the pilot was primarily supported by colleagues working at the Mayor's Fund for London on their Kitchen Social programme. The pilot was designed to be delivered in both a school and non-school based environment, and to include activities that addressed summer learning loss, summer hunger and summer enrichment, with the following embedded principles:
 - a) A varied range of activities that attract a diverse range of pupils from different socio-economic backgrounds, in order to support summer learning, summer hunger and enrichment, such as cooking classes, sports, meaningful exposure to the world of work, access to and enjoyment of cultural activities etc.
 - b) An emphasis on attracting pupils experiencing the most socio-economic disadvantage and involving families in order to further catalyse a whole family approach to education.
 - c) Implementation of the 4x4x4 formula, meaning a programme of activities delivered for four hours a day, over four days a week, for four weeks.
 - d) Setting stretch targets for the number of pupils engaging with the pilots and the duration of their commitment, e.g. 50% attendance.

⁷https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/835115/IdD2019_Statistical_Release.pdf

⁸ <https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/6639/1/DCSF-RW004.pdf>

The Pilot – What Was Commissioned

7. The following partners and their role in delivering this pilot are summarised below:

- a) **The Mayor's Fund for London Kitchen Social Programme Team** – provided advice and insights into the criteria that the projects, including their learning and evaluation, should meet.
- b) **The Cripplegate Foundation** – commissioned the two community-based project partners to deliver the pilot.
- c) **The City of London Academy Highbury Grove** – hosted the school-based pilot and commissioned the project partner to deliver the pilot based within the school, as well as providing their own staffing and resources to support the project's delivery.
- d) **Northumbria University** – the delivery partner for the learning and evaluation report.
- e) **All Change** (registered Charity No. 293972) – delivered a community-based pilot in Islington.
- f) **Global Generation** (registered Charity No. 1106420) – delivered a community-based pilot in Islington.
- g) **Future Foundations** – led the delivery of the school-based pilot at CoLAHG.

8. The costs of the pilot are summarised below:

Partner	Summary of work	Cost
All Change	Delivery of a community-based summer enrichment pilot.	£17,400
CoLAHG	Hosting and supporting the delivery of the school-based summer enrichment pilot.	£12,249.20; split into £10,845.20 (Staffing) and £1,404.00 (Catering)
Cripplegate Foundation	Administration fees for commissioning both All Change and Global Generation on behalf of the City Corporation	£7,000
Future Foundations	Delivery of a school-based summer enrichment pilot.	£31,510
Global Generation	Delivery of a community-based summer enrichment pilot.	£23,524
Mayor's Fund for London	Delivery of a learning and evaluation report of the City Corporation's Summer Enrichment Pilot	£5,000
Total		£96,683.20

9. The three projects delivered the following work:

Programme name:	CoLAHG Summer School
Partners involved:	Future Foundation and CoLAHG
Dates of programme:	Create Your Future (Years 5 and 6), from 29 July 2019 to 31 July 2019 Bright Futures (Years 8 and 9), from 19 August 2019 to 23 August 2019

	(8.45am to 3.30pm daily, for five days, for one week per project)
Location of programme:	CoLAHG, with two off-site days on 31 July 2019 and 22 August 2019
Summary of activities delivered:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each programme offered breakfast and lunches and healthy snacks/refreshments during break times and were led by team coaches. • The programmes focussed on experiential learning, physical activity, workshops and team building exercises that promoted critical thinking, communication, collaboration and creativity. • Each day was structured with specific timings for each activity. • The Bright Futures programmes focussed specifically on English, sustainability, future world of work skills sessions and leadership development. • The Create Your Future programme focussed specifically on preparing participants for success in secondary school by improving general skills, confidence, aspirations, team working and friendship building. This programme also aimed to engage parent/carers of attendees positively with the CoLAHG. 	

Programme name:	B Creative
Partners involved:	All Change
Dates of programme:	29 July 2019 to 2 August 2019 6 August 2019 to 9 August 2019 12 August 2019 to 15 August 2019 19 August 2019 to 22 August 2019 (11am to 4pm daily, for four days, for four weeks)
Location of programme:	Various, including Platform Youth Hub, Autograph ABP, Impact Hub Islington, Apple Store Covent Garden
Summary of activities delivered:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lunch was offered on each day of the project. • The programme was run as an integrated arts summer school, that was co-produced by young women, for young women aged 16-19 years old, with a particular focus on attracting young women who face barriers to participation, including young carers, looked after young women, those on low incomes, women with disabilities and young parents. Some young women were still in education, others were looking to sustain learning while not accessing formal education. • The programme aimed to bridge the summer learning gap by developing new skills and confidence in participants, introducing participants to new experiences and opportunities, giving participants a chance to meet new people as well as helping to shape ideas about their own futures. • All participants were invited to complete the Arts Award accreditation Level 1-3, • The programme involved collaborations with professional artists, opening up local spaces and partnership working with other arts organisations in Islington. • The focus of each week was as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Week 1: integrated dance project with Candoco Dance Company - Week 2: Photography activism project with Autograph ABP - Week 3: Tech activism project with Furtherfield - Week 4: Arts Award and event planning, leading to a two-day arts festival 	

Programme name:	Global Generation Summer 2019
Partners involved:	Global Generation
Dates of programme:	23 July 2019 to 26 July 2019 (pre-programme, optional) 30 July 2019 to 2 August 2019 (pre-programme, optional) 6 August 2019 to 9 August 2019 13 August 2019 to 16 August 2019 20 August 2019 to 23 August 2019 27 August 2019 to 30 August 2019 (Four hours, for four days, for up to six weeks)
Location of programme:	When not off site, activities took place between the King's Cross Skip Garden on Tapper Walk, N1C 4AQ and the Cally Resource Centre in the Caledonian ward of Islington, at 140 Copenhagen Street, N1 0SG
Summary of activities delivered:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pre-programme offered lunch each day, as well as cooking and carpentry classes and an opportunity to design elements of the main programme. The main programme offered lunch every day, and a range of activities including design, cookery and carpentry classes; off-site trips and visits outside of Islington, including a trip to Lion King at the Lyceum Theatre; and youth leadership sessions and volunteering opportunities. The programmes were co-created by a group of specially recruited Youth Leaders. The Youth Leaders were supported through the pre-programme to develop the skills necessary to work together, to design a service and to lead activity sessions within the community. The three core strands to the programme included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bringing young people, children and families together in the centre of the ward through the creation of a vibrant, shared, pop-up cooking, eating and making space - 'The Cally Table'. - Taking young people out of their local area to experience something new. - Giving a core group of young people the opportunity to develop a range of leadership skills, leading to the delivery through August of activities for the community. 	

Learning and Evaluation for the Pilot

10. To analyse the effectiveness of this pilot, five pieces of learning and evaluation were organised – with three of the projects being delivered through Northumbria University and Mayor's Fund for London, and these will be reported on in separate reports. A further two studies were organised internally by City Corporation staff, and the findings of these will be covered in this report. The learning and evaluation that was commissioned is summarised in the table below:

Learning and Evaluation Commissioned		CoLAHG and Future Foundations	All Change	Global Generation
Part 1 – Northumbria University (in partnership with Mayor's Fund for London)	a) Data collection booklet (child characteristics, daily attendance log, daily activity log*)	✓	✓	✓

	b) Physical Activity Study	✓	-	-
	c) Young People's Perspective Study	-	✓	-
Part 2 – City of London Corporation	a) Fusion skills evaluation survey	✓	✓	✓
	b) Learning loss study	✓	-	-

* Under each of these headings, the following data is collected:

- *Child characteristics: Age, Gender, FSM eligibility*
- *Daily attendance log: Logs attendance for half day or fully day, and meal only.*
- *Daily activity log: Total number of meals served, types of meal served, total hours of activity, range of activities, total hours of structured physical activity, photos of meals served.*

11. A more detailed description of each component of the learning and evaluation programme is outlined below:

Study 1a - Data collection booklet

This booklet was completed by all three programmes as follows:

- Child (participant) characteristics: to be completed at the beginning of the programme, or as when new participants join the programme.
- Daily attendance log: to be completed each day of the programme.
- Daily activity log: to be completed each day of the programme. Photos of all meals served should be taken and saved with the data for digital submission.

Study 1b) Physical activity

This study involved a questionnaire that collected data on what activities children take part in and how long they take part in them at the summer programme during the school holidays. The research picks up on any physical activity they take part in i.e. walking, running, activities, and also how they travel to and from the programme. The visits to the project to administer the questionnaire took place on 2 July 2019 and 23 August 2019.

Study 1c) Young People's Perspective

This study captured the insights of young people taking part in the summer enrichment programmes, to gather their views on the programmes, how they are run, and what improvements could be made. The purpose of this study is to gather the views of young people to help design the future provision of summer enrichment programmes.

Study 2a) Fusion skills evaluation survey

This study was designed to capture participants views about the programme from all three projects and their own self-perception about the impact of the programme on their 'soft' or 'fusion' skills. It is being used as a measure of 'proxies' for learning i.e. the presence or absence of general qualities and behaviours associated with better educational progress, attainment and employability.

Study 2b) Learning loss

This study was carried out at CoLAHG only as it is only the education-based provider who can access pupil level data to evaluate whether participation in summer programmes has an impact on learning loss. The study reviewed Year 6 pupil progress, attainment and school attendance as proxies for measures to track learning. The study compared the SATs results of participants prior to involvement in the programme, with their academic achievement and progress post-programme as evidenced through the first termly data assessment reporting period in November 2019. This data was compared with a control group (those not involved in the programme) to provide comparison data. The study looked at potential changes in the behaviour (as evidenced through 'behaviour points') and through the school attendance of the pupils who participated in the summer programme compared with other pupils in the same year (the control group) to assess whether attendance was higher or lower and whether behaviour was better or worse.

Findings from the Pilot

12. The findings outlined in this section relate to the fusion skills evaluation survey and the learning loss study, described as Studies 2a and 2b respectively in the previous section of this report. There were 85 responses to the fusion skills evaluation survey, and the findings are as follows:

CoLAHG Summer School – 49 (57.7%) of the 85 responses received.

B Creative – 28 (32.9%) of the 85 responses received.

Global Generation Summer 2019 – 8 (9.4%) of the 85 responses received.

In total each project reached the following number of people:

CoLAHG Summer School – 56 children and young people

B Creative – 26 children and young people

Global Generation Summer 2019 – 40 children and young people

This means that 57.7%, 32.9% and 9.4% of participants in the CoLAHG Summer School, B Creative and Global Generation Summer 2019 pilots engaged with the fusion skills evaluation survey. The greatest level of take up with the survey was seen at CoLAHG, with the least amount of take up with the survey in Global Generation Summer – and this should be taken into consideration when reviewing the survey results.

Study 2a, Fusion Skills Evaluation Survey – Key Findings

Age and location of attendees

The pilots supported 122 children and young people – of those the 85 that completed the survey were aged 11-25 years. They all had a connection to Islington, with 66 (78%) living in the borough too, alongside 19 (22%) other participants living in the London Boroughs of Barnet, Bromley, Camden, Enfield, Greenwich, Hackney, Haringey, Harrow, Hounslow, Redbridge and Tower Hamlets.

Perspectives on the programme

Those filling in the survey were asked if they **agreed (A)**, **disagreed (D)** or **neither agreed or disagreed (N)** on if they liked the room/s they were in; if the place/s were interesting; if they felt safe; and if they felt relaxed. The results are summarised below:

Question	CoLAHG Summer School (49 responses)	B Creative (28 responses)	Global Generation Summer 2019 (8 responses)
Did you like the room/s you were in?	76% A 24% N	100% A	87% A 13% N
Was the place/s interesting?	59% A 39% N 2% D	89% A 11% N	100% A
Did you feel safe?	90% A 8% N 2% D	96% A 4% N	100% A
Did you feel relaxed?	59% A 33% N 8% D	96% A 4% N	87% A 13% N

The majority of participants in all three pilots agreed with the statements given, however it is worth noting that for the CoLAHG Summer School there were greater levels of participants selecting the 'neither agree or disagree' option – however the numbers surveyed were higher for this pilot.

Participants were also asked if they would come to another summer programme, and if they would recommend the pilot they attended to other people. The results are summarised below:

Question	CoLAHG Summer School (49 responses)	B Creative (28 responses)	Global Generation Summer 2019 (8 responses)
Would you like to come to another summer programme?	10% No answer 29% Yes 10% No 51% Maybe	96% Yes 4% Maybe	100% Yes
Would you recommend this summer programme to other young people?	76% Yes 6% No 18% Maybe	93% Yes 7% Maybe	87% Yes 13% Maybe

The majority of participants in all three pilots would come to another summer programme, although for the CoLAHG Summer School 51% selected Maybe and 29% selected Yes. This could mean that non-school based locations for summer schools are preferred – indeed that is borne out in some of the free text

comments from the CoLAHG Summer School detailed below. All participants were positive about recommending the pilot they attended to others.

Free text responses were sought on the things that the children and young people particularly liked about the pilots they attended, which included responses such as:

Pilot	Feedback
CoLAHG Summer School	The games; the trip; the variety; the debate; the lava challenge; the coaches; the teachers; meeting new people; the games; hanging out with friends; team working; and the games.
B Creative	The dancing; creating placards; the dancing; the variety; having space to be creative; the photography; feeling inspired, united and able to be myself; meeting new people and learning about different perspectives.
Global Generation Summer 2019	The Lion King; the restaurant trip; the variety; meeting new people; and exploring my culture.

Free text responses were sought on the things that the children and young people thought could be improved about the pilots they attended, which included responses such as:

Pilot	Feedback
CoLAHG Summer School	Use a different location; start later; less school work; more sports; more outdoor activities; more breaks; and more trips.
B Creative	Very few responses – but some feedback on more breaks; an extra day; doing the arts award work in the mornings.
Global Generation Summer 2019	More trips; and more people.

Free text responses were sought for any other responses, which included:

Pilot	Feedback
CoLAHG Summer School	Quote from participant: <i>It helped with my confidence, in terms of leadership and communications. And everybody was different from the previous.</i>
B Creative	Quote from participant: <i>I have thoroughly enjoyed my time participating in the 'change the conversation' project. Getting to know a load of different people and hear about the things that are most important to them and acting on them in the form of a protest at the end of the week. When I am participating in the all change projects, I feel like my opinion matters I feel like my opinion matters and it is a safe space to discuss them freely.</i>

Global Generation Summer 2019	Quote from participant: <i>Thank you! I hope we can have more programmes like this in the future. I'd love to participate.</i>
--------------------------------------	--

Feedback on what participants saw, heard or learned

Those filling in the survey were asked if they **agreed (A)**, **disagreed (D)** or **neither agreed or disagreed (N)** with the following statements:

Question	CoLAHG Summer School (49 responses)	B Creative (28 responses)	Global Generation Summer 2019 (8 responses)
The adults who spoke were interesting	76% A 20% N 2% D 2% No answer	100% A	100% A
The adults were easy to talk to	73% A 22% N 3% D 2% No answer	96% A 4% N	87% A 13% No answer
They listened to me	84% A 10% N 4% D 2% No answer	96% A 4% N	87% A 13% No answer
I saw interesting things	69% A 24% N 5% D 2% No answer	86% A 14% N	87% A 13% No answer
I met new people	76% A 16% N 6% D 2% No answer	100% A	74% A 13% N 13% No answer
I was able to talk to people	84% A 12% N 2% D 2% No answer	93% A 7% N	74% A 13% N 13% No answer
I was able to work with new people	82% A 14% N 2% D 2% No answer	96% A 4% D	74% A 13% N 13% No answer
I could use initiative	69% A 27% N 2% D 2% No answer	96% A 4% N	61% A 13% N 13% D 13% No answer
There was problem solving	61% A 29% N 8% D 2% No answer	75% A 25% N	61% A 13% N 13% D 13% No answer
I was more organised	53% A 41% N	75% A 25% N	61% A 13% N

	4% D 2% No answer		13% D 13% No answer
I tried something new	76% A 16% N 6% D 2% No answer	96% A 4% N	87% A 13% No answer
There were chances to read and write	64% A 33% N 1% D 2% No answer	68% A 11% N 21% D	74% A 13% N 13% No answer
I had to work at something challenging	59% A 27% N 12% D 2% No answer	86% A 14% N	62% A 25% D 13% No answer
I could be creative	73% A 20% N 3% D 4% No answer	100% A	87% A 13% No answer
I could work on my own and in groups	73% A 18% N 5% D 4% No answer	100% A	62% A 25% D 13% No answer
The adults helped with me new ideas	78% A 18% N 2% D 2% No answer	89% A 11% N	87% A 13% No answer

The majority of participants in all three pilots have demonstrated progress in the areas covered in the survey, with no real issues to flag in terms of participants disagreeing with the statements.

Feedback on how helpful participants found the programme
with participants being asked to compare themselves to before they joined the programme

Those filling in the survey were asked if they **agreed (A)**, **disagreed (D)** or **neither agreed or disagreed (N)** with the following statements:

Question	CoLAHG Summer School (49 responses)	B Creative (28 responses)	Global Generation Summer 2019 (8 responses)
Feel more confident	69% A 27% N 2% D 2% No answer	96% A 4% N	74% A 13% N 13% No answer
Feel optimistic about the future	70% A 24% N 4% D 2% No answer	89% A 11% N	74% A 13% N 13% No answer

Bring my ideas to life	72% A 20% N 6% D 2% No answer	96% A 4% N	74% A 13% N 13% No answer
Be a better leader	64% A 31% N 4% D 2% No answer	68% A 29% N 3% D	63% A 25% N 12% No answer
Feel excited about my future	72% A 22% N 4% D 2% No answer	79% A 21% N	74% A 13% N 13% No answer
Think about new opportunities	74% A 22% N 2% D 2% No answer	89% A 11% N	63% A 25% N 12% No answer
Understand myself better as a person	61% A 31% N 6% D 2% No answer	71% A 29% N	50% A 25% N 12% D 13% No answer
Start to make some good choices	65% A 33% N 2% No answer	75% A 25% N	74% A 13% N 13% No answer
Feel more inspired	69% A 27% N 2% D 2% No answer	96% A 4% N	63% A 25% N 12% No answer
Take personal responsibility for my future	76% A 20% N 2% D 2% No answer	82% A 18% N	63% A 25% N 12% No answer
Pursue something I am interested in	71% A 27% N 2% No answer	89% A &% N 4% No answer	74% A 13% N 13% No answer
Get things done on time	67% A 29% N 2% D 2% No answer	82% A 18% N	50% A 25% N 25% No answer
Be my true self	74% A 20% N 4% D 2% No answer	93% A 7% N	87% A 13% No answer
Contribute my talents to the group	74% A 22% N 2% D 2% No answer	93% A 7% N	50% A 37% N 13% No answer
Be happy with myself	78% A 16% N 4% D 2% No answer	93% A 7% N	87% A 13% No answer

Other people like me	72% A 22% N 4% D 2% No answer	86% A 14% N	74% A 13% N 13% No answer
To have fun	80% A 18% N 2% No answer	100% A	87% A 13% No answer
Think about different things	74% A 22% N 4% No answer	89% A 11% N	87% A 13% No answer

The majority of participants in all three pilots have demonstrated progress in the areas covered in the survey, with no real issues to flag in terms of participants disagreeing with the statements. B Creative noted the greatest positive change.

Study 2b) Learning loss

Student	English attainment	English VA	Maths attainment	Maths VA	Attendance	Achievement points	Behaviour points
1	1.7	0.3	1	0	94.44	92	16
2	2	-0.3	1	-1.3	100	55	118
3	2.3	-0.7	2	-1	100	93	6
4	1.7	-1	2	-0.7	100	113	14
5	3	0.3	1.7	-1	100	165	17
6	2.7	1.3	1	-0.3	92.22	147	3
7	0	0	-0.3	-0.3	100	96	18
8	2.3	0	1.3	-0.7	100	135	0
9	0	-0.7	1.3	0	82.22	115	89
10	3	1	2	0	100	132	11
11	3.3	0.7	2	-0.7	100	66	3
12	3.3	0.3	1.7	-1.3	97.78	118	2
13	1.7	0.7	1	0	95	123	14
14	1.7	0.3	1.3	0	100	86	9
15	3	-0.7	3	-0.7	100	123	0
16	2.3	0.7	1.3	-0.3	100	82	38
17	1.7	-0.3	1.3	-0.7	100	113	11
18	1	-0.3	1	-0.3	94.44	62	73
19	2.3	1.3	-0.3	-0.7	86.67	112	6
20	2	0	1.3	-0.7	100	63	24
21	4	1	2.7	-0.3	100	90	0
22	4	0.3	3	-0.7	100	121	0
23	3	0.7	2	-0.3	100	58	3
24	2	0	1	-1	97.78	13	16
25	1.7	0.3	1	-0.3	86.67	43	29
26	1.7	0.7	-1.3	-1.7	100	85	5
27	2.7	0.3	1.3	-1	100	127	5
28	1.7	0	1.3	-0.3	100	112	6

29	0	-0.07	1	-0.3	95.56	87	107
Average for this group	2.13103448	0.21137931	1.331034483	0.57241	97.33724138	97.48275862	22.172414
Average for whole year group	2	0.49	1.02	-0.29	96.054	101.74	16.2

Based on the data collected above, there is no statistically significant evidence that those pupils participating in the CoLAHG Summer School first week achieved better outcomes. Their English and Maths attainment were slightly above average, but their VA (value added – i.e. progress towards targets which are based on their KS2 results) is below average. Their achievement (positive) points are lower than average, whilst their behaviour points (negative) are higher. There are some significant ‘outliers’ within the group – such as students 2 and 9 who have a very high number of behaviour points – this may be due to the fact that when recruiting to the pilot, primary schools that were approached were asked to put forward those who they felt needed more support with the transition, and so as it was a stratified sample, pupils with existing behaviour challenges were also included in the initial sample.

Other feedback received

Overall, the organisers involved in delivering the three projects in the pilot spoke positively about their experiences. Although they did cite the following difficulties and considerations that would improve such work in the future:

- Combine the **learning and evaluation** into one unified process, rather than having a programme of work that split into five areas.
- **Scaling up** existing projects was not as easy as some originally thought it would be.
- **Recruitment and retention** were more difficult for the projects than anticipated, especially given the **short lead-in times** from funding being awarded and the projects beginning. For example Global Generation recruited 35 people to the project, but only 17 participants attended regularly and for the CoLAHG Summer School many families had already organised summer holiday provision for their children.
- **Retention was not an issue** in the one-week programmes run as part of the CoLAHG Summer School.
- Offering provision **at different times of the day**, such as in the evenings, may benefit some children and young people more.
- The **offer of food and meals** was not always the main pull into a project, although in the CoLAHG Summer School breakfast was more important to participants than lunch, and B Creative and Global Generation Summer 2019 found that participants would try new cuisines if they cooked them.
- The **involvement of teaching assistants and sixth form mentors** at the CoLAHG Summer School was helpful in supporting participants to build relationships and rapport with them.

Proposals

13. Whilst the findings demonstrated some positive outcomes for participants in terms of their fusion skills, there is no compelling evidence that the pilots addressed summer learning loss or summer hunger. Furthermore, supporting 122 participants at a cost of circa £96,683.20 does not represent the best value for money. The City Corporation does have a City Premium Grants programme which is available to all of the City of London 'family of schools', including CoLAHG, and funding for summer activities aimed at pupils should be granted through this.

Conclusion

14. There are many potential approaches to delivering enrichment programme aimed at children and young people in formal or informal education. Some offer residential and non-residential options to pupils, some take place outside of school premises, in order to attract those pupils that are least likely to engage with the school environment outside of term-time, some are subsidised or free for all with no means testing in order to attract a mixture of pupils from different economic backgrounds, and some are run by schools with others run by independent third parties or charities. Often summer schools aim to address one of the following key issues – not all of them: summer hunger, summer enrichment and summer learning.
15. The reader is invited to share the findings outlined in this pilot to inform their own thinking on summer enrichment work aimed at young people to address issues of summer hunger, summer learning loss and a paucity of enriching, meaningful and affordable activities to participate in. Whilst the City Corporation is unable to continue funding enrichment pilots in 2020, it is hoped that this evaluation will inform the work of other organisations, such as the Mayor's Fund for London who provide vital advocacy and leadership support in London on summer hunger, and those who are considering offering activities aimed at children and young people over the summer. Ultimately, the City Corporation is supportive of initiatives to enhance social mobility.

Detailed Acknowledgements

16. It would not have been possible to deliver this pilot without the ongoing support and expertise of the following people, to whom the City Corporation is incredibly grateful:

Anne Bamford	City of London Corporation
Sir Mark Boleat	Formerly City of London Corporation
Amelia Ehren	City of London Corporation
Mark Emmerson	The City of London Multi Academy Trust
Claire Hersey	The City of London Multi Academy Trust
Katie Hasler	City of London Academy Highbury Grove
Aimee Lyall	City of London Academy Highbury Grove
Helen Kersey	The Cripplegate Foundation
Anne Shewring	The Cripplegate Foundation

Kim Chaplain	Formerly the Mayor's Fund for London
Maryan Nuur	The Mayor's Fund for London
Clara Widdison	The Mayor's Fund for London
Greta Defeyter	Northumbria University
Emily Mann	Northumbria University
Naomi Blanche	All Change Arts
Lina Akbar	Future Foundations
Rachel Solomon	Global Generation

Sufina Ahmad

Corporate Strategy Manager
City of London Corporation

Please direct all enquiries relating to this report to:

Jessica.walsh@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Additional reading:

Northumbria University Evaluation of City of London Corporation's Summer 2019 Holiday Provision



FINAL City of
London Corporatio

Kitchen Social - Young people's perspectives on holiday provision



Young People's
Perspectives on Holi

This page is intentionally left blank

Committees: Summit Group – For decision (Approved) Health and Wellbeing Board – For decision (Approved) Policy & Resources – For information Culture, Heritage and Libraries – For information Procurement Sub-Committee – For decision Open Spaces – For information Community & Children’s Services – For information Port Health & Environmental Services – For information	Dates: 24 February 2020 28 February 2020 19 March 2020 23 March 2020 24 March 2020 7 April 2020 24 April 2020 19 May 2020
Subject: Corporate Sponsorship Guidance on Food and Drink	Public
Report of: Department of Community and Children’s Services	For Information
Report author: Xenia Koumi	

Summary

This draft guidance outlines a procedure by which City of London Corporation teams evaluate opportunities – with a value of less than £10,000 – to partner with external bodies, to ensure that partnership, sponsorship or goodwill/ in-kind agreements with parties involved in the production, manufacture, or retail of food or drink products, do not conflict with, nor undermine, Corporate strategic objectives.

This guidance has been developed by the City Corporation’s Public Health team, with support from Chamberlain’s and insights from a range of departmental leadership teams across the City Corporation.

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- Note the report.

Main Report

Background

1. In September 2018, the City Corporation signed a declaration on Sugar Reduction and Healthier Food¹ as a commitment to tackling obesity and overweight among those living and working in and visiting the Square Mile.

¹ <http://www.businesshealthy.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/CoL-poster-FINAL.pdf>

2. In doing so, it pledged to take action across several areas to make healthier choices easier and more accessible to everyone living or working in, or visiting, the City of London, with the view that this becomes “business as usual” over time.
3. One of the pledges of this cross-Corporation agreement was to develop corporate sponsorship guidance to minimise local promotion of HFSS (high fat, salt and sugar) food and drink.
4. While some governing bodies and local authorities hold Corporate Sponsorship Policies that determine the nature of organisations that they can commercially partner with, it has been decided that the introduction of corporate sponsorship guidance for contracts, sponsorship and in-kind or goodwill agreements with a value of £10,000 or below, with external parties engaged in the manufacturing, advertising/ promotion, or retail/ delivery of food and/ or drink, is the most appropriate way forward for the City of London Corporation.

Current Position

5. This guidance is a short educational piece with the aim of helping to ensure that the City of London Corporation departments and teams secure the best value and advantage from any opportunities that arise to work with organisations that can provide direct or in-kind sponsorship, to help the City Corporation develop and promote services that benefit its residents, workers and visitors and ensure that its activities do not conflict with or undermine its strategic objectives or statutory duties with regards to the protection and improvement of local public health.
6. Sponsorship should be entered into only where it helps promote the City Corporation’s aims and objectives and assist it in meeting its statutory duties around public health, as set out in the Corporate Plan, the Responsible Business Strategy and the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy, for example. This guidance covers food and drink and supports the City Corporation’s public health duties to prevent and reduce overweight and obesity, for example.

Proposals

7. Members are asked to endorse the guidance.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

8. The proposal supports a range of corporate and strategic objectives, including:
 - The Corporate Plan (2018-23): “Contribute to a flourishing society”
 - Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy (2017-20): “A healthy urban environment” and “Promoting healthy behaviours”
 - Responsible Business Strategy (2018-23): “Individuals and communities flourish”
 - DCCS Business Plan: “Promoting equality in health through outreach to all the City communities”; “Supporting City businesses and the City Corporation to improve their employees’ health and wellbeing and participation in health and wellbeing activities”.

Implications

9. Opportunities will be assessed on a case-by-case basis by Public Health and/ or Commercial Contract Management. It is not expected that there will be a high volume of cases to assess.

Conclusion

10. Draft Corporate Sponsorship Guidance on Food and Drink has been developed to assist City Corporation staff to ensure that opportunities to collaborate with external parties do not conflict with or undermine the City Corporation's strategic objectives or legal duties.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Draft Corporate Sponsorship Guidance on Food and Drink

Background Papers

- The Local Government Declaration on Sugar Reduction and Healthier Food (Health and Wellbeing Board, 2 February 2018)
- Annual review of progress of the City Corporation's Declaration on Sugar Reduction and Healthier Food (Update Report) (Health and Wellbeing Board, 2 November 2019)

Xenia Koumi

Public Health Specialist, Department of Community & Children's Services

T: 020 7332 3378

E: xenia.koumi@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Draft Corporate Sponsorship Guidance on Food and Drink

Application

This guidance will apply:

- To contracts or sponsorship/ in-kind/ goodwill agreements between the City of London Corporation/ City Corporation-owned or managed sites with external parties engaged in the manufacturing, advertising/ promotion, or retail/ delivery of food and/ or drink, valued at £10,000 or under per year, and/ or those signed off at a local Departmental level (by City Corporation officers), whether the agreements are formal or informal. This includes hospitality events where the City Corporation (for example Remembrancer's), is the host and/ or directly involved in the event, where the direct sponsorship/ partnership element is valued at less than £10,000 per year.*
- Where the guidance can be implemented without the City Corporation incurring a charge or penalty.
- Where advertising or marketing agencies are acting on behalf of an external organisation or individual and request approval to use City Corporation-owned assets or sites to promote food and/ or drink, even if there is no direct or indirect benefit to the City Corporation.

It will not apply:

- To partnerships/ relationships held between parties hiring out City Corporation-owned or managed sites and third parties. However, where relevant and appropriate, City Corporation staff are encouraged to advise the hirer where they feel this third-party agreement may be in conflict with City Corporation objectives and duties.
- Where the City Corporation-owned/ managed site has charity status, for example Tower Bridge; the charity is required to operate to its own governance requirements, abiding by their specific objectives. Charities for which the City Corporation is Trustee can therefore be mindful of the objectives outlined within the Corporate Plan and apply this policy where possible, considering the reputational risks that may apply. However, the objectives of the charity take precedence.

It is understood that existing commercial contracts held by the City Corporation may be affected by this. Where possible, contract-holders should seek to apply this guidance to existing contracts and agreements, where this does not incur penalties from the third-party, or a significant loss of income to the relevant department or team that cannot be covered through short-term centralised funding. This will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

If it is not possible to apply to existing contracts or partnerships, this guidance should be applied during the renewal/ re-tender/ revision phase.

Procedure

When a City Corporation department or team is considering renewing, or entering into a commercial partnership, or sponsorship/ in-kind/ goodwill agreement to the value of £10,000 or below (per year), with an organisation engaged in the manufacturing, advertising/ promotion, or retail/ delivery of food and/ or drink, it should first approach the Public Health (HealthyCity@cityoflondon.gov.uk) and Chamberlains' Commercial Contracts Management (CCM) (CityProc.CCM@cityoflondon.gov.uk) teams before proceeding, as they will be able to assist with the case-by-case assessment of a potential commercial partner, ensuring that the partnership will not contradict or undermine City Corporation strategic objectives or statutory duties related to protecting and improving the health of local populations or visitors with regards to food and/ or drink.

City Corporation departments and teams holding contracts that fit any of the below categories should complete the associated spreadsheet, listing their sponsorship/ corporate partnership relationships (paid-for and in-kind). This will be overseen by the City Corporation's Health and Wellbeing Advisory Group and will help to build a clear picture of the types of contracts held at a local level within the City Corporation, helping the increase and sharing of organisational intelligence. Where possible,

opportunities will be identified to ensure existing partnerships, or those up for renewal, align with corporate objectives and duties.

What does this guidance cover?

This guidance has been developed by the City of London Corporation's Public Health team, with support from Chamberlain's and insights from a range of departmental leadership teams, listed below:

- Category Board
- Chamberlain's Senior Leadership Team
- Open Spaces Business Managers
- DCCS Departmental Leadership Team
- Culture Management Team (including Culture and the City Information Centre)
- Tower Bridge Management Team
- Remembrancer's
- Culture Mile Board (at the time of the presentation of the draft guidance, it was not appropriate for the CMB to comment, as it had no significant fundraising or sponsorship activity and this is not due to change until mid-2020 at the earliest.)

In September 2018, the City Corporation signed a declaration on Sugar Reduction and Healthier Food¹ as a commitment to tackling obesity and overweight among those living and working in and visiting the Square Mile. In doing so, it pledged to take action across several areas to make healthier choices easier and more accessible to everyone living or working in, or visiting, the City of London, with the view that this becomes "business as usual" over time. One of the pledges of this cross-Corporation agreement was to develop corporate sponsorship guidance to minimise local promotion of HFSS food and drink. The pledges also recognise the introduction of specific KPIs relating to healthy eating and drinking within the Corporate Catering Contract that went live in September 2018.

Not only does this commitment support corporate strategic objectives and legal duties outlined within the Corporate Plan, Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy and Responsible Business Strategy, it brings the City Corporation in line with work being done across the capital – both at local government level and pan-London. Tackling obesity requires a collaborative approach.

Why is it needed?

Background

Obesity is on the increase among adults and children. Almost half of Londoners aged ten years or older are either overweight, or obese². Among other causes, including an increasingly sedentary lifestyle, the availability of unhealthy, high-fat and highly-processed foods and drinks is a key contributing factor, especially as these foods and drinks are often cheaper than fresh produce. Obesity is also closely linked to health inequalities, with adults and children experiencing deprivation more likely to be overweight or obese³.

Despite prevention of overweight and obesity being better than cure, spend on obesity prevention programmes is greatly outweighed by spend on the medical costs of conditions related to being overweight or obese. According to Cabinet Office data, if diets matched nutritional guidelines, it is estimated that 70,000 deaths annually could be avoided and £20 billion could be saved⁴.

At a national level, Government bodies are working with food and drinks manufacturers and retailers to reformulate products, looking to achieve reductions in salt, sugar and fat over the longer-term. In

¹ <http://www.businesshealthy.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/CoL-poster-FINAL.pdf>

² <https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/obesity-adults>

³ <https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN03336/SN03336.pdf>

⁴ http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100407165056/http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/strategy/work_areas/food_policy.aspx

addition, the Soft Drinks Industry Levy (the “Sugar Tax”) came into effect in April 2018. It directly targets the producers and importers of sugary soft drinks to encourage them to remove added sugar, promote diet drinks and reduce portion sizes for high-sugar drinks⁵. In addition, Public Health England and the NHS have been running campaigns, such as Change4Life, aimed at increasing literacy around healthier choices among the general public. Closer to home, Transport for London recently announced that as of February 2019, all adverts promoting food and drink high in fat, salt and/ or sugar (HFSS), will be banned from its assets. This represents a major step-change.

Aims

While some governing bodies and local authorities hold Corporate Sponsorship Policies that determine the nature of organisations that they can commercially partner with, it has been decided that the introduction of corporate sponsorship guidance for contracts, sponsorship and in-kind or goodwill agreements with a value of £10,000 or below, with external parties engaged in the manufacturing, advertising/ promotion, or retail/ delivery of food and/ or drink, is the most appropriate way forward for the City of London Corporation. This establishes a principle and supports the City Corporation’s vision to contribute to a flourishing society, shape outstanding environments and support a thriving economy, for the benefit of people who live, learn, work and visit the Square Mile.

The City of London Corporation has a long-standing and well-respected reputation locally, across the UK and globally. Endorsement of a product or service by the City Corporation is highly-valued and can have a significant positive impact on consumers’ perception of that product or service.

This guidance is a short educational piece with the aim of helping to ensure that the City of London Corporation departments and teams secure the best value and advantage from any opportunities that arise to work with organisations that can provide direct or in-kind sponsorship, to help the City Corporation develop and promote services that benefit its residents, workers and visitors and ensure that its activities do not conflict with or undermine its strategic objectives or statutory duties with regards to the protection and improvement of local public health.

Sponsorship should be entered into only where it helps promote the City Corporation’s aims and objectives and assist it in meeting its statutory duties around public health, as set out in the Corporate Plan, the Responsible Business Strategy and the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy, for example. This guidance covers food and drink and supports the City Corporation’s public health duties to prevent and reduce overweight and obesity, for example.

Evidence is showing that HFSS (high fat, salt and sugar) food and drink is harmful to the population’s health. The use of this guidance will help to ensure that all of the City Corporation’s departments and teams take a uniform approach to agreeing sponsorship, which aligns with the City Corporation’s corporate and strategic objectives, with regards to the health and wellbeing of its residents, workers, students and visitors. In addition, with regards to the pledges the City Corporation has made within its Declaration on Sugar Reduction and Healthier Food, the implementation of this guidance helps the organisation to lead by example.

Definitions

- **The Supplier:** Means a Company, a Partnership, a Public Sector Body, a Charity, a Local Authority, a Government Body, an individual or any other legal entity that entered into a Contract with the City.
- **The City:** Means the City of London Corporation – legally the Mayor and Commonalty and Citizens of the City of London, including in its capacity as Police Authority
- **Contract:** Means any Contract, Agreement, Order Form, Terms & Conditions of any value that the City of London Corporation entered into with a Supplier in exchange for a consideration via a procurement procedure, direct award or any other way that created a contractual relationship between the City and the Supplier. Please note that for the purpose of this paper Sponsorship Agreement is defined separately.

⁵ <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/soft-drinks-industry-levy-12-things-you-should-know>

- **Sponsorship Agreement:** Means a Contract between the City of London Corporation or City Corporation-owned or managed site and a Supplier, where the City Corporation receives either money or a benefit in kind from a Supplier for an event, campaign, promotion, or initiative, which, in turn, helps the third party to gain publicity or other benefits.
- **In Kind/Goodwill** - For the purpose of this paper this means a Contract where a Supplier provides an opportunity to support the City Corporation through the provision of a non-financial benefit, for example providing a venue to host an event, or prizes for a competition, in exchange for public promotion/ partnership with the City Corporation (i.e. to be associated with the City Corporation in some way).

DRAFT

Committee(s): Resource Allocation Sub Committee Policy and Resources	Date(s): 19 March 2020 19 March 2020
Subject: Capital Funding Update	Public
Report of: The Chamberlain	For Decision
Report author: Dianne Merrifield, Group Accountant	

Summary

This report follows on from previous papers on capital prioritisation and the 2020/21 round of annual capital bids.

The first round of annual capital bids gave 'in principle' funding approval to 46 bids with a total value of £89m, together with 'in principle' internal loan funding of £47.7m. A schedule of the successful bids is included at Appendix 1 for information. This report proposes the release of £4.449m to fund progression of 10 of the successful bid schemes as summarised in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Project Funding Requests		Next Gateway	City Fund	City's Cash	Bridge House Estates	Total
			£000	£000	£000	£000
2020/21 New Bids						
To progress to the next gateway:						
(i)	Central Criminal Court Mezzanine Heating	G. 3/4	81.0	-	-	81.0
(ii)	Guildhall PAVA and central locking system	G. 3/4	73.2	38.9	5.9	118.0
(iii)	Energy Efficiency Phase 2	G. 3/4	19.2	31.2	-	50.4
(iv)	Property Management System Replacement	G. 3/4	-	75.0		75.0
(v)	Barbican Podium Waterproofing Phase 2 (1st Priority)	G. 4 (c)	1,516.6	-	-	1,516.6
(vi)	Secure City Stage A and B (Year 1)	G. 4 (c)	822.3	-	-	822.3
Full Funding for Scheme Implementation:						
(vii)	West Ham Park Playground Refurbishment	G. 5	-	862.9		862.9
(viii)	Culture Mile Look and Feel Phase 4	G. 6 (Phase 5)	580.0			580.0
(ix)	City of London Primary Academy Islington (COLPAI) Temporary Site	Outside Gateways		300.0		300.0
(x)	Barbican Turret Disposal Costs	Outside Gateways	43.0			43.0
Total Current Funding Requests			3,135.3	1,308.0	5.9	4,449.2

The annual capital bid process has been an effective way of directing central funding towards the highest priority schemes. However, as with every new process, there is always room for reflection and refinement and in the light of the first year outcomes

we are in the course of review, with a focus on optimising the process of analysis and evaluation. Following the conclusion of this officer review, we will bring back any proposed changes to the existing process for Member consideration.

Recommendations

Members are requested -

- To agree the allocation of central funding of up to £4.449m to allow schemes (i) to (x) as set out in Table 1 (and detailed in paragraph 6 below) to progress, subject to the requisite gateway and other approvals.
- To note the full schedule of 2020/21 successful capital bids provided in Appendix 1 - comprising 'in principle' funding amounting to £89m together with 'in principle' internal loan funding of £47.7m.
- To note that a review of the annual capital bid process is under review and that any changes proposed will be brought back to Members for consideration.

Main Report

Background

1. As part of the fundamental review, Members have agreed the necessity for effective prioritisation of capital and SRP projects, with central funding allocated in a measured way. This has been achieved via the new annual capital bid process which applies prioritisation criteria to ensure that corporate objectives are met and schemes are affordable.
2. The following criteria against which capital and supplementary revenue projects are assessed have been agreed as:
 - i. Must be an essential scheme (Health and Safety or Statutory Compliance, Fully/substantially reimbursable, Major Renewal of Income Generating Asset, Spend to Save with a payback period < 5 years.)
 - ii. Must address a risk on the Corporate Risk register; or the following items that would otherwise be escalated to the corporate risk register:
 - a. Replacement of critical end of life components for core services;
 - b. Schemes required to deliver high priority policies; and
 - c. Schemes with a high reputational impact
 - iii. Must have a sound business case clearly demonstrating the negative impact of the scheme not going ahead, i.e. penalty costs or loss of income, where these are material.

These criteria were used as the basis for prioritising the 2020/21 annual capital bid submissions.

3. The scope of schemes subject to this prioritisation relates only to those funded from central sources, which include the On-Street Parking Reserve, Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), flexible external contributions and allocations from the general reserves of City Fund, City's Cash or Bridge House Estates*. This means that projects funded from most ring-fenced funds, such as the Housing Revenue Account, Designated Sales Pools and Cyclical Works Programmes

are excluded, together with schemes wholly funded from external grants, and tenant/ developer contributions e.g. under S278 agreements and most S106 deposits.

*Contributions from Bridge House Estates are limited to its share of corporate schemes such as works to the Guildhall Complex or corporate IT systems.

Current Position

Approved 2020/21 Annual Capital Bids

4. The first year of the new annual capital bid process gave 'in principle' funding approval to 46 bids with a total value of £89m across the three main funds, together with 'in principle' internal loan funding of £47.7m, as summarised in Table 2 below. A detailed schedule of the successful bids is included at Appendix 1 for information.

Table 2: Summary of approved 2020/21 annual capital bids (all years)	New Bids £m	Loan Facilities £m	Total Central Funding £m
City Fund	69.5	37.1	106.6
City's Cash	18.6	10.6	29.2
Bridge House Estates	0.9	0.0	0.9
	89.0	47.7	136.7

5. Provisions have been included in the latest updates of the medium term financial plans to demonstrate affordability – these were used as the basis for the 2020/21 budgets agreed by the Finance Committee and Court of Common Council.

Current Requests for Release of Funding

6. There are 10 schemes arising from the 2020/21 round of new bids for which the release of funding of up to £4.449m is now requested. Some of this funding is to enable option appraisals and detailed design to be undertaken in preparation for authority to start work and the remainder relates to schemes that now require confirmation of full funding for implementation. Table 1 above gives a summary of these funding requests with individual details provided below:
 - i. Central Criminal Court Ground Mezzanine Heating System - funding of up to £81k now requested to reach the next gateway
 - o This scheme is for the replacement of obsolete M&E services on the Ground Mezzanine floor, including Sheriffs' apartments, Magistrates' room and Head of Operations office, and includes the cost of temporary living arrangements for the Sheriffs and Consorts.
 - o The 'in principal' funding approval was based on the need to replace the critical end of life heating system, with a total estimated cost of up to £1.15m including risk.

- The request to draw down funds of £81k will allow the scheme to progress through to the next gateway (detailed option appraisal) and includes surveys, consultant and internal staff costs.
 - Funding will be met from the provision set aside from City Fund reserves for this 2020/21 annual bid. Release of funding will also be subject to approval of the Gateway 2 report by the relevant committees.
- ii. Public Address and Voice Alarm (PAVA) system and Door Lock Upgrade - funding of up to £118k now requested to reach the next gateway
- This scheme proposes the installation of a PAVA system within the Guildhall complex and upgrade work to the access doors of North and West Wings, Guildhall Art Gallery and City Information Centre that allows for immediate locking.
 - This project will allow the buildings to be locked down at the press of a button and permit communication with occupants in the event of a terrorist attack or natural disaster. It will make the buildings compliant with industry guidance on how to deal with a terrorist threat through effective contingency planning.
 - The 'in principal' funding approval was based on the essential health and safety nature of this scheme, which has a total estimated cost of up to £1.5m.
 - The request to draw down funds of £118k includes £88k to implement the lockdown facility straight away and £30k in consultant and survey costs to progress the PAVA system to the next gateway.
 - Funding will be drawn from the provisions set aside for this 2020/21 annual bid, shared across the funds to reflect the usage of the buildings.
- iii. Energy Reduction Programme Phase 1 - funding of up to £50.4k now requested to reach the next gateway (including a costed risk provision of £10.1k delegated to Chief Officer)
- This programme comprises 8 energy efficiency schemes at various locations across the operational portfolio including car parks, Central Criminal Court, London Metropolitan Archives, the Guildhall complex and Guildhall School.
 - The 'in principal' funding approval was based on 'spend to save' with payback within a five-year period. Annual savings of £263k are currently anticipated against the latest estimated cost of up to £1,317k (including risk), which indicates the scheme is on track to achieve the payback.
 - The request to draw down funds of £40,250 will allow surveys and technical verification and outline design to be completed in order to progress through to the next gateway (detailed option appraisal). Provision of funding for a costed risk provision of £10,100 is also requested.
 - Funding will be met from the provisions set aside for the 2020/21 approved capital bids in accordance with the ownership of the buildings. Release of funding will also be subject to approval of the gateway 2 report by the relevant committees.
- iv. Oracle Property Manager Replacement - funding of up to £75k now requested to reach the next gateway (including a costed risk provision of £25k)
- This scheme is to replace the existing Oracle property management system, which will be out of full support from December 2021, with a new fit for purpose system to manage the City's property portfolio .

- The 'in principal' funding approval was based on the need to replace this critical end of life system, which has a total estimated cost of up to £1.5m including risk.
 - The request to draw down funds of £50k includes project management, consultant and procurement advice to allow the scheme to progress through to the next gateway (detailed option appraisal). Provision of funding for a costed risk provision of £25k is also requested.
 - Funding will be drawn from the provisions set aside for this 2020/21 annual bid across the three main funds, with costs apportioned to reflect the system usage. Release of funding will also be subject to approval of the Gateway 2 report by the relevant committees.
- v. Barbican Podium Waterproofing, Drainage and Landscaping Works Phase 2 (1st Priority zone) – funding of up to £1,513.6k now requested to reach the next gateway (including a costed risk provision of £120k delegated to Chief Officer)
- This scheme proposes surface refurbishment, replacement of waterproofing membrane and landscaping works to the Ben Jonson, Breton and Cromwell Highwalk areas of the Barbican Podium. These areas identified as 1st priority are located over the Exhibition Halls and the Beech Street covered roadway.
 - The 'in principal' funding approval was based on the essential health and safety nature of this scheme, which has a total estimated cost of up to £12.62m (including risk). Failure to progress the top priority zone will impede progression of other works to these areas.
 - The request to draw down funds of up to £1,393.6k (subject to procurement) will allow the appointment of a lead design and multidisciplinary team to progress the detailed design and the completion of surveys, together with the engagement of a communications consultant plus internal staff costs to monitor and support these activities. The actual drawdown required will be confirmed following the procurement exercise. Funding for a costed risk provision of £120,000 is also requested.
 - Funding will be met from the provisions set aside for the 2020/21 approved capital bid through a combination of the On-Street Parking Reserve and capital reserves of City Fund as appropriate.
 - A funding eligibility assessment to inform the final funding strategy for the full costs of delivery will be undertaken for approval at Gateway 4 (c).
- vi. Secure City Programme Stage A and B – funding of up to £822.3k now requested for year 1 programme team costs
- This scheme comprises 9 individual workstreams which aim to stabilise the 'Ring of Steel' infrastructure, including some enhanced functionality.
 - The 'in principal' funding approval was based on the essential and high profile nature of the project which has a total estimated capital cost of £15.852m plus an uplift in revenue maintenance costs of 2.172m over the first 3 years.
 - The request to draw down funds of £822,342 will fund the programme team for the first year and allow the development of detailed design and capital cost options to be reported at Gateway 4(c).
 - Funding to reach the next gateway will be met from the provision set aside from City Fund reserves for this 2020/21 annual bid. Release of funding will also be subject to approval of the Gateway 1-4 report by the relevant committees.

- Release of funding for the delivery of the scheme will be informed by the cost options and value for money assessments to be undertaken at Gateway 4(c).
- vii. West Ham Park Playground Refurbishment – central funding of up to £862.9k now requested (including a costed risk provision of £163k)
 - This scheme is to refurbish the playground at West Ham Park to ensure the equipment and ancillary buildings are fit for purpose and meet current safety and safeguarding standards.
 - The ‘in principal’ funding approval was based on the essential health and safety nature of this scheme
 - The total estimated cost is up to £1.375m including a costed risk provision of £163k. After allowing for other identified sources of funding, including £350k of external contributions, the release of £862.9m of central resources is now requested which is subject to approval of the Gateway 5 report (delegated to Chief Officer)
 - Funding to reach the next gateway will be met from the provision set aside from City’s Cash reserves for this 2020/21 annual bid.
- viii. Culture Mile Look and Feel - funding of up to £580k now requested to implement Phase 4 permanent works
 - Phase 4 of the Culture Mile programme involves permanent public realm interventions that will enable visitors to identify Culture Mile, understand that they are within it and how to navigate around it with a view to driving engagement in the Culture Mile area.
 - The ‘in principal’ funding approval was based on the desire to progress this high-profile policy initiative.
 - The request to draw down funds of £580k will allow progression of the 2020/21 phase 4 works.
 - Funding will be met from the provision set aside from City Fund reserves for this 2020/21 annual bid.
- ix. City of London Primary Academy Islington (COLPAI) Temporary Site - funding of up to £300k now requested
 - COLPAI is required to leave its present temporary site in July 2020. Various options for an alternative temporary site pending the completion of the permanent building have been explored and the Copenhagen Primary School has been chosen.
 - The ‘in principal’ funding approval was based on the statutory compliance nature of the requirement.
 - The draw down funds of the £300k is required now in order to facilitate the move in time for the September 2020 term.
 - Funding to reach the next gateway will be met from the provision set aside from City Fund reserves for this 2020/21 annual bid.
- x. Barbican Estate Turret development site -funding of up to £43k now requested
 - The Turret area, located on the John Wesley Highwalk of the Barbican Estate, was identified as a vacant space for possible development and resale by the City. Rather than the in-house development previously proposed, it has now been decided to sell the space with planning permission for redevelopment by a third party, which involves further planning and other fees and staff costs.

- The 'in principle' funding approval was based on the need to incur these costs to achieve the capital receipt which will accrue to City Fund reserves and the drawdown of funds is now required to expedite this.
- Funding will be met from the provision set aside from City Fund reserves for this 2020/21 annual bid.

Annual Bid Process Update

7. The annual capital bid process has been an effective way of directing central funding towards the highest priority schemes. However, as with every new process, there is always room for reflection and refinement and in the light of the first-year outcomes we are in the course of review, with a focus on optimising the process of analysis and evaluation to inform Member funding decisions. Following the conclusion of this officer review, we will bring back any proposed changes to the existing process for Member consideration.

Conclusion

8. The first round of annual capital bids gave in 'in principle' funding approval to 46 bids with a total value of £89m, together with 'in principle' internal loan funding of £47.7m. A schedule of the successful bids is included at Appendix 1 for information.

Release of funding of up to £4.449m is now requested to allow the progression of ten of the schemes with 'in principle' funding approval granted as part of the 2020/21 annual capital bid process.

Following the conclusion of the first annual capital bid process an officer review is underway, with a focus on optimising the process of analysis and evaluation. Any proposed changes to the existing process will be brought back for Member consideration.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – 2020/21 Approved Bids

Background Papers

- Annual Capital Prioritisation Report , 12 December 2019 (Non-Public).
- Prioritisation of Remaining 2020/21 Annual Capital Bids (Deferred from December 2019 Meeting), 23 January 2020 (Non-Public)

Dianne Merrifield

Group Accountant, Capital

T: 020 7332 1113

E: dianne.merrifield@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1 - 2020/21 Approved Bids				
Project Name	City Fund £'m	City's Cash £'m	BHE £'m	Total Funding Requirement £'m
Critical End of Life Replacement				
Barbican Replacement of Art Gallery Chiller	0.300	-	-	0.300
Car Park - London Wall Joints and Waterproofing	2.000	-	-	2.000
Car Park - Hampstead Heath, East Heath Car Park Resurface	-	0.415	-	0.415
Central Criminal Court - Replacement for Heating, Cooling and Electrics for the East Wing Mezzanine including the sheriff's apartments.	1.000	-	-	1.000
Finsbury Circus Garden Re-instatement	2.558	-	-	2.558
Guildhall - North and East Wing Steam Generator replacement – including Art Gallery	0.744	0.396	0.060	1.200
Guildhall - West Wing - Space Cooling - Chiller Plant & Cooling Tower Replacement	1.860	0.990	0.150	3.000
Guildhall event spaces - Audio & Visual replacement / upgrade	-	0.330	-	0.330
Guildhall Yard - Refurbishment/ Replacement of Paviments	-	3.000	-	3.000
I.T - Computer Equipment rooms (CER) Uninterrupted Power Supplies (UPS)Upgrades and Replacements	0.090	0.100	0.010	0.200
I.T - Essential Computer (Servers) operating system refresh programme	0.068	0.075	0.008	0.151
I.T - Personal device replacement (Laptops, Desktops and tablet/mobile device)	1.013	1.125	0.112	2.250
I.T - Rationalisation of Financials, HR & Payroll Systems	2.654	2.949	0.295	5.898
I.T - Telephony replacement	0.873	0.343	0.034	1.250
LMA : Replacement of Fire Alarm, Chillers and Landlords Lighting and Power	1.397	-	-	1.397
Oracle Property Management System Replacement	0.713	0.380	0.058	1.151
Structural - Lindsey Street Bridge Strengthening	5.000	-	-	5.000
Structural - Dominant House Footbridge	1.025	-	-	1.025
Structural - West Ham Park Playground Refurbishment	-	1.279	-	1.279
Fully or substantially reimbursable				
Barbican Turret John Wesley High Walk	0.043	-	-	0.043
Chingford Golf Course Development Project	-	0.075	-	0.075
High Profile Policy Initiative				
Bank Junction Transformation (All Change at Bank)	4.000	-	-	4.000
Culture Mile Implementation Phase 1 incl CM experiments and Culture Mile Spine	0.580	-	-	0.580
I.T - Smarter working for Members and Officers	0.113	0.125	0.013	0.251
Rough Sleeping - assessment hub	1.000	-	-	1.000
Rough Sleeping High Support Hostel - Option 3	0.500	-	-	0.500
Secure City Programme	15.852	-	-	15.852
Statutory Compliance/Health and Safety				
Barbican Exhibition Halls	5.000	-	-	5.000
Barbican Podium Waterproofing, Drainage and Landscaping Works (Ben Jonson, Breton & Cromwell Highwalk) Phase 2 – 1st Priority	13.827	-	-	13.827
City of London Primary Academy Islington (COLPAI) temporary site	-	0.300	-	0.300
Golden Lane Lighting and Accessibility	0.500	-	-	0.500
Guildhall - Great Hall - Internal Stonework Overhaul	-	2.000	-	2.000
Guildhall - Installation of Public Address & Voice Alarm (PAVA) and lockdown system at the Guildhall (Security Recommendation)	0.930	0.495	0.075	1.500
I.T - Critical Security Works agreed by the DSSC	0.112	0.125	0.013	0.250
I.T - GDPR and Data Protection Compliance in addition saving money in being able to share and find information quickly	0.090	0.100	0.010	0.200
Confined and Dangerous Spaces - Barbican Centre	2.000	-	-	2.000
Confined and Dangerous Spaces - GSMD	-	0.400	-	0.400
Fire Safety - Car Park London Wall - Ventilation, electrics, lighting and fire alarm works	1.370	-	-	1.370
Fire Safety - Works in car parks	1.032	-	-	1.032
Fire Safety - Frobisher Crescent, Barbican Estate (compartmentation)	0.550	-	-	0.550
Fire Safety - Smithfield sprinkler head replacement and fire door replacement.	-	0.150	-	0.150
Queen's Park Public Toilet Rebuild	-	0.380	-	0.380
Spitalfields Flats Fire Door Safety	0.146	-	-	0.146
Spend to save with a payback < 5 years				
Energy programme of lighting and M&E upgrade works (Phase 1)	0.440	0.489	0.049	0.978
I.T - GDPR Compliance Project Unstructured data	0.112	0.125	0.013	0.250
The Monument Visitor Centre	-	2.500	-	2.500
Total Approved Funding Bids	69.492	18.646	0.900	89.038
Loan Facilities				
City of London Police and Housing Revenue Account	37.100	-	-	37.100
City of London School	-	10.600	-	10.600
Total Loan Facilities	37.100	10.600	-	47.700

Appendix 1 - 2020/21 Approved Bids				
Project Name	City Fund £'m	City's Cash £'m	BHE £'m	Total Funding Requirement £'m
Total Central Funding	106.592	29.246	0.900	136.738

Committee: Policy and Resources	Date: 19 March 2020
Subject: Policy Initiatives Fund/Committee Contingency/Brexit Contingency/Committee's Project Reserve	Public
Report of: Chamberlain	For Decision
Report author: Laura Tuckey – Senior Accountant	

Summary

This report provides the schedule of projects and activities which have received funding from the Policy Initiatives Fund (PIF), the Policy and Resources Committee's Contingency Fund, the Brexit Contingency Fund and the Committee's Project Reserve for 2019/20 and future years with details of expenditure in 2019/20. The balances remaining for these Funds for 2019/20 are shown in the Table below.

Fund	Balance Remaining 2019/20
Policy Initiative Fund	£437,248
Policy and Resources Contingency	£233,753
Brexit Contingency Fund	£2,034,860
Policy and Resources Committee's Project Reserve	£405,000

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- Note the report and contents of the schedules.
- Decide if any unallocated balances on your Committee's PIF and Contingency Fund should be carried forward into 2020/21.
- Roll forward the Brexit Contingency Fund into 2020/21 due to the delays in reaching the Brexit date.

Main Report

Background

1. The purpose of the Policy Initiatives Fund (PIF) is to allow the Committee to respond swiftly and effectively with funding for projects and initiatives identified during the year which support the City Corporation's overall aims and objectives.
2. The current process for identifying which items should sit within the PIF are if they fall under the below criteria:
 - Items that relate to a specific initiative i.e. research;

- Sponsorship/funding for bodies which have initiatives that support the City's overall objectives; and
 - Membership of high-profile national think tanks.
3. To restrict the depletion of funds in future years, a two-year time limit is in place on multiyear PIF bids, with three years being an option by exception. To ensure prioritisation within the multiyear bids, the PIF for the financial year 2019/20 and onwards has £600k of its total budget put aside for multiyear bids with the rest set aside (£650k) for one off allocations, with the option to 'top up' the multiyear allocation from the balance if members agree to do so. This will ensure that there should always be enough in the PIF to fund emerging one-off opportunities as they come up.
 4. PIF bids need to include a measurable success/benefits criterion in the report so that the successful bids can then be reviewed to see what the outcomes are and if the works/activities meet the objectives of the PIF. These measures will be used to review PIF bids on a six-monthly basis. This review will aide members in evaluating the effectiveness/benefits of PIF bids supported works/activities which can be taken into consideration when approving similar works/activities in the future.
 5. When a PIF bid has been approved there should be a reasonable amount of progress/spend on the works/activities within 18 months of approval which allows for slippage and delays. If there has not been enough spend/activity within this timeframe, members will be asked to approve that the remaining allocation be returned to the Fund where it can be utilised for other works/activities. If the Department requires funding for the same works/activities again at a later date, it is suggested that they re-bid for the funding. If there is a legitimate reason, out of the Departments control, which has caused delays, it is recommended that these are reviewed by Committee as needed.
 6. The Committee Contingency Fund is used to fund unforeseen items of expenditure when no specific provision exists within the Policy Committee's budget such as hosting one-off events.
 7. The Brexit Contingency Fund is a time limited fund established to meet any unforeseen items of expenditure due to the UK leaving the EU such as; communicating the interests of the City, helping mitigate the risks identified in the Corporate Risk Register or managing any urgent unforeseen issues arising from Brexit.
 8. The Committee's Project Reserve is a limited reserve which has been established from funds moved from the Projects Sub Committee Contingency Fund as approved in May's Policy and Resources Committee. This reserve of £450,000 from the Project Sub Committee is not an annual Contingency but a one-off sum. It is suggested that this reserve is used for project type spend.

Current Position

9. Appendices 1, 3, 5 and 8 list the projects and activities which have received funding for 2019/20 from the PIF (Appendix 1), your Committee's Contingency (Appendix 3), the Brexit Contingency (Appendix 5) and the Committee's Project Reserve (Appendix 8) with the expenditure incurred to date. Appendices 2, 4, 6 and 9 shows all committed projects and activities approved by this Committee from the PIF (Appendix 2), the Contingency (Appendix 4), the Brexit Contingency (Appendix 6) and the Committee's Project Reserve (Appendix 9) for the current and future financial years with the remaining balances available shown.
10. It should be noted that all items bar those in Appendices 5 and 6 have been the subject of previous reports approved by this Committee. Items in Appendices 5 and 6 have either been approved by the Town Clerk under delegated authority (for amounts under £100k) or by this Committee.
11. The balances that are currently available in the Policy Initiatives Fund, Committee Contingency Fund, Brexit Contingency Fund and Committee's Project Reserve for 2019/20 are shown in the Table below.

Fund	Balance Remaining 2019/20
Policy Initiative Fund	£437,248
Policy and Resources Contingency	£233,753
Brexit Contingency Fund	£2,034,860
Policy and Resources Committee's Project Reserve	£405,000

12. In June's Committee Members agreed to approve the transfer of funds of £61,865 from the Committee Contingency Fund to the Policy Initiatives Fund in order to increase the 2019/20 Multiyear allocation to £700,000; the initial allocation set aside of £600,000 was not high enough for the financial year. The remaining multiyear allocation is shown in the Table below with details, as shown in Appendix 7, prior to any allowances being made for any other proposals on today's agenda.

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Balance remaining of Multiyear PIF allocation	£57,865	£ 154,365	£583,365

13. Given the ongoing Fundamental Review, Members are asked to decide on whether any uncommitted balances on the PIF or Committee Contingency Fund should be carried forward into 2020/21 as has historically occurred or to not roll forward any uncommitted balances into 2020/21. The table below shows the current level of uncommitted funds in 2019/20. The budget and uncommitted spend for 2020/21 onwards for the PIF is shown in Appendix 2 and for the Committee's Contingency in Appendix 4.

14. It is recommended to members that the uncommitted balance of the Brexit Contingency Fund is rolled forward into 2020/21 as due to the delays in Brexit there may be an ongoing need for the provision of funds. The uncommitted balance of the Brexit Contingency Fund can be found in the table below.

Fund	Current Uncommitted 2019/20 Balance
Policy Initiative Fund	£437,248
Policy and Resources Contingency	£233,753
Brexit Contingency Fund	£2,034,860
Total	£2,705,861

Corporate & Strategic Implications

15. Although each PIF application has to be judged on its merits, it can be assumed that they may be helping towards contributing to a flourishing society, supporting a thriving economy and shaping outstanding environments as per the corporate plan.
16. Each PIF application should be approved on a case by case basis and Departments should look to local budgets first before seeking PIF approval, with PIF requests only being submitted if there is no funding within local budgets available.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – PIF 2019/20 Expenditure
- Appendix 2 – PIF 2019/20 & Future FY Committed
- Appendix 3 – Contingency 2019/20 Expenditure
- Appendix 4 – Contingency 2019/20 & Future FY Committed
- Appendix 5 – Brexit Contingency 2019/20 Expenditure
- Appendix 6 – Brexit Contingency 2019/20 Committed
- Appendix 7 – PIF Multiyear allocations
- Appendix 8 – Committee's Project Reserve 2019/20 Expenditure
- Appendix 9 – Committee's Project Reserve 2019/20 Committed

Laura Tuckey

Senior Accountant, Chamberlains

T: 020 7332 1761

E: laura.tuckey@cityoflondon.gov.uk

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE - POLICY INITIATIVES FUND 2019/20

<u>ALLOCATIONS FROM PIE</u>					<u>STATUS OF BALANCE</u>	
<u>COMMITTEE</u> <u>DATE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>RESP</u> <u>OFFICER</u>	<u>ALLOCATION</u> £	<u>ACTUAL</u> <u>PAID</u> TO 05/03/2020 £	<u>BALANCE</u> <u>TO BE SPENT</u> £	<u>NOTES</u>
	Events					
22/02/2018	Sponsorship of the Wincott Foundation's 'Wincott Awards' - the City Corporation to sponsor this annual Awards programme. The Wincott Foundation is a registered charity that supports and encourages high quality economic, financial and business journalism in the UK and internationally to contribute to a better understanding of economic issues	DOC	4,000	4,000	-	3 year funding: £4,000 in 2019/20 & 2020/21
05/07/2018	City Week 2019 Events Sponsorship	DIG	25,000	25,000	-	
05/07/2018	Events Partnership with the Strand Group, Kings College London - City of London to fund 3 events in partnership with the Strand Group	DOC	50,000	14,213	35,787	£25,000 re 2018/19 deferred to 2019/20. £25,000 final payment in 2019/20
06/09/2018	Event and Publication Sponsorship: Centre for London Conference and Fabian Society - City of London to sponsor the Centre for London's 2018 London Conference (£25,000) and the Fabian Society's London: Policy and Challenges into the 2020s Publication (£18,500)	DOC	9,250	9,250	-	£9,250 deferred from 2018/19
09/01/2019	Sponsorship of the CPS Margaret Thatcher Conference on British and America - The City of London Corporation to sponsor this Conference to discuss the relationship between Britain and the USA	DOC	20,000	15,525	4,475	
14/03/2019	Franco-British Young Leaders Programme - Gala Dinner 2019	DOC	20,000	17,387	2,613	
14/03/2019	Sponsorship of the 2019 Bright Blue Conference, "Fixing The Future"	DOC	6,000	2,949	3,051	
14/03/2019	Think Tank Review and Memberships 2019-20: Renewal of COL's membership to Centre for the Study of Financial Innovation (£5,000); Chatham House (£20,000); Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR - £14,500); Local Government Information Unit (LGIU - £12,500); New Local Government Network (NLGN - £12,400); Whitehall & Industry Group (WIG - £5,000); Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS - £10,000) & Open Europe (£10,000), Chatham House Europe Programme (£10,000)	DOC	99,400	89,570	9,830	
11/04/2019	2019 Party Conferences Funding - the City Corporation to hold private roundtables and dinners at the 2019 party conferences of the Liberal Democrats, Labour and Conservatives. In addition City Corporation is exploring to partner with UK Finance, a trade association, for the private dinners at the Labour and Conservative party conferences	DOC	41,000	41,000	-	

<u>ALLOCATIONS FROM PIF</u>					<u>STATUS OF BALANCE</u>	
<u>COMMITTEE</u> <u>DATE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>RESP</u> <u>OFFICER</u>	<u>ALLOCATION</u> £	<u>ACTUAL</u> <u>PAID</u> TO 05/03/2020 £	<u>BALANCE</u> <u>TO BE SPENT</u> £	<u>NOTES</u>
06/06/2019	Centre for London Conference - The City Corporation to sponsor the CFL's 2019 London Conference on 5 November 2019 and will look to explore what London's leaders must do to solve London's critical challenges ahead of the Mayoral election in May 2020. The CFL is a politically-independent, not-for-profit think-tank and charity focused on exploring economic and social challenges across London	DOC	25,000	25,000	-	
04/07/2019	Sponsorship of Centre for European Reform's 2019 Ditchley Conference: COL partnering with the Centre for European Reform (CER) in hosting this high-level conference taking place on 15-16 November 2019	DOC	20,000	20,000	-	
23/01/2020	Sponsorship of New Local Government Network 'Community Mobilisation' Project: The COL to sponsor the NLGN's research project proposal examining community mobilisation in the UK and the role of local authorities in this space. The aim of the research is to seek to understand the practical steps local authorities are taking to develop the ability and capacity of communities to mobilise around particular goals	DOC	12,500	-	12,500	
	Promoting the City					
04/05/2017	Secretariat of the Standing International Forum of Commercial Courts: City Corporation to provide financial support for a third of the costs of the secretariat for the first 3 years	DIG	100,000	100,000	-	£50,000 final payment in 2019/20; £50,000 allocated in 2018/19 now deferred to 2019/20
06/07/2017	One City Social Media Platform: City Corporation to provide financial support for a third of the costs for 3 years of this ongoing development of a new social media led platform dedicated to City workers in promoting the attractions and events held within the Square Mile	DBE / CS / DOC	60,000	50,000	10,000	Final payment in 2019/20
22/02/2018	Continued Sponsorship to support Innovate Finance	DIG	250,000	187,500	62,500.00	£250,000 final payment in 2020/21
15/03/2018	Match Funding from The Honourable Irish Society to the National Citizenship Scheme - City of London Corporation to match fund the Society's grant totalling £33,000 over 3 years	TC	11,000	11,000	-	3 year funding: £11,000 final payment in 2020/21
12/04/2018	City of London Corporation Regional Strategy: City of London's membership to Scottish Financial Enterprise (SFE) and expanding the partnership programme to 3 more UK City Regions	DIG	22,695	22,695	-	£22,695 deferred from 2018/19
03/05/2018	Saudi Arabia: Vision 2030 - COL to engage with Saudi Arabia and to support work on the new Private Sector Groups established by the Dept of International Trade to support export and investment programmes	DIG	27,487	-	27,487	£27,487 deferred from 2018/19

<u>ALLOCATIONS FROM PIF</u>					<u>STATUS OF BALANCE</u>	
<u>COMMITTEE</u> <u>DATE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>RESP</u> <u>OFFICER</u>	<u>ALLOCATION</u> £	<u>ACTUAL</u> <u>PAID</u> TO 05/03/2020 £	<u>BALANCE</u> <u>TO BE SPENT</u> £	<u>NOTES</u>
07/06/2018	City of London Corporation - Engagement with Strategy World Economic Forum (WEF): City of London Corporation to develop a 3 year rolling engagement strategy with WEF, an independent non-profit organisation dedicated to improving global economic and social conditions on a global scale. The CPR and LM to attend the WEF Annual Meeting in Davos and an event in another priority market and CoL to host a WEF meeting/event in the City	DIG	57,662	13,769	43,893	3 year funding: £21,162 deferred from 2018/19. £36,500 in 2019/20 & £38,000 in 2020/21
17/01/2019	Sponsorship of Children's Book with Guy Fox History Project Ltd	DOC	42,000	39,115	2,885	
21/02/2019	London & Partners: Domestic Promotion of London	DOC	100,000	100,000	-	3 year funding: final payment in 2021/22
21/02/2019	City of London Advertising - continuation of placing advertisements in CityAM to promote services provided by COL and advertising in a new newspaper, City Matters, covering the Square Mile	DOC	45,000	40,000	5,000	
21/02/2019	City Matters: placing additional full page advertisements in City Matters to promote City of London Corporation's cultural events and activities	DOC	34,000	34,000	-	
26/06/2019	Sponsorship of the IPPR Commission on Environmental Justice: City of London to sponsor the first year. This will enable the Corporation to make a substantive contribution to the debate on how climate change is best tackled	DOC	40,000	40,000	-	
04/07/2019	Recognition of Women: a City Response	TC	61,000	12,000	49,000	
23/10/2019	Renewal of CWEIC's Strategic Partnership: City of London to renew both its Strategic Partnership with CWEIC (£10k pa) and to provide office accommodation in the Guildhall Complex (£10k pa)	REM / DIG	20,000	10,000	10,000	2 year funding: £20,000 final payment in 2021/22
20/02/2020	Secretariat of the Standing International Forum of Commercial Courts: City Corporation to provide financial support towards the running costs	TC	60,000	-	60,000	
Communities						
16/11/2017	Centre for Study of Financial Innovation (CSFI): Corporation supporting CSFI in its continued occupancy to enable the Think Tank to remain in the City	DOC	6,635	6,635	-	5 year funding: final payment in 2021/22
07/06/2018	Social Mobility: Sponsorship of the Social Mobility Employer Index - City of London to sponsor the 2018 SMEI and enable City of London to continue being a leading voice on Social Mobility	DIG	27,610	8,840	18,770	£27,610 deferred from 2018/19

Page 118

ALLOCATIONS FROM PIF				STATUS OF BALANCE		
COMMITTEE DATE	DESCRIPTION	RESP OFFICER	ALLOCATION £	ACTUAL PAID TO 05/03/2020 £	BALANCE TO BE SPENT £	NOTES
11/04/2019	Research Sponsorship of the Fabian Society research project: City Corporation to sponsor the research project, "Using Arts and Culture to enable Deprived Communities to Thrive". This would support and advance the Corporation's strategic aims to "contribute to a flourishing society, shape outstanding environments and support a thriving economy	DOC	20,000	20,000	-	
04/07/2019	Sponsorship of Reseach and Events Programme: Looking Ahead: UK Engagement and Influence After Brexit: City Corporation to cooperate with the Institute of Government, a non-partisan think-tank, on a project looking at how the UK can engage and influence the EU after Brexit. COL to co-host two roundtables, one held in the Guildhall then one in Brussels	DOC	25,000	-	25,000	
			1,342,239	959,448.55	382,790.45	
	BALANCE REMAINING		437,248			
	TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET		1,779,487			
	ANALYSIS OF TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET					
	ORIGINAL PROVISION		1,250,000			
	UNCOMMITTED BALANCES BROUGHT FORWARD FROM 2018/19		105,341			
	UNSPENT COMMITTED BALANCES DEFERRED FROM 2018/19		183,204			
	UNSPENT COMMITTED BALANCES RETURNED TO FUND		140,942			
	TRANSFERRED FROM CONTINGENCY		100,000			
	TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET		1,779,487			
NOTES: (i) The Committee date records the actual approval meeting; in some instances approval is given for multi-year support for a project but the financial details in this table only show the expenditure due in the current year (2019/20). It should be noted that actual payments sometimes are made towards the end of a financial year.						
KEY TO RESPONSIBLE OFFICER:-						
DIG	Director of Innovation and Growth	DOC	Director of Communications	DBE	Director of Built Environment	
TC	Town Clerk	CS	City Surveyor	REM	City Remembrancer	
CAROLINE AL-BEYERTY - DEPUTY CHAMBERLAIN						

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE - POLICY INITIATIVES FUND 2019/2020 - 2021/2022

Date	Description	Allocation 2019/20	Allocation 2020/21	Allocation 2021/22
	BASE BUDGET	£	£	£
	+ Uncommitted balance brought forward from 2018/19	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
	+ unspent balances deferred from 2018/19	105,341		
	+ unspent balances in 2018/19 returned to Fund	183,204		
	+ balance moved from P&R Contingency to cover multi year allocations	140,942		
		100,000		
	TOTAL BUDGET	1,779,487	1,250,000	1,250,000
	ALLOCATIONS			
07/07/2016	London Councils Summit		16,000	
04/05/2017	Secretariat of Standing International Forum of Commercial Crt's	100,000		
06/07/2017	One City Social Media Platform	60,000		
16/11/2017	Proposed Grant to retain the Centre for the Study of Financial Innovation	6,635	6,635	6,635
22/02/2018	Sponsorship of the Wincott Foundation's 'Wincott Awards'	4,000	4,000	
22/02/2018	Continued Sponsorship to support Innovate Finance	250,000	250,000	
15/03/2018	Match Funding from The Honourable Irish Society to the National Citizenship Scheme	11,000	11,000	
12/04/2018	City of London Corporation Regional Strategy	22,695		
03/05/2018	Saudi Arabia Vision 2030, Public Investment Fund and Financial Services	27,487		
07/06/2018	City of London Corporation - Engagement with Strategy World Economic Forum (WEF)	57,662	38,000	
07/06/2018	Social Mobility: Sponsorship of the Social Mobility Employer Index	27,610		
05/07/2018	City Week 2019 Event Sponsorship	25,000		
05/07/2018	Events Partnership with The Strand Group, King's College London	50,000		
06/09/2018	Sponsorship of the Fabian Society's London: Policy and Challenges into the 2020s publication	9,250		
17/01/2019	Sponsorship of the CPS Margaret Thatcher Conference on Britain & America	20,000		
17/01/2019	Sponsorship of Children's Book with Guy Fox History Project Ltd	42,000		
21/02/2019	London and Partners: domestic promotion of London	100,000	100,000	100,000
21/02/2019	City AM & City Matters	79,000		
14/03/2019	Sponsorship of the 2019 Bright Blue Conference, 'Fixing the Future'	6,000		
14/03/2019	Think Tank Review and Memberships 2019-20	99,400		
14/03/2019	Franco-British Young Leaders' Programme - Gala Dinner 2019	20,000		
11/04/2019	Sponsorship of the Fabian Society Research Project	20,000		
11/04/2019	2019 Party Conferences	41,000		
06/06/2019	Sponsorship of the IPPR Commission on Environmental Justice	40,000		
06/06/2019	Centre for London - 2019 London Conference	25,000		
04/07/2019	Sponsorship of Centre for European Reform's 2019 Ditchley Park Conference	20,000		
04/07/2019	Sponsorship of Reseach and Events Programme: Looking Ahead: UK Engagement and Influence After Brexit	25,000		
04/07/2019	Recognition of Women: a City Response	61,000		
17/10/2019	City Week 2020 Event Sponsorship		25,000	
23/10/2019	Renewal of CWEIC Strategic Partnership	20,000	20,000	
23/01/2020	Sponsorship of New Local Govt Network 'Community Mobilisation' Project	12,500		
20/02/2020	future.now - Application for Funding		17,000	
20/02/2020	Secretariat of Standing Committee	60,000		
20/02/2020	Tokyo 2020 Games		40,000	
	TOTAL ALLOCATIONS	1,342,239	527,635	106,635
	BALANCE AVAILABLE	437,248	722,365	1,143,365

Less: Possible maximum allocations from this meeting: **19 March 2020**

- London Messaging Research
- Think Tank Debate Proposal

Balance:

-	40,000	-
-	12,000	-
437,248	670,365	1,143,365

This page is intentionally left blank

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE - CONTINGENCY 2019/20**ALLOCATIONS FROM CONTINGENCY**

<u>COMMITTEE</u>					<u>STATUS OF BALANCE</u>	
<u>DATE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>RESP OFFICER</u>	<u>ALLOCATION</u>	<u>ACTUAL PAID</u>	<u>BALANCE</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
			<u>£</u>	<u>TO 05/03/2020</u>	<u>TO BE SPENT</u>	
			<u>£</u>	<u>£</u>	<u>£</u>	
17/03/2016	Lord Mayor's Show Fireworks: City of London Corporation to hold a public fireworks display following the LM's Show. Funding to cover all aspects of the planned display including the fireworks display itself, and all the traffic management, public safety and crowd and related events management issues	DOC	125,000	125,000	-	
08/05/2014	City of London Scholarship - Anglo-Irish Literature: CoL to award a yearly scholarship to a single student to continue their studies in the field on Anglo-Irish Literature	TC	29,350	9,500	19,850	£4,350 deferred from 2016/17; £25,000 deferred from 2017/18
17/11/2016	Police Arboretum Memorial Fundraising Dinner: City Corporation to host a fundraising dinner at Guildhall	DIG	30,000	-	30,000	Originally allocated from 2016/17; deferred to 2019/20
06/2018	Renewal Electricity Policy and Sourcing Strategy: City of London Corporation to adopt this strategy and purchase renewable electricity	CHB / CS / TC	25,000	25,000	-	Deferred from 2018/19
07/2018	Resourcing Diversity and Business Engagement - Establishing the Diversity and Business Engagement Manager to support the City's wider equalities, diversity and inclusion work	HR	7,375	7,375	-	Deferred from 2018/19
06/09/2018	Gresham College Funding Arrangements: Appointment of a Consultant - City of London Corporation to joint fund the cost of appointing a Consultant to conduct a review of Gresham College	TC	30,000	29,034	966	Deferred from 2018/19
04/10/2018	Beech Street Transformation Project - an additional budget to support detailed analysis and business case work as progression to a Gateway 3 report	BC	55,000	-	55,000	Deferred from 2018/19
11/04/2019	Sponsorship of Battle of Ideas Festival 2019 - the City Corporation to sponsor the festival as a "Battle Champion" and "Debate Partner", organised by The Academy of Ideas (AOI), taking place on 2nd & 3rd November 2019 at the Barbican Centre	DOC	20,000	20,000	-	

<u>ALLOCATIONS FROM CONTINGENCY</u>					<u>STATUS OF BALANCE</u>	
<u>COMMITTEE</u> <u>DATE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>RESP</u> <u>OFFICER</u>	<u>ALLOCATION</u> £	<u>ACTUAL</u> <u>PAID</u> TO 05/03/2020 £	<u>BALANCE</u> <u>TO BE SPENT</u> £	<u>NOTES</u>
12/12/2019	Administrative, consultancy and support fees associated with governance review activities	TC	25,000	-	25,000	
			346,725	215,909	130,816	
	BALANCE REMAINING		233,753			
	TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET		580,478			
	ANALYSIS OF TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET					
	ORIGINAL PROVISION		300,000			
	UNCOMMITTED BALANCES BROUGHT FORWARD FROM 2018/19		78,450			
	UNSPENT COMMITTED BALANCES DEFERRED FROM 2018/19		176,725			
	UNSPENT COMMITTED BALANCES RETURNED TO FUND		125,303			
	TRANSFERRED TO POLICY INITIATIVE FUND		(100,000)			
	TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET		580,478			
NOTE: The Committee date records the actual approval meeting; in some instances approval is given for multi-year support for a project but the financial details in this table only show the expenditure due in the current year (2019/20). It should be noted that actual payments sometimes are made towards the end of a financial year.						
<u>KEY TO RESPONSIBLE OFFICER:-</u> DIG Director of Innovation and Growth TC Town Clerk DOC Director of Communications CS City Surveyor CHB Chamberlain BC Managing Director, Barbican Centre HR Human Resources						
CAROLINE AL-BEYERTY - DEPUTY CHAMBERLAIN						

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE - CONTINGENCY 2019/2020 - 2021/2022

Date	Description	Allocation 2019/20	Allocation 2020/21	Allocation 2021/22
	BASE BUDGET	£ 300,000	£ 300,000	£ 300,000
	+ Uncommitted balance brought forward from 2018/19	78,450		
	+ unspent committed balances deferred from 2018/19	176,725		
	+ unspent balances in 2018/19 returned to Fund	125,303		
	- balance moved to Policy Initiative Fund to cover multi year allocations	- 100,000		
	TOTAL BUDGET	580,478	300,000	300,000
	ALLOCATIONS			
08/05/2014	City of London Scholarship - Anglo-Irish Literature	29,350		
17/03/2016	Lord Mayor's Show Fireworks	125,000		
17/11/2016	Police Arboretum Memorial Trust - Dinner	30,000		
07/06/2018	Renewable Electricity Policy and Sourcing Strategy	25,000		
05/07/2018	Resourcing Diversity and Business Engagement	7,375		
06/09/2018	Gresham College Funding Review	30,000		
04/10/2018	Beech Street Transformation Project	55,000		
11/04/2019	Sponsorship of the 2019 Battle of Ideas Festival	20,000		
12/12/2019	Administrative, consultancy and support fees associated with governance review activities	25,000		
20/02/2020	Common Council Elections in March 2021		127,000	
	TOTAL ALLOCATIONS	346,725	127,000	-
	BALANCE AVAILABLE	233,753	173,000	300,000

Less: Possible maximum allocations from this meeting: **19 March 2020**

-

Balance

-	-	-
233,753	173,000	300,000

This page is intentionally left blank

<u>POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE - BREXIT CONTINGENCY 2018/19 - 2019/20</u>							
<u>ALLOCATIONS FROM BREXIT CONTINGENCY</u>						<u>STATUS OF BALANCE</u>	
<u>Date of Bid</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>RESP OFFICER</u>	<u>ALLOCATION</u>	<u>ACTUAL PAID TO 31/03/2019</u>	<u>ACTUAL PAID TO 05/03/2020</u>	<u>BALANCE TO BE SPENT</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
			£	£	£	£	
11/01/2019	Brexit Engagement Action Plan: Develop and bring into effect an engagement action plan and to provide for the City Corporation's participation in a cross-sectoral project to enhance the City's soft power potential	REM	60,000	10,000	47,200	2,800	2 year funding: £20,000 in 2018/19 & £40,000 final payment in 2019/20
05/02/2019	No Deal Preparation Adverts: A dedicated information resource is currently being created within the corporate website and it is this page (and the urgent need for businesses to prepare for Brexit, especially a 'no deal' scenario) that needs widespread communication to our business audiences	DOC	13,680	13,680	-	-	2018/19 funding
07/02/2019	The Communications Team requires funding for a short-term post to assess and mitigate all committee reports and other external committee output for reputational risk relating to Brexit.	DOC	13,000	-	12,560	440	2019/20 funding
08/03/2019	Supply Chain category card analysis: Commissioning an external consultancy firm to work with us to produce Category level risk cards. The categories that selected were based on internal knowledge, spend data and of the areas that would be most impacted by Brexit. These have been developed to allow us at this stage to identify the main risks in these categories	CHB	9,900	9,900	-	-	2018/19 funding
27/03/2019	Police costs as a result of protest activities: Activity as a result from Brexit protest groups has meant that the Police have had to deal with direct action without time delay awaiting PAN LONDON resources. Due to the increased number of regional protest this could impact on response to the incident and therefore impact on business ability to continue to operate	POL	44,000	9,022	34,978	-	2018/19 funding
03/04/2019	Expand recruitment activity to (and increase the number of places on) the BMus/MMus Jazz, World, Studio and Electronic pathways, which currently recruit the great majority of their students from within the UK	GSDM	20,000	-	19,624	376	

<u>ALLOCATIONS FROM BREXIT CONTINGENCY</u>						<u>STATUS OF BALANCE</u>	
<u>Date of Bid</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>RESP OFFICER</u>	<u>ALLOCATION</u> £	<u>ACTUAL PAID TO 31/03/2019</u> £	<u>ACTUAL PAID TO 05/03/2020</u> £	<u>BALANCE TO BE SPENT</u> £	<u>NOTES</u>
23/09/2019	To impress upon businesses the importance of preparing for Brexit and also to workers and residents on the need to register via the EU Settlement procedure if they wish to remain in the UK	COM	14,560	-	5,490	9,070	
	BALANCE REMAINING		175,140	42,602	119,852	12,686	
	TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET		2,034,860				
	ANALYSIS OF TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET		2,210,000				
	ORIGINAL PROVISION		2,000,000				
	MHCLG funding 2018/19		105,000				
	MHCLG funding 2019/20		105,000				
	TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET		2,210,000				
<p><u>NOTE:</u> The date records the actual date the Town Clerk in conjunction with the Chamberlain has approved the bid. In some instances approval is given for multi-year support for a project, the financial details in this table shows the expenditure for both years (2018/19 & 2019/20). It should be noted that actual payments sometimes are made towards the end of a financial year.</p> <p><u>KEY TO RESPONSIBLE OFFICER:-</u></p> <p>RM Remembrancer DOC Director of Communications GSMD Guildhall School of Music & Drama CHB Chamberlains POL City of London police</p> <p>CAROLINE AL-BEYERTY - DEPUTY CHAMBERLAIN</p>							

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE - BREXIT CONTINGENCY 2018/2019 - 2019/20

Date	Bid Name	Description	Department	Brexit Risk Mitigation Category	Funding	Allocation 2018/19	Allocation 2019/20
		BASE BUDGET MHCLG funding Additional MHCLG funding + balance brought forward as agreed by Committee: Mar 2019 TOTAL BUDGET				£ 2,000,000 105,000	£ - - 105,000 2,017,420
						2,105,000	2,122,420
11/01/2019	Brexit Engagement Action Plan	Develop and bring into effect an engagement action plan and to provide for the City Corporation's participation in a cross-sectoral project to enhance the City's soft power potential	Remembrancers	Attractiveness of London & Regulatory Landscape	Brexit Contingency Fund	20,000	40,000
05/02/2019	No Deal Preparation - Adverts	A dedicated information resource is currently being created within the corporate website and it is this page (and the urgent need for businesses to prepare for Brexit, especially a 'no deal' scenario) that needs widespread communication to our business audiences.	Communications	Attractiveness of London	MHCLG Funding	13,680	
07/02/2019	Post Funding for Mitigation of Reputational Risk	The Communications Team requires funding for a short-term post to assess and mitigate all committee reports and other external committee output for reputational risk relating to Brexit.	Communications	Other	MHCLG Funding		13,000
08/03/2019	Supply Chain category card analysis	Commissioning an external consultancy firm to work with us to produce Category level risk cards. The categories that selected were based on internal knowledge, spend data and of the areas that would be most impacted by Brexit. These have been developed to allow us at this stage to identify the main risks in these categories.	Chamberlains	Procurement & Supply Chain	Brexit Contingency Fund	9,900	
27/03/2019	Police costs as a result of protest activities	Activity as a result from Brexit protest groups has meant that the Police have had to deal with direct action without time delay awaiting PAN LONDON resources. Due to the increased number of regional protest this could impact on response to the incident and therefore impact on business ability to continue to operate.	City of London Police	Other	MHCLG Funding	44,000	
03/04/2019	Guildhall School of Music & Drama Expanded Recruitment	Expand recruitment activity to (and increase the number of places on) the Bmus/Mmus Jazz, World, Studio and Electronic pathways, which currently recruit the great majority of their students from within the UK.	Guildhall School of Music & Drama	Income Stream & recruitment and Retention	Brexit Contingency Fund		20,000

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE - BREXIT CONTINGENCY 2018/2019 - 2019/20

Date	Bid Name	Description	Department	Brexit Risk Mitigation Category	Funding	Allocation 2018/19	Allocation 2019/20
23/09/2019	Preparation comms	To impress upon businesses the importance of preparing for Brexit and also to workers and residents on the need to register via the EU Settlement procedure if they wish to remain in the UK	Communications	Other	MHCLG Funding		14,560
						87,580	87,560
						2,017,420	2,034,860

Less: Possible maximum allocations from this meeting: 19 March 2020

Brexit Contingency Fund Balance	1,910,100
MHCLG Balance	124,760
Total Balance	2,034,860

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE - POLICY INITIATIVES FUND MULTI YEAR ALLOCATIONS

Date	Description	Allocation 2019/20	Allocation 2020/21	Allocation 2021/22
	Multi Year Allocation	£	£	£
	+ Transfer from contingency	600,000	600,000	600,000
		100,000		
	TOTAL BUDGET	700,000	600,000	600,000
	ALLOCATIONS			
07/07/2016	London Councils Summit		16,000	
04/05/2017	Secretariat of Standing International Forum of Commercial Crts	50,000		
06/07/2017	One City Social Media Platform	60,000		
16/11/2017	Proposed Grant to retain the Centre for the Study of Financial Innovation	6,635	6,635	6,635
22/02/2018	Sponsorship of the Wincott Foundation's 'Wincott Awards'	4,000	4,000	
22/02/2018	Continued Sponsorship to support Innovate Finance	250,000	250,000	
15/03/2018	Match Funding from The Honourable Irish Society to the National Citizenship Scheme	11,000	11,000	
07/06/2018	City of London Corporation - Engagement with Strategy World Economic Forum (WEF)	36,500	38,000	
05/07/2018	Events Partnership with The Strand Group, King's College London	25,000		
21/02/2019	London and Partners: domestic promotion of London	100,000	100,000	10,000
21/02/2019	City AM & City Matters	79,000		
23/10/2019	Renewal of CWEIC Strategic Partnership	20,000	20,000	
	TOTAL ALLOCATIONS	642,135	445,635	16,635
	BALANCE AVAILABLE	57,865	154,365	583,365
Less: Possible maximum allocations from this meeting: 19 March 2020				
	Balance	57,865	154,365	583,365

This page is intentionally left blank

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE - PROJECT RESERVE - 2019/20ALLOCATIONS FROM BREXIT CONTINGENCYSTATUS OF BALANCE

<u>Date of Bid</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>RESP OFFICER</u>	<u>ALLOCATION</u> £	<u>ACTUAL PAID TO 05/03/2020</u> £	<u>BALANCE TO BE SPENT</u> £	<u>NOTES</u>
06/06/2019	Housing Delivery Strategy - Request for funding to Appoint Advisors	DCCS	45,000	20,000	25,000	
			-	-	-	
	BALANCE REMAINING		45,000	20,000	25,000	
	TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET		405,000			
	ANALYSIS OF TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET		450,000			
	ORIGINAL PROVISION		450,000			
	TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET		450,000			

NOTE:

The date records the actual date the Policy & Resources Committee has approved the bid. It should be noted that actual payments sometimes are made towards the end of a financial year.

KEY TO RESPONSIBLE OFFICER:-

DCCS Director of Community & Children's Services

CAROLINE AL-BEYERTY - DEPUTY CHAMBERLAIN

This page is intentionally left blank

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE - PROJECT RESERVE 2019/2020

Date	Description	Allocation 2019/20	Committee/Fund
06/06/2019	BASE BUDGET	£ 450,000	
	TOTAL BUDGET	450,000	
	ALLOCATIONS		
	Housing Delivery Strategy – Request for Funding to Appoint Advisors	45,000	
	TOTAL ALLOCATIONS	45,000	
	BALANCE AVAILABLE	405,000	

Less: Possible maximum allocations from this meeting: **20 February 2020**

Balance

405,000

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

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