

## **POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**Thursday, 11 March 2021**

Minutes of the meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee held over Microsoft Teams and streamed at [https://youtu.be/xX1-c0g\\_UhQ](https://youtu.be/xX1-c0g_UhQ) on Thursday, 11 March 2021 at 1.45 pm

### **Present**

#### **Members:**

Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chair)  
Sheriff Christopher Hayward (Deputy Chairman)  
Deputy Keith Bottomley (Vice-Chairman)  
Deputy Tom Sleigh (Vice-Chair)  
Randall Anderson (Ex-Officio Member)  
Rehana Ameer  
Nicholas Bensted-Smith (Ex-Officio Member)  
Tijs Broeke  
Karina Dostalova  
Anne Fairweather  
Marianne Fredericks  
Alderman Timothy Hailes  
Deputy Wendy Hyde (Ex-Officio Member)  
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark  
Shravan Joshi  
Deputy Edward Lord  
Alderman Vincent Keaveny  
Alderman Ian Luder  
Jeremy Mayhew  
Andrew McMurtrie  
Wendy Mead  
Deputy Brian Mooney (Chief Commoner) (Ex-Officio Member)  
Sir Michael Snyder  
Deputy James Thomson (Ex-Officio Member)  
Mark Wheatley  
Deputy Philip Woodhouse  
Alderman Sir David Wootton

#### **Officers:**

John Barradell	- Town Clerk and Chief Executive
Peter Kane	- The Chamberlain
Michael Cogher	- Comptroller and City Solicitor
Paul Double	- City Remembrancer
Paul Wilkinson	- City Surveyor
Caroline Al-Beyerty	- Deputy Chamberlain
Damian Nussbaum	- Director of Innovation & Growth
Bob Roberts	- Director of Communications
Peter Lisley	- Assistant Town Clerk

Angela Roach	- Assistant Town Clerk
Nigel Lefton	- Remembrancer's Department
Charles Griffiths	- Bursar, City of London School
Alan Bird	- Head, City of London School
Jeremy Blackburn	- Mansion House
Giles French	- Assistant Director of Economic Development
Amanda Mays	- Human Resources
Richard Messingham	- Town Clerk's Department
Sanjay Odedra	- Communications Team
Steven Reynolds	- Chamberlain's Department
Adam Rout	- Mansion House
Peter Shadbolt	- Department of the Built Environment
Paul Wright	- Deputy Remembrancer
Mark Gettleton	- Electoral Engagement Manager
Peter Young	- City Surveyor's Department

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Deputy Alastair Moss, Deputy Joyce Nash, Andrien Meyers and the Rt Hon The Lord Mayor Alderman William Russell.

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

Alderman Vincent Keaveny and Alderman Sir David Wootton declared non-pecuniary interests in respect of Item 22 as Honorary Benchers of Gray's Inn.

3. **MINUTES**

- a) The public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 18 February 2021 were approved.
- b) The public minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 25 January 2021 were noted.
- c) The public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 17 February 2021 were noted.
- d) The draft public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 2 March 2021 were noted.

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

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk setting out amendments requested from various committees to their compositions or terms of reference.

Introducing the item, the Town Clerk advised of a minor issue with the proposed amendment to the Community & Children's Services Committee's terms of reference, in relation to new public safety responsibilities. It was

observed that the proposal specified that the Police Authority Board Chair/Deputy Chair would serve as the SaferCity Partnership Deputy Chair; however, that Board had, in fact, agreed that it should be a Member of that Board, not necessarily the Chair/Deputy. Subject to the wording being amended to reflect this revised position, Members were supportive of the change.

A late request from the Markets Committee was also brought to Members' attention, which sought an addition to their terms of reference to provide for "input into the design and management elements of the new consolidated market at Dagenham Dock." Members discussed the proposal, noting the various discussions in recent years in relation to responsibilities around the relocation programme, including the establishment of a protocol to clarify definitively such matters. The Committee questioned the necessity of such an amendment but, on balance, was not opposed to one if it helped add greater clarity. However, it was cautioned that it would need to be re-worded sufficiently to make clear the respective responsibilities of the two Committees; in particular, the ownership of the programme by the Policy & Resources Committee must be respected, so it was clear that the Markets Committee was simply providing views and not making decisions. It was agreed that authority should be delegated to the Town Clerk, in conjunction with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, to consider final wording.

The Committee was also advised of a prospective amendment to the Barbican Centre Board's arrangements, which the Board was set to consider at its next meeting. If approved, this would provide for a second Deputy Chair, selected from amongst the external membership, in a manner akin to that in place for the Audit & Risk Management Committee. Members noted the prospective proposal and agreed to delegate authority to the Town Clerk, in conjunction with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, to consider such a proposal in due course.

**RESOLVED:** That Members:-

1. Approve the minor changes to the terms of reference of the Policy and Resources Committee (Appendix E)
2. Support the proposed amendments to the composition of the City of London Police Authority Board, together with amendments to its terms of reference (Appendix A)
3. Support the proposed change to the composition of the Board of Governors of the City of London Freemen's School (Appendix B)
4. Support the proposed additions to the Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee's terms of reference in relation to Aldgate Square and the Blue Plaque Scheme (Appendix C)
5. Support the proposed addition to the Terms of Reference of the Community and Children's Services Committee to provide oversight of the new responsibilities of the of that service area in relation to public protection (Appendix D), subject to an amendment in respect of the Police Authority Board's representative on the Safer City Partnership

6. Delegate authority to the Town Clerk, in conjunction with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, to consider proposed amendments to the Markets Committee's Terms of Reference in relation to the new co-located market
7. Delegate authority to the Town Clerk, in conjunction with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, to consider proposed amendments to the Barbican Centre Board's constitution, concerning a second Deputy Chair
8. Delegate authority to the Town Clerk, in conjunction with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, to consider any further changes requested by Committees which might arise unexpectedly in advance of the next meeting, to facilitate their submission to the Court through the White Paper.

5. **APPOINTMENTS TO THE STATUES WORKING GROUP**

The Committee proceeded to make appointments to the five vacancies on the Statues Working Group.

Pursuant to the resolution at the last meeting, Deputy Wendy Hyde (as Chair of the Culture, Heritage & Libraries Committee) was appointed to one of the vacancies. Members proceeded to ballot in respect of the remaining four vacancies.

The results of the ballot were announced as follows:-

	<b>Votes</b>
Munsur Ali	- 18
Mary Durcan	- 19
Sheriff Christopher Hayward	- 21
Deputy Clare James	- 11
Andrew Mayer	- 3
Natasha Lloyd-Owen	- 6
John Scott	- 5
William Upton	- 12
Deputy Philip Woodhouse	- 6

RESOLVED: That Munsur Ali, Mary Durcan, Sheriff Christopher Hayward, Deputy Wendy Hyde, William Upton be appointed to the Statues Working Group.

6. **APPOINTMENT TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE MUSEUM OF LONDON**

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk proposing the reappointment of the Rt Hon the Lord Boateng to the Board of Governors of the Museum of London.

RESOLVED: That the reappointment of Rt Hon the Lord Paul Boateng to the Board of Governors of the Museum of London for a 12-month term expiring 31 March 2022 be approved.

7. **MEETING SCHEDULING**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk concerning the formalisation of recess periods, during which the scheduling of meetings should be avoided.

The Town Clerk clarified that the proposals would be put into effect from the coming municipal year, if approved.

In response to questions, it was confirmed that a degree of pragmatism would be used where the recess dates fell awkwardly, such that business was accommodated sensibly and recess lengths were consistent with the spirit of the proposals. It was also confirmed that recess dates would be made clear in advance through the annual committee diary setting process.

RESOLVED: That the introduction of formal Christmas recess period, in addition to those covering the Easter and Summer holidays, be approved, during which time no formal committee meetings should be held.

#### 8. **GOVERNANCE REVIEW: PLANNING OUTCOMES**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk concerning those aspects of the Governance Review relating to the Planning & Transportation Committee. The report presented the recommendations of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee (RASC), following an informal engagement process intended to gather the views of all Members.

The Chair thanked Sheriff Christopher Hayward for his efforts in managing the consultation process to-date and drew Members' attention to RASC's proposals as set out in the report. The Committee proceeded to debate the various recommendations in turn.

During discussion on the specific issues, Members made the following points

- A Member reflected on the history of their service on the Court and the wishes of voters in their Ward, highlighting the integral nature of planning matters within this activity and their role in representing constituents' views. The Member argued that the move to Panels would prevent them undertaking this role as effectively and be against the interests of the voters of the Ward.
- Calls into question previous decisions if saying Ward Members participating is not good practice. Going to panels waters down democratic oversight large committee provides. Doesn't address real conflict which is conflict with PIB / bias due to property industry.
- Other Members spoke in strong support of the Panel approach, reflecting on practice elsewhere, the question of efficiency, and the clear recommendations of Lisvane. Balance between representation and decision-making, this actually should make us more effective in representing, allows you to get involve don pre-application basis in way that wouldn't currently be possible. Puts ward member advocacy at its heart. Also much more transparent.

- Mooney's comments not valid, could have done all those, transportation matters not planning. On planning matters, proposals give ward members a greater opportunity.
- Think smaller decision making panels is good but not yet convinced geographic basis is necessarily best. Need to think about loss of confidence of residents in system and ensure get balance right in any new approach to ensure panels constituted in such a way as to ensure residents feel their views are key part.
- Don't need to sit on committee to influence or impart views, misrepresentation to view it as any sort of emasculation of rights.
- Shouldn't be seen as residential vs business, fake distinction, all here to serve city community
- Need to look at efficiency, decision-making, to increase confidence.
- Support but not set in stone, we could always review operation and change / improve so we respond to any concerns arising from operation
- Look at what achieved with current structure, don't fix what not broken
- Support panel but not geographic structure. Concerns on P&T is potential for undue influence, and smaller committees increase risk. Geographic means know who in advance. Plus you risk different panels getting different views on same policy. So random changed ones each time.
- AMcM – if partner of prof firm involved in application, don't have to declare if not fee earner? Comptroller – incorrect, would qualify as disclosable pecuniary interest.
- Old protocol, PIB members didn't serve on planning, close-knit relationship with property community not last through BIDs, reduce any whiff of conflict and prevent them from serving. And those with professional interest, would service them and CoLC best if clear defined distance and no conflict or perceived bias.
- We are an organisation which struggles to draw on all our talents and same thing here – why would we produce barriers to participation of democratically elected representatives, self-defeating. BIDs are core part of promoting city communities na dbringing unheard voices to table, find it amazing anyone would oppose, obody spoke against BID policy when came for decision. Damaging to reputation and unhelpful to debate.
- On CBC, no point in saying can't sit as miniscule number of applications likely, only one now and no Member would participate in decision, more unlikely in near future if at all, seems misplaced.
- Strong support for those with property expertise being involved as it's that we need, entirely appropriate. Ofc any interest then bound by code of conduct not to participate so not sure issue.

(i) ***Should the Planning & Transportation Committee continue to be a Ward Committee?***

It was noted that there a clear consensus had emerged that Ward Committee status should be retained.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Court that the Planning and Transportation Committee be retained as a Ward Committee.

**(ii) *Should the size of the Planning & Transportation Committee be reduced?***

Regarding the size of the Committee it was felt that the current membership of 35 Members is too large and that Aldermen should retain appointment rights. Both aspects shall however have to be further considered in the context of the Member consultation process on Ward Committees. This aspect is relevant to the proposed establishment of Planning Panel as there will need to be enough members on the Planning and Transportation Committee to fill places on the panels (assuming that the panels will be sub-committees of the Planning and Transportation committee).

**(iii) *Should panels be established for consideration of planning applications?***

As at (i), the view of Members in respect of the future role of a Planning and Transportation Committee in determining planning applications was split. However, there was widespread agreement that the current decision-making arrangement meant most Committee time was spent on planning applications leaving insufficient time for the formation and oversight of policy and strategy and the detailed exploration and consideration of other strategic planning, highways and transportation matters.

The following reasons/anticipated outcomes were considered to support the introduction of Planning Panel to consider planning applications:-

- (a) to avoid the exploration of minute detail, lengthy debate and complex representations regarding applications at meetings of the grand committee;
- (b) to enhance the efficiency of decision-making by creating an environment where matters of detail in respect of planning applications can be appropriately explored, debated and finessed;
- (c) to allow better advocacy for Ward Members. For those Members not serving on a panel they would be free to undertake their democratic tasks of representing their wards (unfettered); they would have greater opportunity to shape and refine matters at an early stage; and applicants would be able work closely with Ward Members;
- (d) subject to the form and structure of future panels, residents would be reassured if residential Wards were always represented on a panel; and

(e) the introduction of panels should reduce the amount of work the grand committee, and its membership, is currently expected to manage.

(iv) **Suggested form/structure of, and arrangements for Planning Panels:**

(a) Planning applications shall be considered by geographically defined Planning Panels (as sub-committees of the Planning and Transportation Committee), comprising the grand committee's Members from the Wards in those areas, dealing with those applications in the 'mirror' area.

(b) The geographical formation would ensure that there is clarity in terms of composition, thus removing the potential risk of the composition of ad hoc Planning Panels becoming contentious, and also removing any conflicts from Members hearing applications in their own Wards, but freeing them up to advocate for their constituents, just as happens on licensing panels.

(c) Suggested format:-

- **West Planning Panel** considers applications for the East of the City (Aldersgate, Bread Street, Castle Baynard, Farringdon Within, Farringdon Without, Queenhithe).
- **East Planning Panel** considers applications for the West of the City (Aldgate, Billingsgate, Langbourn, Lime Street, Portsoken, Tower).
- **North Planning Panel** considers applications for the South of the City (Bassishaw, Bishopsgate, Broad Street, Cheap, Coleman Street, Cripplegate).
- **South Planning Panel** considers applications for the North of the City (Bridge & Bridge Without, Candlewick, Cordwainer, Cornhill, Dowgate, Vintry, Walbrook).

(d) No Member shall sit on a panel to hear a planning application that affects their Ward.

(e) The size of the panel should comprise of 8-10 Members, each with an appropriate quorum.

(f) The amount of time allocated to a Ward Member to make oral representations to a Planning Panel on behalf of stakeholders (either for or against) should be up to a maximum of 10 minutes per Ward Member and with no requirement to "share time" with any other individual seeking to make representation.

(g) The Chairs of the Planning Panels should be elected via the Grand Committee and shall be rotated in a fair and appropriate manner.

**Recommendation (b):** That –



- (i) Planning Panels (as sub-committees of the Planning and Transportation Committee), comprising the grand committee's Members from the Wards in those areas, dealing with those applications in the 'mirror' area be established; and
- (ii) Noting the points raised in the report at paragraph 23 iv (a-g), officers be requested to draft detailed proposals on the establishment of Planning Panels, outlining quorum requirements, terms of reference and suggested revisions to the Planning Protocol etc. ahead of submission to the Policy and Resources Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee in April 2021 for approval, and with submission thereafter to the Court of Common Council.

***(iii) If so, how should Members be selected for such panels?***

As set out above.

***(iv) Should the two existing sub-committees continue as they are currently?***

***Recommendation (c):*** That the detailed work currently delegated to the Local Plans Sub-Committee and Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee remain with those bodies.

***(v) Should Members be able to discuss and/or vote on items relating to their Wards?***

***Recommendation (d):*** That no Member shall sit on a Planning Panel to hear a planning application that affects their Ward (but should be free to make representations to a Panel).

***(vi) Should Members be prohibited from serving on both the Planning & Transportation Committee and Property Investment Board?***

***Recommendation (e):*** That there shall not be an outright ban on Members sitting on both the Property Investment Board and the Planning and Transportation Committee or the Capital Buildings Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee.

***(vii) Should Members with professional connections or a background or expertise in property serve on the Committee?***

***Recommendation (f):*** That there shall not be an outright ban on Members with professional connections or a background or expertise in property serving on the Planning and Transportation Committee as good governance dictates that those Members with the right skills should be encouraged to participate in the governance structures.

**(viii) Should training be mandatory for Members of the committee?**

**Recommendation (g):** That training for all Members of the Planning and Transportation Committee should be mandatory.

RESOLVED: That Members:-

- Considered the proposals in relation to Planning made by Lord Lisvane in Section 7 of his Review (Appendix 1)
- Noted the feedback provided by Members through the informal engagement process (Appendix 2)
- Considered the items in respect of the various proposals, as set out in this report and Lord Lisvane's Review, together with the recommendations from the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee (see paragraph 23), as to a way forward
- Agreed that officers be requested to draft detailed proposals on the establishment of Planning Panels, outlining quorum requirements, terms of reference and suggested revisions to the Planning Protocol etc. ahead of submission to the Policy and Resources Committee in April 2021 for consideration, and with submission thereafter to the Court of Common Council in May 2021

**9. INTERIM SCHEME OF DELEGATION CHANGES**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk proposing interim amendments to the City of London Corporation's Scheme of Delegations to Officers, required as a consequence of the ongoing organisational restructure.

RESOLVED: That the proposals as outlined be recommended for approval by the Court of Common Council and that the Town Clerk be authorised to make such minor amendments to the Scheme of Delegations as required whilst structures are developed and implemented throughout the next 12 months.

**10. RECOVERY PROMOTIONAL CAMPAIGN**

The Committee considered a joint report of the Director of Innovation & Growth and the Director of Communications regarding the need for a large scale and sustained promotional campaign to entice workers back to the Square Mile sooner and give people compelling reasons to return frequently.

The following points emerged during discussion:

- Members strongly endorsed the proposed approach, as well as the suggestion that thought be given to increasing the level of resource available in support of this initiative. The Committee agreed to delegate

authority to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, to consider related proposals as required.

- It was urged that any intended activity be grounded in what City businesses were planning or encouraging their employees to do. This would ensure that efforts did not end up simply functioning as a marketing exercise but, instead, resulted in a co-ordinated and considered approach.
- It was suggested that initiatives such as the roll-out of a “City gift card” should be explored, in an effort to stimulate spending at local businesses.
- Caution was urged in respect of ensuring that any approach, whilst supporting London-wide recovery, remained politically neutral the in run-up to the Mayoral election.
- Members reflected on the difficult tensions between necessary budget cuts in some areas and expenditure on initiatives such as this, noting the importance of prioritisation. This included items such as expenditure on public toilets, which would be a necessary provision in plans to bring people back to the City, whilst opportunities to leverage activity in some areas for the benefit of other objectives should also be explored. In this particular instance, could this increased engagement with workers and businesses be leveraged into an opportunity to increase voter registration, for example.
- It was urged that any planned events or activity be coordinated carefully with neighbouring boroughs.

RESOLVED: That:-

1. The City of London recovery promotional campaign core purpose and success metrics be approved, as set out in the report.
2. The phase 1 budget of £250k be approved, to be met from the COVID Contingency Fund in order to launch the recovery campaign by spring/summer 2021.
3. Authority be delegated to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, to consider further funding allocation to this campaign.

**11. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY: EXTENSION OF DEFERRAL OF CIL PAYMENTS DUE TO COVID**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Built Environment regarding the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and proposing an extension of the deferral of CIL Payments due to COVID.

RESOLVED: That a time-limited extension to the Community Infrastructure Levy phasing policy until 31 July 2021, as set out in paragraphs 5-8 of the report, be approved.

**12. POLICY INITIATIVES FUND AND COMMITTEE CONTINGENCY**

The Committee considered a report of the Chamberlain which provided the schedule of projects and activities which had received funding from the Policy Initiatives Fund (PIF), the Policy and Resources Committee’s Contingency Fund, Committee’s Project Reserve, COVID19 Contingency Fund and Brexit Contingency Fund for 2020/21 and future years, with details of expenditure in 2020/21.

RESOLVED: That Members note the report and contents of the schedules, whilst granting approval for unallocated balances on the Committee's PIF and Contingency Fund should be carried forward into 2021/22, as well as for the rolling forward of the COVID Contingency Fund into 2021/22 due to the ongoing pandemic and the need to respond rapidly.

13. **OFFICER APPOINTMENTS BY COMMITTEE**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Human Resources which outlined the revised arrangements concerning senior officer appointments and committee involvement therein.

The Town Clerk advised of an error in the appended schedule in relation to the appointment of senior police officers (i.e. the Assistant Commissioner and Commanders). The list set out gave the impression that such posts were Member appointments; however, whilst there was Member involvement in the process, it was important to clarify that such appointments were made by the Commissioner of Police.

A Member also queried the arrangements concerning the Head of the Barbican & Community Libraries post, observing that, whilst the budget for the Library Service fell within the remit of the Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee, the Head of the Libraries Service reported to the Director of Community and Children's Services. It was, therefore, agreed that the latter committee should also be included within the recruitment process for this particular post.

Subject to these two amendments, Members approved the paper for onwards submission to the Court of Common Council.

RESOLVED: That the interim position in respect of the recruitment of senior officers be approved for submission to the Court of Common Council, as set out appendix 1 and subject to corrections in relation to senior police roles and the Head of Libraries post.

14. **CITY OF LONDON COVID BUSINESS RECOVERY FUND: INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

The Committee considered a joint report of the Town Clerk, Chamberlain, Director of Innovation & Growth, and City Surveyor concerning the details of a COVID Business Recovery Fund, intended to support small businesses in the City affected by the pandemic.

Members welcomed the report and commended officers on the pace with which the proposals had been developed following the Fund's establishment at the previous week's meeting of the Court of Common Council.

During discussion, the following points arose:

- It was agreed that the Deputy Chairman of Finance should be added to the informal "sounding board" of Members outlined in the report and at recommendation 3.
- In relation to the criteria at paragraph 19 subsection (vi), assurances were sought and provided that the City Corporation's own SME tenants would be

able to apply for grants where eligible, and that the Corporation would be proactive in this respect. Clarification was also sought in respect of those businesses which might not qualify solely due to unsupportive landlords. Officers advised that one of the intentions of the scheme's design was to put pressure on landlords to engage with their businesses, assisting them in gaining additional grant funding: it was, clearly, in the interests of landlords to have viable tenants. The lack of stipulations around the level of support within this particular clause would also aid in that respect.

- In response to a query around a similar ongoing process for Housing Revenue Account (HRA) tenants, assurance was provided that a joined-up approach would be employed to minimise any duplication or overlap of activity.
- Responding to questions concerning the online-based nature of the application process, officers advised that there would be 1-1 telephone support, as well as computer support in the City's business library, to assist those with who had difficulties using online systems. However, it was important to maintain the management of the process through an online system as this could be procured in such a way as it would undertake certain checks automatically, thereby improving the speed of the application process.
- With reference to the question posed at paragraph 19 subsection (ii), Members expressed support for expanding the criteria to include small independent hotel and bed & breakfast accommodation, and leisure and sports facilities.
- It was confirmed that the target date for launching the Fund for applications would be immediately after the next meeting of this Committee (8 April 2021), pending approval at that meeting of refined criteria for the final scheme.

RESOLVED: That Members:-

1. Agree to the outline scheme design Option B, as set out in the report.
2. Support the scheme eligibility criteria to be used as set out in paragraph 19, including the expansion at (ii)(a).
3. Agree to establish a small Member Sounding Board to provide guidance to officers as the scheme is established and implemented (such membership to comprise the Chair and Deputy Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee, the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Finance Committee, and the Proposer of the Court Amendment.
4. Authorise officers to procure external provider(s) for financial viability assessments, with approval to support the recommended procurement option, should it be needed, delegated to the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman of Policy and Resources Committee.

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

There were two questions:-

### **Virtual meetings**

A Member observed that the Regulations governing the ability to hold virtual meetings (introduced as a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic) were shortly to expire and requested an update on the position. The Assistant Town Clerk advised that consideration was being given to the various scenarios for holding meetings in the event that the Regulations were either extended or not, including hybrid meetings, and would report back to Members with more detail. The Remembrancer added that the Corporation continued to lend its voice to the Local Government Association's efforts in calling for an extension.

### **Census**

A Member reflected on the potential difficulties faced by those residents who did not have ready access to the internet in completing the Census, as well as the prospective impact of Census completion rates on the Corporation's funding allocations. The Assistant Town Clerk advised that paper forms were made available and undertook to provide information on this to Members following the meeting. A Member, also the Chairman of Finance, took the opportunity to clarify that the Corporation's funding allocation from central Government would be subject to consideration within the context of the wider Fair Funding Review, adding that the Chamberlain and Town Clerk would be monitoring the position.

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

There were no items of urgent business.

#### **17. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

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

#### **18. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The following non-public minutes were considered:

- a) The non-public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 18 February 2021 were agreed
- b) The non-public minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 25 January 2021 were noted.
- c) The non-public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 17 February 2021 were noted.
- d) The draft non-public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 2 March 2021 were noted

#### **19. TARGET OPERATING MODEL UPDATE**

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk providing an update on the Target Operating Model implementation.

#### **21. DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY OR URGENCY POWERS**

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk advising of decisions taken under delegated authority or urgency powers since the last meeting.

**22. CLS & CLSG SATELLITE STRATEGY AND ASSOCIATED FUNDING**

The Committee considered and approved a joint report of the Heads of the City of London School and City of London School for Girls presenting the strategy and associated funding proposals for a satellite site.

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

There were no questions.

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

There was one urgent item, concerning ongoing engagement with Transport for London.

**The meeting ended at 3.36 pm**

-----

Chairman

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