



## Property Investment Board

**Date:** WEDNESDAY, 9 MARCH 2016  
**Time:** 1.45 pm  
**Venue:** COMMITTEE ROOMS, 2ND FLOOR, WEST WING, GUILDHALL

**Members:**

Deputy Alastair Moss (Chairman)	Deputy Roger Chadwick
Tom Sleigh (Deputy Chairman)	Deputy John Chapman
Chris Boden	George Gillon
Mark Boleat	Deputy Brian Harris
Keith Bottomley (Co-Opted Member)	Ann Holmes
David Brooks Wilson (Co-Opted Member)	Michael Hudson
Deputy Michael Cassidy	Tony Joyce (Co-Opted Member)
	Dhruv Patel

**Enquiries:** David Arnold  
tel. no.: 020 7332 1174  
david.arnold@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Lunch will be served in Guildhall Club at 1PM  
NB: Part of this meeting could be the subject of audio or video 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 approve the public minutes and summary of the Property Investment Board meeting held on 10 February 2016.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 1 - 4)

4. **INCOME GENERATION - REPORT OF A CROSS-CUTTING SERVICE BASED REVIEW**

Report of the Chamberlain, approved by the Finance Committee on 16 February 2016 and the Policy & Resources Committee on 18 February 2016 and to be considered by the Education Board on 3 March 2016, the Epping Forest & Commons, Culture Heritage & Libraries, and Efficiency & Performance Sub- Committees on 7 March 2016, and the Port Health & Environmental Services Committee on 8 March 2016.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 5 - 16)

5. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE BOARD**

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

7. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

MOTION – 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.

**For Decision**

## Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda

8. **NON PUBLIC MINUTES**

To approve the non-public minutes of the Property Investment Board meeting held on 10 February 2016.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 17 - 24)

9. **THE CITY SURVEYOR'S BUSINESS PLAN 2016-2020**

Report of the City Surveyor.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 25 - 80)

10. **BARBICAN EXHIBITION HALL 1**  
Report of the City Surveyor.
- For Decision**  
(Pages 81 - 84)

11. **BRIDGE MASTER'S HOUSE PHASE II - GATEWAY 5 ISSUE REPORT**  
Report of the City Surveyor, approved by the Projects Sub-Committee on 25 February 2016.
- For Decision**  
(Pages 85 - 94)

#### **CITY FUND**

12. **LETTING REPORT - GRANT OF A NEW LEASE, BROAD STREET PLACE EC2**  
Report of the City Surveyor.
- For Decision**  
(Pages 95 - 100)

13. **LETTING REPORT - GRANT OF A NEW LEASE, LEADENHALL MARKET EC3**  
Report of the City Surveyor.
- For Decision**  
(Pages 101 - 104)

14. **LETTING REPORT - GRANT OF A NEW LEASE, TABERNACLE STREET EC2 (TO FOLLOW)**  
Report of the City Surveyor.
- For Decision**  
(To follow)

#### **CITY'S ESTATE**

15. **LETTING REPORT - LEASE RENEWAL, TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD W1**  
Report of the City Surveyor.
- For Decision**  
(Pages 105 - 110)

16. **RENT REVIEW - CHARTERHOUSE STREET, EC1**  
Report of the City Surveyor.
- For Decision**  
(Pages 111 - 114)

17. **ISSUE REPORT - NEW BROAD STREET, EC2 (TO FOLLOW)**  
Report of the City Surveyor.
- For Decision**  
(To follow)

## **BRIDGE HOUSE ESTATES**

18. **SURRENDER AND RE-GRANT OF NEW HEAD LEASE TO FACILITATE DEVELOPMENT - GRESHAM STREET, EC2 (TO FOLLOW)**

Report of the City Surveyor.

**For Decision**  
(To follow)

19. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE BOARD**

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

## PROPERTY INVESTMENT BOARD

Wednesday, 10 February 2016

**Minutes of the meeting of the Property Investment Board held at the Guildhall EC2 at 1.45 pm**

### **Present**

#### **Members:**

Deputy Alastair Moss (Chairman)	George Gillon
Chris Boden	Deputy John Chapman
Mark Boleat	Ann Holmes
David Brooks Wilson (Co-Opted Member)	Michael Hudson
Deputy Roger Chadwick	Tony Joyce (Co-Opted Member)

#### **Officers:**

David Arnold	- Town Clerk's Department
John James	- Chamberlain's Department
Alan Bennetts	- Comptroller & City Solicitor's Department
Peter Bennett	- City Surveyor
Nicholas Gill	- City Surveyor's Department
Peter Young	- City Surveyor's Department
Tom Leathart	- City Surveyor's Department
Trevor Nelson	- City Surveyor's Department
Jennifer Lewis	- City Surveyor's Department

#### **1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Tom Sleigh (Deputy Chairman), Keith Bottomley, Deputy Brian Harris, and Dhruv Patel.

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

Tony Joyce declared a non-pecuniary interest in any matters relating to the letting of the Third Floor of 21 Whitefriars Street, EC4.

#### **3. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – That the public minutes and summary of the Board meeting held on 13 January 2016 be approved, subject to the addition of Chris Boden's apologies for absence.

#### **4. HOUSING AND PLANNING BILL**

The Board received a report of the Remembrancer that advised Members of provisions included in the Housing and Planning Bill currently before Parliament. The provisions were intended principally to encourage land held in the public sector to be made available for housing development.

Members noted that any surplus City Fund land suitable for housing would be looked into and that the Board would be kept updated of any developments, particularly where investment properties were concerned.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.

5. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE BOARD**

There were none.

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

There was none.

7. **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.

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Paragraph No.</u>
8	1, 2, 3 & 5
9 – 20	3
23	1 & 4

8. **NON PUBLIC MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – That the non-public minutes of the Board meeting held on 13 January 2016 be approved.

9. **MUSEUM OF LONDON: FUNDING FOR UPDATED BUSINESS CASE FOR MUSEUM'S OCCUPATION OF SMITHFIELD GENERAL MARKET SITE.**

The Board received a report of the City Surveyor regarding funding for an updated business Case for the Museum of London's occupation of the Smithfield General Market Site.

10. **CITY SURVEYOR'S DEPARTMENTAL BUSINESS PLAN QUARTER 3 PROGRESS UPDATE**

The Board received a report of the City Surveyor that provided Members with details of the progress made in Quarter 3 against the City Surveyor's Departmental Business Plan 2015-18 and the key risk areas associated with the delivery of that plan.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.

11. **CITY SURVEYOR'S DEPARTMENTAL RISK UPDATE**

The Board received a report of the City Surveyor that provided Members with an update regarding the management risks within the City Surveyor's Department.

**RESOLVED** – That the actions taken within the City Surveyor's Department to effectively monitor and manage risks arising from the City Surveyor's Department's operations be noted.

12. **CITY'S RENTAL FORECASTS MONITORING REPORT**  
The Board received a report of the City Surveyor that provided the quarterly update of rental forecasts for City's Estate, Bridge House Estates, City Fund, and the Strategic Estate, as at 31 December 2015.  
**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.
13. **VACANT ACCOMMODATION UPDATE AS AT 1 DECEMBER 2015**  
The Board received a report of the City Surveyor that provided a summary of the commercial property portfolio vacancy position as at 1 December 2015.  
**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.
14. **METRICS USED IN MAKING MAJOR PROPERTY DECISIONS**  
The Board received a joint report of the City Surveyor and the Chamberlain that provided Members with a background to the appraisal metrics used in City Corporation property reports.  
**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.
15. **LETTING REPORT - FINSBURY HOUSE, EC2**  
The Board consider a report of the City Surveyor that sought approval to a letting of offices and storage accommodation in Finsbury House, EC2.
16. **LAND SWAP AND GRANT OF LONG LEASE TO FACILITATE DEVELOPMENT -LEADENHALL TRIANGLE, EC3**  
The Board considered a report of the City Surveyor that sought approval to enter into an Option Agreement for the Leadenhall Triangle Site.
17. **GATEWAY 3/4 OPTIONS APPRAISAL - REFURBISHMENT OF 3RD FLOOR AND RECEPTION AREA, WHITEFRIARS STREET, EC4**  
The Board considered a report of the City Surveyor that sought approval to an option for the refurbishment of a 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor and Reception Area in Whitefriars Street, EC4.
18. **LETTING REPORT - GRANT OF A NEW LEASE, NEW BOND STREET W1**  
The Board considered a report of the City Surveyor that sought approval to the grant of a new lease in New Bond Street, W1.
19. **LETTING REPORT - RENT REVIEW, BAYNARD HOUSE EC4**  
The Board considered a report of the City Surveyor that provided details of a rent review in respect of Baynard House, 135 Queen Victoria Street, EC4.
20. **ISSUE REPORT - 4-14 TABERNACLE STREET, EC2**  
The Board considered a report of the City Surveyor that sought approval to an increase to a contract works budget.
21. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE BOARD**  
There were none.

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

The Board considered one item of urgent business.

**23. RESTRUCTURING OF THE FACILITIES MANAGEMENT TEAMS**

The Board received a report of the City Surveyor regarding the restructuring of the Facilities Management Team.

**RESOLVED** – That the restructuring proposals be noted.

**The meeting closed at 3.15 pm**

-----  
Chairman

**Contact Officer: David Arnold  
tel. no.: 020 7332 1174  
david.arnold@cityoflondon.gov.uk**



# Agenda Item 4

<b>Committee:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
Finance Committee	16 February 2016
Policy & Resources Committee	18 February 2016
Education Board	3 March 2016
Epping Forest and Commons Committee	7 March 2016
Culture, Heritage and Libraries	7 March 2016
Efficiency and Performance Sub-Committee	7 March 2016
Port Health & Environmental Services Committee	8 March 2016
Property Investment Board	9 March 2016
Planning & Transportation Committee	10 March 2016
Community & Children's Services Committee	11 March 2016
General Purposes Committee of Aldermen	15 March 2016
Barbican Centre	16 March 2016
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Public</b>
Income Generation - Report of a Cross-Cutting Service Based Review	
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>For Decision</b>
The Chamberlain (on behalf of the Performance and Strategy Summit Group)	
<b>Report author:</b>	
Susan Baxter, Town Clerk's Department	

## Summary

A cross-cutting review of the potential for the City Corporation to exploit new sources of income was commissioned as part of the Service Based Review programme. The review was undertaken from April - September 2015, with a final report cleared by the Chief Officers Summit Group in January 2016. A summary of the review report and its recommendations are attached at Appendix 1.

The review found that there are:

- Opportunities to increase certain fees and charges to bring income into greater alignment with costs, in line with the approach taken in London local authorities;
- Opportunities to drive increased income from a more entrepreneurial approach in certain areas;
- Limited scope to increase revenues from public sector grants
- Potential opportunities to unlock increased corporate sponsorship and private giving to the benefit of the City's cultural and artistic institutions by taking a more co-ordinated approach.

## Recommendations

The **Finance Committee** is asked to agree the overall report and all of its recommendations.

The **Policy & Resources Committee** is asked to agree the overall report and all of its recommendations.

**All Committees** are asked to endorse the overall report.

The **Planning & Transportation Committee** is asked to:

- a) approve headline recommendation 1 (“Harmonise the approach to setting all charges, fees and debt recovery for City Fund services with those of other relevant authorities within 12 months, unless a compelling business case is agreed for individual exceptions.”)
- b) approve the introduction of Planning Performance Agreements to increase income from Development Control services (detailed recommendation a); and
- c) agree to review options to maximise full deployment of capacity and increase charges to align with neighbouring authorities / NCP charges to increase income from off-street parking (detailed recommendation b).

The **Education Board** is asked to note detailed recommendation i) (“that the Department of Community & Children’s Services lead the preparation of a business case presenting options, costs, resources, risks and timetables for establishing the commercial expansion of central support services tied to the expansion of academy schools over the next one to three years”).

The **Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee** is asked to:

- a) endorse headline recommendation 5 (“That a feasibility study be commissioned to explore the potential cost-benefits of adopting a more co-ordinated approach to securing commercial sponsorship for the City’s cultural, heritage and arts institutions with the long term aim of ensuring they become less dependent upon public funding”);
- b) agree detailed recommendation c) (“that the Department of Culture, Heritage & Libraries prepare options to review charging and income generation opportunities from the City Corporation’s museums and galleries”); and
- C) endorse the recommendation g (“to adopt a proactive approach to marketing the Corporation’s filming locations ensuring consistent coverage of professional film location handling services services across the Corporation’s entire land and property portfolio”) and endorse the proposal to seek income from filming commercials on Tower Bridge.D) agree detailed recommendation j) (“that the Department of Culture, Heritage & Libraries commission a marketing consultancy to explore ways in which the City’s offer to visitors can be better developed, co-ordinated and promoted to increase revenues to the City Corporation”).

The **Efficiency and Performance Sub-Committee** is asked to agree headline recommendation 1) (“Harmonise the approach to setting all charges, fees and debt recovery for City Fund services with those of other relevant authorities within 12 months, unless a compelling business case is agreed for individual exceptions.”)

The **Port Health & Environmental Services Committee** is asked to:

- a) agree detailed recommendation d) (“that the Department of Markets & Consumer Protection prepare a business case for expanding the animal transit and inspections services to London’s airports on a more commercial basis to maximise potential income”); and
- b) agree detailed recommendation h) (“that the Department of Markets & Consumer Protection prepare a business case for maximising the commercial potential of business regulatory advisory services via the Primary Authority

partnership model”).

The **Community & Children’s Services Committee** is asked to agree detailed recommendation i) (“that the Department of Community & Children’s Services lead the preparation of a business case presenting options, costs, resources, risks and timetables for establishing the commercial expansion of central support services tied to the expansion of academy schools over the next one to three years.”)

The **Barbican Centre Board** is asked to:

- a) endorse headline recommendation 5: (“That a feasibility study be commissioned to explore the potential cost-benefits of adopting a more co-ordinated approach to securing commercial sponsorship for the City’s cultural, heritage and arts institutions with the long term aim of ensuring they become less dependent upon public funding”);
- b) note detailed recommendation j) (“that the Department of Culture, Heritage & Libraries commission a marketing consultancy to explore ways in which the City’s offer to visitors can be better developed, co-ordinated and promoted to increase revenues to the City Corporation”).

The **Property Investment Board** is asked to agree detailed recommendation e (“That the City Surveyor prepares a business case for the relevant Committees presenting options, costs, resources required, risks and timetables for establishing an “intelligent client” service for public bodies seeking to manage and develop their property assets.”)

The **General Purposes Committee of Aldermen** is asked to endorse the recommendation g (“to adopt a proactive approach to marketing the Corporation’s filming locations ensuring consistent coverage of professional film location handling services services across the Corporation’s entire land and property portfolio”), noting the specific reference to actively marketing Mansion House as a filming location.

The **Epping Forest and Commons Committee** is asked to endorse the recommendation g (“to adopt a proactive approach to marketing the Corporation’s filming locations ensuring consistent coverage of professional film location handling services services across the Corporation’s entire land and property portfolio”), noting the specific reference to the opportunity to in relation to Burnham Beeches.

## **Main Report**

### **Background**

#### 1. The review:

- Benchmarked the City Corporation’s income in relation to costs for its public services against those of London local authorities (on a consistent basis and taking account of the differences in scale);
- Assessed the opportunities to increase revenues from a more commercial approach to providing services;
- Assessed the scope to increase income from public grants and
- Considered the scope to increase income from commercial sponsorship and donations, particularly for the cultural and artistic initiatives.

## **Current Position**

2. In relation to the City Corporation's income from fees, charges and reclaimable costs from its public services, the City Corporation compares favourably with London local authorities in over half of London's services which are almost wholly self-financing. The areas of Off-street Parking, Development Control and Museums & Galleries offer the greatest opportunities for increasing charges to achieve levels more approaching London averages for cost-efficiency.
3. Upwards of £3m in additional income could be derived by taking a more overtly commercial approach to expanded services in several areas, the top three being:
  - Animal transit and inspections at London's airports
  - Property services: provision of an 'intelligent client' service for public bodies seeking to manage and develop their property assets
  - Venue hire and events management
4. Different commercial models would be deployed according to the nature of the service and certain of the City Corporation's decision-making processes and operating procedures might require adjustment to enable these services to operate with optimum commercial efficacy.
5. There is limited scope to drive significant additional income from domestic and EU public sector grants, since these sources are geared towards supporting new public sector initiatives and/or special needs – which the City Corporation does not generally tend to focus on due to its relatively small scale and its customer base as a public authority.
6. There is more scope to work in partnership with the City's cultural and artistic institutions to take a more structured and co-ordinated approach to securing corporate sponsorship and giving. This might unlock levels of funding and patronage that organisations are currently unable to secure at an individual level.

## **Options, Proposals and Implications**

7. These are set out for each of the areas identified above in the tables of recommendations at Appendix 1.

## **Appendix**

Appendix 1 - Income Generation Cross-Cutting Review: Summary & Recommendations.

## **Background Papers**

A copy of the full report and its Annexes is available to Members as a PDF on the intranet at: <http://vmtcapp12/documents/s60865/IncomeGenerationFullReport.pdf> PDF and paper copies are also available on request from the Committee and Member Services Team.

**Sue Baxter**, Partnership Advisor, Town Clerk's Department  
T: 020 7332 3148, E: [sue.baxter@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:sue.baxter@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

# INCOME GENERATION CROSS CUTTING REVIEW : SUMMARY

## WHY INCOME GENERATION MATTERS FOR THE CITY CORPORATION

The Square Mile has long been a premiere global destination for financial and blue chip businesses and in more recent years, increasing numbers of new visitors and tourists who have come to enjoy its world class attractions and cultural events. The completion of Crossrail in the next 2-3 years will bring the City within even easier reach of millions more businesses, workers and visitors. Ensuring the Square Mile continues to flourish as an engaging economic engine in a constantly evolving geo-political, financial, social and cultural environment brings ever changing challenges and opportunities for the City Corporation to extend its reach, impact and income. The current agenda of rapidly diminishing public sector financing, rising public expectations of transparency in governance, ambitions to create a cultural hub in the Square Mile, potentially with a new world class Centre for Music, means that taking a fresh look at the City Corporation's approach to income generation will help to maximise its full potential, achieve its ambitions, reduce the need to cut resources and embrace best commercial and public sector practice.

## SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

This report summarises the conclusions of an exercise between May - October 2015 to assess the potential to increase income from a variety of sources. The review aimed to:

1. Compare the City Corporation's income from fees, charges and debt recovery with that of London local authorities on a service-by-service basis for 2013/14 (the latest year for which comparisons were available)
2. Identify areas where fees, charging and debt recovery could be set in greater alignment with the approach taken elsewhere in London to increase income for the Corporation
3. Highlight the potential for more effective commercial exploitation of some of the City's services and the organisational implications for achieving optimum returns
4. Assess the extent to which the City Corporation might benefit from additional public funds and grants which have previously not been explored
5. Assess the potential to secure greater private sector sponsorship to support the City Corporation's priorities and the implications for the organisation.

Excluded from the review were issues which are (or have been recently) considered elsewhere:

- Use of property assets: this is subject to a separate cross-cutting review
- Measures to review business rates: the Business Rates Premium is under consideration as part of the budget setting process for the City of London Police
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL): the CIL rates have recently been set at a deliberately lower rate than elsewhere in central London but this may be reviewed by the Department for the Built Environment
- The Corporation's current policy against advertising hoardings around the Square Mile: this currently remains a priority for retention by Members, although it merits periodic review in relation to income potential, particularly in relation to public information
- Departmental efficiency savings: these are covered by departmental service based reviews.

## HEADLINE FINDINGS

### STATUTORY SERVICES

**The City Corporation boasts some unique strengths but increased income could be achieved in other areas if an approach to setting fees, charges and debt recovery was aligned to and regularly benchmarked against London local authorities.**

From an assessment of comparable categories of public authority spending, the City Corporation is most distinguished from London local authorities in relation to its significantly higher City Fund-related income derived from its property portfolio, its ‘theatres’ (as a result of the Barbican Centre), its ‘port health functions’ (as a result of the Animal Reception Centre) and from its ‘cemetery and cremation services’ (these spending categories are set and defined by the Revenue Outturn Returns reporting process.) These City Fund services alone generate £34m more than the London average for the equivalent services. Other City Corporation services, such as on-street parking and trade waste also do well when income is compared to costs in areas which are readily comparable. However, it would be possible to raise even more by increasing the rate of return on investment to levels which proportionately match the London local authority average in relation to the following services:

- Off street parking
- Development control
- Museums & galleries  
(in relation to the Guildhall Art Gallery, the Amphitheatre, the Roman Bath House and the Museum of London grant – ie the budgets included within this City Fund category.)

### COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY & MARKETING

**There is scope to refocus and expand some of the City Corporation’s services which already have a commercial or recharged element. This could increase income by around £3m and would also demonstrate the City Corporation’s commercial acumen to public and private sector stakeholders.**

The City Corporation could maximise its earning potential and its reputational credibility as a public authority by working more adeptly in an increasingly commercial and competitive public sector environment. Current commercial offers across the City Corporation have evolved incidentally over time, resulting in a somewhat ad hoc and low key market presence. Whilst some services are more focussed than others on generating revenues, there is scope to augment income if the Corporation takes a fresh look at its commercial and marketing approach to services with income potential, most significantly in the areas of:

1. Animal transit & inspections at London’s airports
2. Property services: An “intelligent client” service for public bodies seeking to manage and develop their property assets
3. Venue hire and events management
4. Film location services
5. Business regulatory advisory services – via the “Primary Authority” partnership model
6. Central support services (especially for potential future academy schools)

The success of greater commercialisation in the above areas would be reliant upon a more purposeful and corporately coherent approach to their direction, promotion and support (including investment, resourcing and professional services). However, the specific form and

structure of the commercial presentation of these services to the market will vary according to the circumstances of each specific case.

## **PUBLIC SECTOR GRANTS**

**There is no significant scope to increase income from mainstream domestic grants. However, there is potential to apply for a wider range of competitive UK and EU programmes but these are geared more towards new initiatives than to supporting core business.**

The relatively small scale and wealthy nature of the City detracts from its capacity to attract substantial income other than the mainstream local authority grants from central government. However, there are approximately 20 domestic sources of funding (such as the Heritage Lottery Fund in relation to historic buildings) and 13 EU programmes which could fund the Corporation's more experimental projects, such as the Safe & Smarter City Programme. These are aimed principally at enabling new initiatives and innovative ways of working (for example, many of the performing organisations which perform at City venues and festivals benefit from Arts Council England grants) rather than at meeting shortfalls in domestic mainstream funding. These programmes often require 'match-funding' although if projects are carefully constructed, match-funding can comprise existing budgets. Many larger local authorities run EU funded projects to highlight their initiative and participation on a wider stage. The Corporation has directly led a few EU funded projects within the last five years (mainly to support employment and policing) but none are currently live.

## **CORPORATE SPONSORSHIP & PRIVATE GIVING**

**As public funding for culture, heritage and the arts in London drops sharply, there is scope to help the City's organisations operating in these areas secure increased commercial sponsorship.**

There is potential to lead the establishment of a more co-ordinated approach to fund-raising and seeking commercial sponsorship, while respecting the sensitive nature of sharing development contacts nurtured over long periods of time. A more structured and co-ordinated approach supported by the City Corporation might be able to unlock significant funds and patronage which smaller, individual organisations or different parts of the City Corporation are currently unable to secure on a piecemeal basis. Positive involvement by the City in developing major contacts for new projects, particularly as the plans for a new Museum of London and a world-class Centre for Music develop, would require a wholly different level of private support.

## HEADLINE RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations	Committee approval
<p>1. <b>Harmonise the approach to setting all charges, fees and debt recovery for City Fund services with those of other relevant authorities within 12 months, unless a compelling business case is agreed for individual exceptions.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy &amp; Resources Committee;</li> <li>- Finance Committee;</li> <li>- Performance &amp; Efficiency Sub Committee;</li> <li>- Relevant service committees</li> </ul>
<p>2. <b>Review annual performance of income recovered in relation to costs for all services from which income can be derived, benchmarking performance against London local authorities.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Finance Committee;</li> <li>- Performance &amp; Efficiency Sub Committee;</li> <li>- Relevant service committees</li> </ul>
<p>3. <b>Commission business cases containing business model options to maximise the short, medium and longer term commercial income</b> from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Animal transit &amp; inspections at London’s airports</li> <li>▪ Property services: An “intelligent client” service for public bodies seeking to manage and develop their property assets</li> <li>▪ Venue hire and events management – following a steer from Members on principles for free and subsidised venue hire</li> <li>▪ Film location services</li> <li>▪ Central support services (targeting future CoLC academy schools)</li> <li>▪ Business regulatory advisory services – via the “Primary Authority” partnership model</li> <li>▪ Development of a co-ordinated and marketed City ‘heritage offer’</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy &amp; Resources Committee;</li> <li>- Finance Committee;</li> <li>- Relevant service committees</li> </ul>
<p>4. <b>Decide which commercialised services to implement, if any, on the basis of the business cases prepared.</b> Agree an appropriate business model for each case agreed and any associated broader organisational changes which are required to accommodate and support the commercial activity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy &amp; Resources Committee;</li> <li>- Finance Committee;</li> <li>- Relevant service committees</li> </ul>
<p>5. <b>Commission a feasibility study to explore the potential cost-benefits of adopting a more co-ordinated approach to securing commercial sponsorship for the City’s cultural, heritage and arts institutions</b> with the long term aim of ensuring they become less dependent upon public funding.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy &amp; Resources Committee;</li> <li>- Finance Committee;</li> <li>- Relevant service committees</li> </ul>



## PUBLICLY FUNDED SERVICES - BENCHMARKING FEES, CHARGES & RECLAIMABLE COSTS : DETAILED RECOMMENDATIONS

Headline recommendations	Actions	Timescales
1. Harmonise the approach to setting all charges, fees and debt recovery for City Fund services with those of other relevant authorities within 12 months, unless a compelling business case is agreed for individual exceptions.	All departments: All officers responsible for recovering fees, charges and debts to review CoLC charging & recovery policies / practice in relation to those applied by individual neighbouring or relevant London boroughs and recommend any changes to their respective committees.	Immediate
2. Review annual performance of income recovered in relation to costs for all services from which income can be derived, benchmarking performance against other London local authorities.	Chamberlain's: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Maintain a central overview of full service costs and income, ensuring that systems used to apportion income and expenditure to City's Cash and City Fund do not make the City Corporation appear unduly inefficient.</li> <li>▪ Commission annual supplementary analysis from CIPFA drawn from "Income Generation Comparative Profiles" derived from revenue outturn returns to Government</li> <li>▪ Analyse significant differences and the underlying reasons and propose relevant recommendations in collaboration with relevant departments.</li> </ul>	Immediate

Page 13

Detailed Recommendations	Actions	Timescales
<b>a) Development Control</b>		
Consider the introduction of Planning Performance Agreements	Department of Built Environment (DBE) to propose options.	Immediate
<b>b) Off-street parking</b>		
Review options to maximise full deployment of capacity and increase charges to align with neighbouring authorities / NCP charges.	DBE to propose options for maximising capacity and adjusting charging on an annual basis, following any necessary upgrades to car parks.	Immediate
<b>c) Museums &amp; galleries</b>		
Review charging and income generation opportunities to increase revenues.	Department of Culture, Heritage & Libraries to propose options to increase income.	Immediate

## CORPORATE COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY : DETAILED RECOMMENDATIONS

Headline recommendations	Actions	Timescales
<p>3. <b>Commission business cases containing business model options to maximise the short, medium and longer term commercial income</b> from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Animal transit &amp; inspections at London’s airports</li> <li>▪ Property services: An “intelligent client” service for public bodies seeking to manage and develop their property assets</li> <li>▪ Venue hire and events management</li> <li>▪ Film location services</li> <li>▪ Business regulatory advisory services – via the “Primary Authority” partnership model</li> <li>▪ Central support services (targeting future CoLC academy schools)</li> </ul> <p>Recommended business models should set out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Anticipated additional annual income against additional costs and/or other resources required</li> <li>- Additional organisational changes or services required to enable and support the commercial activity, including any additional central support</li> <li>- The scope of commercial ‘autonomy’ sought by the service in relation to the relevant department/s and committee/s; a viable proposition for the apportionment of central costs and overheads and relevant commercial incentives (eg retention of surpluses generated)</li> </ul>	<p>Income Generation Review implementation process to propose a framework for adopting and supporting a more commercial approach in the areas outlined in Recommendation 3. This should include operational proposals for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prioritising investment to increase revenue-generating activities</li> <li>- Retention of revenues for business reinvestment</li> <li>- Apportionment of central costs</li> <li>- Longer term options for establishing formal trading vehicles in appropriate cases.</li> </ul>	<p>Starting immediately and spread over the next year.</p>
<p>4. <b>Decide which commercialised services to implement, if any, on the basis of the business cases prepared.</b> Agree an appropriate business model for each case and any associated broader organisational changes required to accommodate and support the commercial activity.</p>		

Page 14

Detailed recommendations	Actions	Timescales
<p>d) <b>Animal transit &amp; inspections at London’s airports</b></p>	<p>Dept Markets &amp; Consumer Protection to prepare a business case to the relevant Committees presenting options, costs / resources required, risks and timetables for establishing the commercial proposition as outlined.</p>	<p>Immediate</p>
<p>e) <b>Property services: Management of property assets &amp; development works</b></p>	<p>City Surveyor’s to prepare a business case to the relevant Committees presenting options, costs / resources required, risks and timetables for establishing the commercial proposition as outlined.</p>	<p>Within 1 year</p>
<p>f) <b>Venue hire &amp; events management</b></p>	<p>Income Generation Review implementation process to deliver a business case with options for a tighter, more integrated corporate commercial offer which addresses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pricing policy in relation to principles for free and subsidised hire (who, when and why) and which draws on models pursued elsewhere (eg charging on the basis of per person per hour) – following a steer by Members</li> <li>- Core terms and conditions of hire for incorporation into all hire contracts which cover the Corporation’s risks and liabilities associated with the commercial hire of its venues – under the auspices of the City Events Management Group proposed by the Hospitality SBR (provided this is agreed)</li> </ul>	<p>Within 1 year</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Functions, resources and expertise which might be shared to increase business, reduce duplication and plug gaps – under the auspices of the City Events Management Group proposed by the Hospitality SBR (provided this is agreed)</li> <li>- Identification of additional venues and grounds which could be hired out + any associated investments needed to bring them into use – under the auspices of the City Events Management Group proposed by the Hospitality SBR (provided this is agreed)</li> </ul>	
<b>g) Film Location Services</b>		
Adopt a proactive (rather than reactive) approach to marketing the Corporation’s filming locations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Income Generation Review Implementation Manager to prepare a business case to increase staff resources by one or two additional people in the Film Team on a 2 year trial basis - the arrangement to be assessed after 2 years in relation to the additional revenues generated. (There is a particular need to market the Mansion House actively as a film location to turn around industry perceptions that filming is not allowed there.)</li> <li>- Enlarged Film Location Services team to prepare a comprehensive prospectus of all the City’s potential filming assets (both within and outside the Square Mile) working closely with City Surveyors and Open Spaces to identify and document potential locations and indicative filming charges. This might be done as an internship project in partnership with the London Film School or University of Arts London more widely. Corporation venues also available for hire should be signalled and promoted prominently.</li> </ul>	Immediate
Ensure consistent coverage of professional film location handling services across the Corporation’s entire land and property portfolio.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Enlarged Film Location Services team to establish a consistent charging policy and service across the entire land and property portfolio of the City Corporation, working closely with the relevant governing Trusts or leaseholders. (Burnham Beeches, due to its proximity to Pinewood Studios, has particular potential to generate more filming income.)</li> </ul>	Within 1 year
Seek income from filming commercials on Tower Bridge.	Income Generation Review Implementation Manager to propose rescinding the blanket ban on filming commercials on Tower Bridge in favour of an approach which considers the merits of every application (which would be consistent with the approach taken for all other filming and hospitality applications to use the Bridge).	Immediate
<b>h) Business regulatory advisory services – via the “Primary Authority” partnership model</b>	Dept Markets & Consumer Protection to prepare a business case to the relevant Committees presenting options, costs / resources required, risks and timetables for establishing the commercial proposition outlined in this report.	Immediate
<b>i) Central support services – especially tied to the expansion of academy schools</b>	Dept Community & Children’s Services to lead preparation of a business case to the relevant Committees presenting options, costs / resources required, risks and timetables for establishing the commercial proposition outlined in this report.	1 – 3 years
<b>j) Development of the City’s heritage offer</b>	Dept Culture, Heritage & Libraries (in consultation with the workstream to develop the cultural hub) to commission a marketing consultancy to explore ways in which the City’s offer to visitors can be better developed, co-ordinated and promoted, leading to increased revenues to the City Corporation.	Within 1 year

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 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

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