



Members Privileges Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee

Date: THURSDAY, 26 MARCH 2015

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: COMMITTEE ROOM 3 - 2ND FLOOR WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members:

Deputy John Bennett (Chairman)	George Gillon
Deputy Ken Ayers	Jeremy Mayhew (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy John Barker	Oliver Lodge
Mark Boleat (Ex-Officio Member)	Deputy Richard Regan
Deputy Billy Dove	David Thompson (Ex-Officio Member)

Enquiries: Emma Sawers
tel. no.: 020 7332 3801
emma.sawers@cityoflondon.gov.uk

NB: Part of this meeting could be the subject of audio or video recording

**John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive**

AGENDA

Public Agenda

1. **APOLOGIES**
2. **DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS OF PERSONAL OR PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS
IN RESPECT OF ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED AT THIS MEETING**
3. **MINUTES**
To agree the minutes of the meeting held on 1 October 2014.

For Decision
(Pages 1 - 4)
4. **ISSUES REPORT**
Report of the City Surveryor.

For Decision
(Pages 5 - 8)
5. **ROTA FOR APPOINTMENT TO WARD RECEPTION COMMITTEES**
Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information
(Pages 9 - 14)
6. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
7. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

MEMBERS PRIVILEGES SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE **Wednesday, 1 October 2014**

Minutes of the meeting of the Members Privileges Sub (Policy and Resources)
Committee held at Committee Rooms, 2nd Floor, West Wing, Guildhall on
Wednesday, 1 October 2014 at 11.00 am

Present

Members:

Deputy John Bennett (Chairman)
Deputy Ken Ayers
Deputy John Barker
Mark Boleat
Deputy Billy Dove
George Gillon
Jeremy Mayhew
Oliver Lodge

Officers:

Gregory Moore - Town Clerk's Department

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Deputy Richard Regan and David Thompson.

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

There were none.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That minutes of the meeting held on 11 July 2013 be approved, subject to the following amendments:

- **Meeting time (page 1)** – that the stated time of 1.45am be corrected to read 1.45pm
- **Use of Reading Room (page 5)** – that the reference to past Chief Commoners and Lord Mayors being permitted access to the Reading Room be clarified, so as to make clear that this was a return to previous practice rather than a new development.

4. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Sub-Committee considered its Terms of Reference, with a view to determining whether they continued to be appropriate.

A Member noted that the Sub-Committee had no powers to make decisions on matters affecting Members' privileges or facilities, instead requiring the approval of the Policy & Resources Committee on each occasion, even when the issues involved were relatively minor. He expressed surprise that this was

the case and questioned whether this should be revisited, in the interests of avoiding duplication and streamlining the decision-making process.

Members debated the merits of any change, noting that the occasions where anything had had to be referred to the Policy & Resources Committee had been few and far between, with it being rare that any such issues arose. It was noted that the Sub-Committee's proposals had all been endorsed and helpful comments made; as such, it was felt that retaining the status quo in this area would be the preferred option. It was also noted that the Sub-Committee did have the authority to make decisions on the Member Development programme, with responsibility delegated to it to agree the programme and associated training.

RESOLVED: That it be agreed that the Terms of Reference of the Sub-Committee be left unchanged.

5. **MEMBERS' FACILITIES AND ACCOMMODATION**

The Chief Commoner and Town Clerk provided the Sub-Committee with verbal updates on a number of issues which had been raised at the previous meeting. The following key points were noted:

Overnight Accommodation/Room Bookings: With the Policy & Resources Committee having endorsed the proposals at its September meeting, the Town Clerk had subsequently met with representatives from the Remembrancer's Department to communicate the changes. The revised protocols were now in place and the guidance note for staff taking bookings was being formally amended. Those for whom there had been a change of status were in the process of being contacted individually to advise of the impact. Members noted that a number of Masters of Livery Companies currently used the rooms and it was likely that a steady stream of regular users would take up the opportunity to stay at the Guildhall.

Double/Single Charging: Since the last meeting, there had been a small number of occasions where Members had had to book a double room because no single room was available. As such, they were also being charged for a double room. Accordingly, it was decided that if Members asked for a single room and only a double room was available then, in line with standard hotel practice, they should be charged only at the single room rate.

Members Lounge: The rug had now been delivered and was in the lounge, which it was hoped improved the appearance of the room. The low marble-topped coffee tables were shortly due to be removed by a charity, to whom they had been donated.

2nd Floor Chairman/Deputy Chairman's IT Room: The City Surveyor's Department were currently looking in to options for the room, with it noted that Members had expressed a range of views as to whether this should remain a dedicated IT room, become a meeting room, or possibly a combination of the two. The Sub-Committee suggested that the use of a dividing wall to allow a room which could be used for both meetings and IT purposes would be useful.

Mezzanine IT Room: Members queried the plans around the small room on the Mezzanine floor, noting that it was infrequently used and that newer Members might well be unaware of its existence. It was clarified that the ongoing plans around developing Members' lockers were exploring the use of this room as part of any proposal; Members supported this suggestion, noting that sufficient IT facilities existed on the 3rd floor.

3rd Floor Members' IT Room: As had been agreed, four of the computers had now been removed (one from each bank of desks) to allow for more writing space; the Chief Commoner noted that he had requested that these be the desks next to the window to allow more light in to the room. Screens had also been erected between each desk space to allow for privacy, and the writing desks had all also now been refurbished and returned.

RECEIVED.

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

There were two questions:

Guildhall Club

In response to a Member's question, it was clarified that both the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the House Committee of the Guildhall Club were Members of the Members' Privileges Sub Committee.

Lockers

Clarity was sought as to how the changes to Members' lockers would be effected, with concern expressed that a substantial decrease in numbers would be impractical. It was clarified that it was certainly not the intention to substantially reduce the number of lockers; Members had been surveyed and monitoring activity undertaken to ascertain the level of requirements and usage, and it would be ensured that those who required a locker would retain the use of one.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There were no urgent items.

The meeting ended at 11.30am

Chairman

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

This page is intentionally left blank

Committees:	Dates:
Projects Sub-Committee Corporate Asset Sub-Committee	25 March 2015 31 March 2015
Subject: Issues Report – Gateway 2: Guildhall West Wing - Provision of toilets and cloakroom facilities for visitors	Public
Report of: City Surveyor	For Decision
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Summary</u></p> <p>In 2008, a project to provide additional function/event guest cloakrooms facilities was considered. An evaluation and feasibility report set out a scheme that provided adequate facilities for guests whilst the scope of works would have also provided new male and female cloakroom facilities for Members and new toilet facilities for visitors to the Guildhall Library.</p> <p>For a number of reasons, the project was not progressed past feasibility report stage. Whilst Members had acknowledged that the project would not be progressed, they had agreed that there was a need to improve the provision of personal lockers for Members in the existing facilities.</p> <p>Currently, there is no funding in place for either the initial project or the provision of new improved lockers. Having established how the Members locker rooms are currently utilised, officers have considered options for the provision of new lockers and essential building fabric works to improve Members facilities. In total, such a project is currently estimated at £90,000 – 100,000.</p> <p>To progress, this Issues Report seeks approval to reduce the scope of the original project, which in 2008 was estimated at £1,660,000, and seek funding via the Gateway process (Light Route).</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce the original scheme for the West Wing development in favour of only improving the provision of lockers and essential decoration works in both current male and female Member locker rooms, not including toilet and showering facilities. 2. Approve the progression via the Gateway 'Light' route seeking the approval of Resources Allocation Sub-Committee for funding from the City's Cash provision for new schemes. 3. Procure works via the City's Minor Frameworks with the aim to complete all works during the 2015 summer recess. 	

Main Report

<p>1. Issue description</p>	<p>The Guildhall Improvement Project (GIP) completed in 2008, provided some additional cloakroom and toilet facilities adjacent and near to the entrance from Basinghall Street. New links at lower ground level to the existing cloakroom and toilets within the Guildhall Art Gallery were also provided. However, the Remembrancer had expressed a desire for the GIP to consider the provision of additional cloakroom facilities for guests at lower ground level within the West Wing enabling further flexibility in accommodating guests. This was not progressed as it was considered outside the scope of the GIP.</p> <p>It had been thought that an increased cloakroom and toilet provision for guests may lead to an increase in private bookings generating further income. The validity of this argument was not tested, neither was a business case put forward to support the increased provision.</p> <p>However, during September 2008, committees approved a Capital Bid Report that sought approval for an Evaluation Report to be developed considering the options and costs for improving the provision of toilets and cloakroom facilities for guests to events. In January 2010, a Feasibility Report was received from the City's appointed consultants Bisset Adams at a cost of £28,220.</p> <p>The Feasibility Report set out a scheme developing part of the lower ground floor. To accommodate the requirement for the visitor cloakrooms, the project would have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided Members with new locker rooms including toilets and showering facilities • New Robe Room • New visitor toilet facilities for the Guildhall Library in anticipation of an increased foot fall following the transfer of the Business Library to Guildhall. <p>The report estimated the proposed project at £1,166,000.</p> <p>Despite a comprehensive report having been received and stakeholders consulted regarding the details of proposed plans, the project was not progressed beyond this point due to a number of reasons. The two main reasons being the overall cost which was anticipated to increase once detailed structural, mechanical and electrical surveys had been undertaken, and the uncertainty of the City's requirement for accommodation.</p> <p>However, Members had agreed that there is a need to improve the provision of individual lockers and the decoration of the Members male and female locker room facilities. Therefore, more recently Members were consulted regarding their personal use of lockers, from which the proposals for the provision of</p>
------------------------------------	--

	improved lockers has been discussed with the Chairman of Policy and the Chief Commoner.
2. Last approved limit	During September 2008, committees approved a Capital Bid Report seeking Member approval to prepare an Evaluation Report, at an estimated cost of £30,000, for the major project.
3. Options	<p>1. Continue with the development of the Guildhall West Wing lower ground floor.</p> <p>2. Cancel indefinitely the complete project.</p> <p>3. Reduce the scope of the original project to only include the replacement of the current lockers with new fit for purpose lockers and carry out essential building fabric works.</p>
4. Recommendation	<p>To reduce the original scheme for the West Wing development in favour of only improving the provision of lockers and essential decoration works in both current male and female Member locker rooms, but not including toilet and showering facilities.</p> <p>The funding to undertake these improvements will be sought via the Gateway Process whereby the provision of lockers and improvements to the building fabric is estimated at £90,000 – 100,000.</p> <p>Due to the total estimated cost being below the £250,000 threshold for Capital Projects, the Gateway ‘Light’ route will be followed, seeking approval of Resources Allocation Sub-Committee for funding from the City’s Cash provision for new schemes.</p> <p>The replacement lockers and fabric improvement works will be procured via the National Schedule of Rates – Minor Frameworks with the intention to complete all works during the 2015 summer recess.</p>

Contact

Report Author Stephen Bursi – Assistant Director / Guildhall Manager
Email Address stephen.bursi@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number 020 7332 1487

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s):	Date(s):
Members' Privileges Sub Committee	19 March 2015
Subject: Rota for Appointment to Ward Reception Committees	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Information
<p style="text-align: center;">Summary</p> <p>The composition of Ward Reception Committees was recently raised by Members at a meeting of the Court of Common Council, with a view to examining the current arrangements and ensuring the appointment to such Committees are made in an equitable manner.</p> <p>Following examination of the existing procedures, it has become apparent that the current allocation of places on Ward Reception Committees inadequately reflects changes in the number of Members representing each Ward since the process was originally approved. Amendments to the allocations made from each Ward have therefore been identified which would ensure parity and fair distribution of appointment. These proposals constitute an updating of existing processes in line with the spirit of the original Court of Common Council agreement, rather than a significant break with tradition or existing practices.</p> <p>This report is concerned only with the appointment of Common Councilmen and does not explore or seek to amend the process by which Aldermanic and ex-officio appointments are made.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>That Members note the updating of the existing rota system in line with the arrangements set out at paragraph 15 of the report.</p>	

Main Report

Background and Current Position

1. At its 22 June 2000 meeting, the Court of Common Council approved a report of the City Lands and Bridge House Estates Committee proposing a revised approach to the appointment of Ward Reception Committees. This new method was intended to provide for a more equitable allocation of places on such Committees, ensuring that membership was spread amongst each Member of the Court as fairly as possible, whilst also retaining representation from each Ward on every occasion.
2. The system is managed on a rota basis, whereby a certain proportion of places on the Committee are allocated to each Ward such that every Common Councilman will serve on at least every third Reception Committee. This system was established so that, with the usual proximity of State Banquets being two per annum, each Member would be appointed to a Ward Reception Committee at least once every 18 months, thereby ensuring allocation was as fair as possible whilst retaining representation from each Ward.
3. With the number of places allocated to each Ward set out by the rota, the Town Clerk identifies the relevant Common Councilmen within each Ward who have gone for the longest period without being appointed to a Ward Reception Committee, thereby

ensuring that Members within each Ward “take turns” and spread the opportunities equally. New Members joining a Ward are placed to the bottom of the list so as not to “jump the queue” and delay others from taking their turns.

4. A number of Members are also on Ward Reception Committees in an ex-officio capacity, i.e. the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, the two Sheriffs, the Chief Commoner, and the Senior Alderman above the Chair (the latter two being the Mover and Seconder of the motion to grant hospitality at the relevant Court of Common Council meeting).
5. Where those ex-officio Members would have been appointed to the Committee according to the rota, the next in line is appointed in their stead. This means that the number of Members comprising a Ward Reception Committee is kept consistent and as high as possible.
6. If a Member indicates they do not wish to serve on a particular Committee, a “swap” is arranged with the Member in the Ward who is next in line to serve.
7. The appointment of Aldermen is managed separately and is also made in accordance with a rota. This sees a total of 6 Aldermen (2 above the Chair and 4 below the Chair) appointed on each occasion, again determined by the length of time since the Alderman last served on a Ward Reception Committee. No amendments are required to this element of the process, with the number of Aldermen for each Ward having remained the same.
8. The full process by which Ward Reception Committees are appointed is set out at Appendix A.

Issues

9. With the arrangements having remained more or less static since their original approval in June 2000, they now no longer adequately reflect the changes to Ward boundaries and associated number of Members in each Ward through the allocations of places on the Committees. As such, Members from some of the Wards recently increased in size are not serving on Ward Reception Committees as often as the original intent would have had them, while others are serving with more frequency.
10. The range in size of the various Wards means that, in practice, Members of some of the smaller Wards are appointed more regularly than those from some of the larger Wards. Not only is the present system inequitable from this perspective, but also in the case of the smaller Wards it places additional burdens on those Members. Under the present system, the disparity in sizes of Wards/Sides of Wards means that, for example, a Member for the Ward of Cheap (which has 3 Members) will be appointed once every third Committee; a Member for the Ward of Castle Baynard, however (which has 8 Members) will be appointed only every fourth Committee.
11. There are also come discrepancies between Sides of Wards. For instance, Cripplegate Within and Cripplegate Without are both represented by 4 Common Councilmen, but whereas as Cripplegate Within is awarded 5 places every three Committees, Cripplegate Without is awarded only 4. A similar situation can be found in Farringdon Without, where the North and South Sides receive slightly different allocations.

Updating the Rota

12. It is therefore apparent that it is necessary to update the allocations for each Ward based on their current representation, altering the rota accordingly. It is not proposed

to remove the Ward element of the Committees, as it is desirable at such events to ensure all Wards/Sides of Wards of the City are represented.

13. It is not therefore proposed to make any fundamental changes to the process, with instead this representing solely an overdue update of the current allocations in line with the process previously agreed by the Court, which should have been implemented automatically at an earlier stage.
14. The allocations made to each Ward will therefore be revisited in such a way as to take account of the alterations made to Ward Boundaries and the consequent number of Members for each Ward since 2000. This would have the benefit of retaining the strengths of the existing system which, on the whole, has worked well since its implementation, while also increasing the equitability of the allocation of places.
15. The revised rota would therefore see appointments made in accordance with the following allocations:
 - Wards with 2 or 3 Members would receive 3 places every 3 Committees.
 - Wards with 4 Members would receive 4 places every 3 Committees.
 - Wards with 5 Members would receive 5 places every 3 Committees.
 - Wards with 6 Members would receive 6 places every 3 Committees.
 - Wards with 8 Members would receive 8 places every 3 Committees.
16. This means that each Ward Reception Committee would be comprised of 36 or 37 Common Councilmen, 6 Aldermen, the Lord Mayor, the Sheriffs for the time-being, and the Chief Commoner.

Implications

17. The updating of the rota will mean an increase to the allocations made to the following Wards:
 - Castle Baynard
 - Farringdon Without North Side
 - Lime Street
18. As a result, the following Wards would also lose one allocation per cycle, so as to allow for this and ensure parity with other Wards.
 - Bishopsgate Within
 - Bishopsgate Without
 - Coleman Street
 - Cripplegate Within
 - Tower
19. It should be noted that these amendments would not unfairly disadvantage any one Ward/Side of Ward as opposed to another, but would restore parity and equitable distribution of places in line with the original intention of the Court's approved rota system.
20. The notable exception remains those Wards with only 2 Common Councilmen (i.e. Bassishaw, Billingsgate, Bread Street, Bridge and Bridge Without, Candlewick, and Queenhithe). These Wards will continue to have slightly greater representation on

Ward Reception Committees given their small size (i.e. 1.5 places every 3 Committees). However, without removing the necessity for all Wards to be represented or fundamentally altering either the size of Wards or the size of Ward Reception Committees, it is not possible to remove this in-built bias.

Conclusion

21. The existing rota system is clearly outdated and in need of updating so as to make it salient for the changing sizes of Wards since its original approval. This refresh will maintain the spirit of the existing system while increasing the equitability of distribution. Members are therefore asked to note this update to the Rota to reflect the current position.

Appendices

Appendix A: Process for the appointment of a Ward Reception Committee

Gregory Moore

Senior Committee & Member Services Officer

T: 0207 332 1399

E: gregory.moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Ward Reception Committees: Appointment Process

Step 1: Appointing the Committee

- Each Ward Reception Committee is in essence a Ward Committee comprised of 36 or 37 Common Councilmen, plus ex-officio Members and Aldermen. This ensures that each Common Councilman is invited to serve on at least every third Committee. It is helpful to think of each set of three Committees as a full “cycle”.
- To ensure that each Ward gets a fair number of places, each Ward is allocated a certain number of places which varies across the three Committees in a cycle. To keep them distinct, the three Committees (and their allocations) are split as “A”, “B”, and “C” – this keeps the rotation amongst Ward Members “fair” and ensure each Ward gets equal representation.
- Working out whether a Committee is A/B/C is straightforward – if it was A last time, it’s B now; B last time, C now, etc. (and back to A after C).
- Identifying the Member(s) whose “turn” it is from each Ward is also straightforward, with a checklist maintained of who has been appointed to previous Committees and highlighting whose “turn” it is next. An example of the process in action is set out at the end of this appendix.
- Aldermen are appointed via a similar “turn-based” checklist, with 2 seniors and 4 juniors on each occasion.
- The following individuals are also automatically on the Committee by virtue of their position, and are set aside at the beginning before so that another Member (where applicable) from their Ward can be appointed in their stead:
 - Lord Mayor
 - The two Sheriffs
 - Chief Commoner
 - The Senior Alderman Above the Chair
- Once the list of names is complete, this forms the paper for the next meeting of the Court. This is put to the non-public session for approval.
- Immediately after approval, the Members appointed are emailed informing them and advising them of the date of the first meeting – this is agreed with the Chief Commoner (who is automatically Deputy Chairman of the Committee) in advance, but normally has to take place within a very specific timeframe to allow the Remembrancer to make the necessary arrangements.

Example: Ward Reception Committee for the President of Greece

A State Visit from the President of Greece has just been announced. When looking at the Ward of Broad Street, we can see they are entitled to one Member regardless of whether it is an “A”, “B” or “C” Committee. We can see that Deputy Bennett was last appointed; therefore it is Mr Hayward who is next in line and should be appointed to the Greece Committee. If Mr Hayward decides he does not wish to serve, the position will be offered to Mr Scott, with Mr

Hayward then offered Mr Scott's place on the next Committee to arise. The cycle then reverts to normal.

	Ward: Broad Street				
Reception	<i>France</i>	<i>Germany</i>	<i>Spain</i>	<i>Italy</i>	<i>Greece</i>
Committee Type	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>
No. of Reps	1	1	1	1	1
<i>Bennett, J.A., Deputy</i>					
<i>Hayward, C.M</i>					
<i>Scott, J.G.S</i>					

The Ward of Cripplegate Without, on the other hand, has varying allocations to ensure that everyone gets an opportunity to serve every third Committee:

	Ward: Cripplegate Without				
Reception	<i>France</i>	<i>Germany</i>	<i>Spain</i>	<i>Italy</i>	<i>Greece</i>
Committee Type	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>
No. of Reps	1	2	1	1	2
<i>Tomlinson, J., Deputy</i>					
<i>Moore, G.W.</i>					
<i>Punter, C.</i>					
<i>Quilter, S.D.</i>					

Accordingly, the Ward should receive two places on the Greek Committee – which means Mr Moore and Mr Punter on this occasion.

This process is followed for each Ward. The allocation to each is such that the size of each Ward Reception Committee is always 36 or 37.