



Policy and Resources Committee

Date: THURSDAY, 19 JANUARY 2017
Time: 1.45 pm
Venue: COMMITTEE ROOMS - 2ND FLOOR WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members:

Mark Boleat (Chairman)	Vivienne Littlechild (Ex-Officio Member)
Simon Duckworth (Deputy Chairman)	Edward Lord
Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Deputy Chairman)	Jeremy Mayhew
Hugh Morris (Deputy Chairman)	Andrew McMurtrie (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Douglas Barrow	Wendy Mead
Alderman Sir Michael Bear	Deputy Alastair Moss (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy John Bennett	Deputy Joyce Nash
Alderman Charles Bowman	The Rt. Hon. The Lord Mayor Alderman
Deputy Roger Chadwick (Ex-Officio Member)	Andrew Parmley
Henry Colthurst	Dhruv Patel (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Alex Deane	Alderman Baroness Scotland (Ex-Officio Member)
Sheriff & Alderman Peter Estlin	Deputy Dr Giles Shilson
The Lord Mountevans	Tom Sleight
Stuart Fraser	Sir Michael Snyder
Marianne Fredericks	Deputy John Tomlinson
George Gillon	Michael Welbank (Chief Commoner) (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy the Revd Stephen Haines (Ex-Officio Member)	Alderman Sir David Wootton
Christopher Hayward (Ex-Officio Member)	
Wendy Hyde	

Enquiries: Angela Roach
tel. no.: 020 7332 3685
angela.roach@cityoflondon.gov.uk

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

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

Part 1 - Public Agenda

1. **APOLOGIES**

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

3. **MINUTES**

To consider minutes as follows:-

- a) To agree the public minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2016.

For Decision
(Pages 1 - 12)

- b) To note the draft public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 15 December 2016.

For Information
(Pages 13 - 18)

- c) To note the draft public minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 14 December 2016.

For Information
(Pages 19 - 26)

4. **COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE**

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Decision
(Pages 27 - 32)

5. **COURTS SUB-COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE**

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Decision
(Pages 33 - 36)

6. **REVIEW OF DEPUTY CHAIRMEN**

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Decision
(Pages 37 - 42)

7. **LONDON COUNCILS GRANTS SCHEME**

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Decision
(Pages 43 - 50)

8. **POLICING THE BRIDGES**
Joint report of the Chamberlain and Comptroller and City Solicitor, together with a resolution of the Police Committee of 3 November 2016 and a report of the Commissioner of Police.
- NB: This report will have been considered by the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee earlier this day.**
- For Decision**
(Pages 51 - 78)
9. **PROJECT FUNDING UPDATE**
Report of the Chamberlain.
- NB: This report will have been considered by the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee earlier this day. It is to be read in conjunction with the non-public Appendix at item no. 26. The non-public background papers relating to the two projects covered in the report are available on request.**
- For Decision**
(Pages 79 - 82)
10. **ACCOMMODATION AND WAYS OF WORKING**
Report of the Comptroller and City Solicitor.
- NB: This report will have been considered by the Establishment Committee and it is also due to be considered by the Projects and Corporate Asset Sub-Committees.**
- For Decision**
(Pages 83 - 92)
11. **MEMBERSHIP OF THECITYUK**
Report of the Director Economic Development.
- For Decision**
(Pages 93 - 108)
12. **SPONSORSHIP TO SUPPORT CHEMISTRY CLUB, CITY**
Report of the Director of Economic Development.
- For Decision**
(Pages 109 - 112)
13. **REVIEW AND RECLASSIFICATION OF FORMER FINANCE GRANTS SUB-COMMITTEE GRANTS**
Report of the Town Clerk.
- For Decision**
(Pages 113 - 118)
14. **CHEAPSIDE BUSINESS ALLIANCE UPDATE**
Report of the City Surveyor.
- For Information**
(Pages 119 - 124)

15. **REGULATION OF INVESTIGATORY POWERS ACT**

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information
(Pages 125 - 126)

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

Report of the Chamberlain.

For Information
(Pages 127 - 140)

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

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

19. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

MOTION - That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act. In addition, for one item which fell under paragraph 100A (2) of the Act relating to confidential information that would be disclosed in breach of an obligation of confidence.

Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda

20. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

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

- a) To agree the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2016.

For Decision
(Pages 141 - 146)

- b) To note the draft non-public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 15 December 2016.

For Information
(Pages 147 - 150)

- c) To note the draft non-public minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 14 December 2016.

For Information
(Pages 151 - 160)

- d) To note the draft non-public minutes of the Hospitality Working Meeting held on 6 December 2016.

For Information
(Pages 161 - 166)

21. **FIRST REGISTRATION OF THE CITY'S FREEHOLD TITLES - PROGRESS**
Report of the Comptroller and City Solicitor.
For Decision
(Pages 167 - 172)
22. **CYCLICAL WORKS PROGRAMME FUNDING**
Report of the Chamberlain.
NB: This report will have been considered by the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee earlier this day.
For Decision
(Pages 173 - 182)
23. **LONDON WORK & HEALTH PROGRAMME**
Report of the Director of Economic Development.
For Decision
(Pages 183 - 194)
24. **MUSEUM OF LONDON RELOCATION UPDATE**
Joint report of the Town Clerk and City Surveyor.
NB: This report is due to be considered by the Markets Committee and the Property Investment Board.
For Information
(Pages 195 - 202)
25. **DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY OR URGENCY POWERS**
Report of the Town Clerk.
For Information
(Pages 203 - 206)
26. **PROJECT FUNDING UPDATE - APPENDIX**
To be read in conjunction with item no. 9.
For Information
(Pages 207 - 208)
27. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
28. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED.**

Part 3 - Confidential Agenda (Members Only)

29. **MINUTES**
To agree the confidential minutes of the Committee meeting held on 15 December 2016.
For Decision
(Pages 209 - 210)

This page is intentionally left blank

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE **Thursday, 15 December 2016**

Minutes of the meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee held at Committee Rooms, 2nd Floor, West Wing, Guildhall on Thursday, 15 December 2016 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Mark Boleat (Chairman)
Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Douglas Barrow
Deputy John Bennett
Deputy Roger Chadwick (Ex-Officio Member)
Stuart Fraser
Marianne Fredericks
George Gillon
Deputy the Revd Stephen Haines (Ex-Officio Member)
Christopher Hayward (Ex-Officio Member)
Wendy Hyde
Vivienne Littlechild (Ex-Officio Member)
Edward Lord
Jeremy Mayhew
Andrew McMurtrie (Ex-Officio Member)
Wendy Mead
Deputy Alastair Moss (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Joyce Nash
Dhruv Patel (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Dr Giles Shilson
Sir Michael Snyder
Deputy John Tomlinson
Michael Welbank (Chief Commoner) (Ex-Officio Member)
Alderman Sir David Wootton
Sheriff & Alderman Peter Estlin

Officers:

John Barradell	- Town Clerk & Chief Executive
Simon Murrells	- Assistant Town Clerk
Peter Lisley	- Assistant Town Clerk
Bob Roberts	- Director of Communications
Damian Nussbaum	- Director of Economic Development
Philip Everett	- Project Director, Town Clerk's Department
Simon Latham	- Town Clerk's Department
Alistair MacLellan	- Town Clerk's Department
Charlotte Taffel	- Town Clerk's Department
John Park	- Town Clerk's Department
Henry Tanner	- Town Clerk's Department
David Bianco	- Town Clerk's Department

Peter Kane
Caroline al-Beyerty
Paul Double
Nigel Lefton
Michael Cogher
Paul Wilkinson
Nick Gill
Carolyn Dwyer
Iain Simmons
Peter Shadbolt
Gillian Howard

Neal Hounsell

Sir Nicholas Kenyon
William Chapman

- Chamberlain
- Deputy Chamberlain
- Remembrancer
- Remembrancer's Office
- Comptroller & City Solicitor
- City Surveyor
- City Surveyor's Department
- Director of the Built Environment
- Department of the Built Environment
- Department of the Built Environment
- Department of the Built Environment
- Acting Director of Community and Children's Services
- Managing Director of the Barbican Centre
- Private Secretary to the Lord Mayor

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Simon Duckworth, Hugh Morris, Alderman Sir Michael Bear, Alderman Charles Bowman, Henry Colthurst, Deputy Alex Deane, Alderman The Lord Mountevans, The Rt Hon the Lord Mayor Dr Andrew Parmley, Alderman Baroness Scotland and Tom Sleigh.

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

The following Members declared non-pecuniary interests: Deputy Doug Barrow, Item 25 (Museum of London); Chris Hayward, Item 27 (King Edward's School Witley); Vivienne Littlechild, Item 11 (Project Funding Update) ; Marianne Fredericks, Item 27 (Christ's Hospital); Deputy Catherine McGuinness, Item 27 (Christ's Hospital); Deputy Joyce Nash, Item 11 (Project Funding Update); Deputy John Tomlinson, Item 11 (Project Funding Update); Alderman Sir David Wootton, Item 27 (King Edward's School Witley).

3. **MINUTES**

3a. The public minutes of the meeting held on 17 November 2016 were approved as a correct record.

3b. The draft minutes of the One Safer City Working Party meeting held on 28 October 2016 were received.

3c. The draft minutes of the Projects Sub Committee meeting held on 23 November 2016 were received.

3d. The draft minutes of the Courts Sub Committee meeting held on 2 December 2016 were received.

Matters Arising

Terms of Reference of the Courts Sub Committee

The Town Clerk noted that the Sub Committee's resolution regarding its terms of reference would be the subject of a report at a future meeting. A Member added that it was the wish of the Sub Committee that its terms of reference be amended back to their original iteration.

4. BANK JUNCTION IMPROVEMENTS: EXPERIMENTAL SAFETY SCHEME

Members agreed to vary the order of items on the agenda so that the report on Bank Junction Improvements was considered first. The Assistant Director (Local Transportation) briefed the Committee on the background to the Bank Junction proposal, noting that Bank Junction was one of the busiest road junctions in London that was the subject of significant pressure in terms of road traffic and pedestrians.

At the invitation of the Chairman, five persons addressed the Committee from the public gallery: Richard Massett (Licensed Taxi Drivers' Association), Peter Murray (Construction Industry Cycling Commission), Vincent Stops (London TravelWatch), Tom Bogdanowicz (London Cycling Campaign) and Jeremy Leach (London Living Streets) were heard.

The Chairman of the Planning and Transportation Committee noted that the experimental scheme offered several benefits, but at this early stage the primary benefit was public safety. Without doubt Bank Junction was one of the most dangerous in London and was one of only three corporate red risks facing the City of London Corporation – the proposal before the Committee was therefore a critical mitigation measure. The proposal had been considered and approved by both the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee. Transport for London had examined the City Corporation's proposal in detail and had agreed it was technically the best potential solution to issues at Bank Junction. The proposal had the support of local businesses, and it offered real improvements to bus journey times through the junction. He further noted that he had sympathy for black cabs and had met with their representatives to explore alternative solutions, which had been modelled. Nevertheless the proposal before the Committee remained the best possible solution. He concluded by emphasising that the proposed scheme was experimental and gave the assurance in his capacity as Chairman of the Planning and Transportation Committee that officers would report back to Members verbally after the first four weeks of operation and submit a formal report to Members after the first eight weeks of operation.

A Member stated that he had reservations over the proposed scheme but agreed that some form of solution had to be found for the issues at Bank Junction. Given the emphasis on improved journey times of buses he would welcome data on the use of buses through the junction. He would not oppose the scheme on the basis the City of London Corporation would be operating a 4 week review period, which would include measuring the actual number of vehicles that used this whole area before and after the experiment had started.

In response to questions from a member, the Assistant Director (Local Transportation) clarified how close to the junction taxis could approach, and noted that the exclusion area had been modified in response to local consultation. He added that 15% of casualties in the past year involved both private hire vehicles and taxis compared to a 24% average City-wide.

A Member noted his support for the proposal, saying that the Committee should acknowledge the benefits for public transport and the potential to promote more free-flowing traffic in the area.

In response to a question, the Assistant Director (Local Transportation) confirmed that it was not anticipated that the scheme would have an adverse effect on people with disabilities.

A Member stated his opposition to the proposal, saying that he felt it was an ill-thought through scheme that did not address other risk factors in the wider City. It was his belief that the proposal would cause traffic chaos.

A Member noted that the issues at Bank Junction had been a problem for many years. The proposal before the Committee was experimental and it was in the best interests of the City to take a clear decision to seek to deal with those issues.

A Member added that the City Corporation's traffic modelling had been rigorously scrutinised by Transport for London, and therefore Members should have confidence in the modelling that underpinned the proposal. The proposal was roundly welcomed by businesses, and formed part of the City's longer-term aspirations for the area.

The Chairman thanked the members of the public and Members for their contributions. He supported the scheme, but added that more attention should be given to managing congestion in the area caused by buses and local deliveries. He emphasised that the scheme would be subject to review in the short term.

A motion was moved and seconded, to amend the recommendation of the report to include licensed taxis alongside buses and cycles. The motion was defeated by 18 votes to 6.

Members proceeded to vote on the recommendation in the report, which was approved by 22 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

RESOLVED, that Members

- Approve the recommendation of the Resource Allocation Sub Committee for the allocation of the S106 deposits set out in Table 3 (Appendix 1) totalling £121,052 to the Bank junction experimental safety scheme;

- Approve the recommendation of the Resource Allocation Sub Committee for the allocation of up to £670,948 from the On Street Parking Reserve account to the Bank Junction experimental scheme;
- Approve the recommendation of the Resource Allocation Sub Committee for the inclusion of any Transport for London funding to the project budget that arises with a report to this committee to confirm the inclusion and resultant balance on the On Street Parking Reserve or S106 contributions;
- Approve the experiment to restrict vehicles crossing Bank Junction to be bus and cycle only Monday to Friday, 0700-1900 for a period of up to 18 months.

5. **TERMS OF REFERENCE - OUTSIDE BODIES SUB-COMMITTEE**

Members considered and approved a report of the Town Clerk on the terms of reference of the Outside Bodies Sub Committee.

RESOLVED, that the proposed changes to the terms of reference be approved.

6. **RESOLUTION OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT PENSIONS BOARD: AMENDMENT TO STANDING ORDER 29 (3)**

Members considered and approved a resolution of the Local Government Pensions Board.

RESOLVED, that Members recommend to the Court of Common Council the addition of the Local Government Pensions Board to the list of Grand Committees set out in Standing Order 29(3) of which a Member is eligible to serve as Chairman, in addition to serving as a Member of another Grand Committee.

7. **PROJECT PROCEDURE RESOLUTIONS FROM THE FINANCE COMMITTEE AND THE PROJECTS SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE**

7.1 **Finance Committee**

Members considered and approved a resolution of the Finance Committee dated 19 July 2016 regarding the role of the Corporate Asset Sub (Finance) Committee in the City of London Corporation's Projects Procedure.

7.2 **Projects Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee**

Members considered and approved a resolution of the Projects Sub Committee dated 23 November 2016.

RESOLVED, that Members

- Approve an amendment to the City of London Corporation Projects Procedure to provide the Corporate Asset Sub Committee with a

strategic role in the Projects Procedure for operational property projects, subject to the amendment making clear that the Sub Committee's role is limited to the strategic prioritisation of projects and no role being created for the Sub Committee within the Gateway approval process or any other aspect of the project procedure, and the fulfilment of the Sub Committee's role not causing any delays to the current Project Procedure.

8. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMEN OF SUB COMMITTEES

Members considered and approved a report of the Town Clerk and Comptroller and City Solicitor regarding the appointment of Sub Committee Chairmen.

RESOLVED, that Members

- Agree that when a Chairman does not wish to exercise his right to be the Chairman of a Sub Committee and wishes a specific member to be appointed, Committees adopt a convention whereby the Chairman submits his nomination for Chairman and/or Deputy Chairman to the Committee for approval;
- Agree that a resolution to this effect be circulated to all relevant Committees to endorse this convention.

9. ASSETS OF COMMUNITY VALUE (ACV) GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING NOMINATIONS

Members considered and approved a report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding guidelines for determining nominations for Assets of Community Value, subject to the number of criteria required for listing being specified.

RESOLVED, that the guidelines for the determination of nominations of Assets of Community Value be approved s subject to the number of criteria required for listing being specified.

10. SPECIAL EVENTS ON THE HIGHWAY IN MARCH 2018

Members considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding Special Events on the Highway in March 2018, noting that the report had been considered by the Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee and the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee, both of which had recommended Option 2a within the report.

Several Members were heard in support of the proposal for a London Half Marathon by Tommy's. It was felt that Option 2a alone did not reflect the positive support that the City wished to afford the Tommy's proposal and therefore Members should adopt both Options 1 and 2a.

RESOLVED, that Members

- Approve the Tommy's event (Option 1);

- Recommend to TfL that they reject London Marathon's application (Option 2a).

11. **PROJECT FUNDING UPDATE**

Members considered and approved a report of the Chamberlain regarding Project Funding.

RESOLVED, that Members,

- Agree the recommendation of the Resource Allocation Sub Committee that the report be approved.
- Agree to the following requests for funding totaling £799k from the 2016/17 City Fund provision for new schemes, all subject to the requisite approvals by other committees.
 - Relocation of Adult Skills and Education Services to Guildhall Business Library – a contribution of up to £71k, dependent on the project sum approved at Gateway 5 by the Chief Officer after procurement;
 - Barbican Estate New Baggage Stores (SBR proposal) – a provision of up to £610k, (including £19k to progress to the next gateway) with the remainder of £591k dependent on the project sum approved at Gateway 5 by the Chief Officer after procurement;
 - Top-up loan funding for two Barbican Centre SBR proposals to cover cost increases:
 - Frobisher Crescent Level 4 - £52k
 - New Retail Unit - £66k.

12. **REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGETS 2017/18**

Members considered a report of the Town Clerk, Chamberlain and Remembrancer regarding Revenue and Capital Budgets 2017/18. In response to a question the Chamberlain confirmed that the figures included an allowance for the proposed Special Representative for Asia.

RESOLVED, that Members

- Note the latest 2016/17 revenue budget;
- Approve the budget for submission to the Finance Committee;
- Authorise the Chamberlain to revise these budgets to allow for further implications arising from the Service Based Reviews and other corporate efficiency projects;
- Note the draft capital and supplementary revenue budget.

13. CITY OF LONDON POLICE DRAFT MEDIUM-TERM FINANCIAL PLAN UP TO 2019/20

Members considered a report of the Chamberlain and the Commissioner of City Police regarding the draft City of London Police Medium Term Financial Plan up to 2019/20. Members noted that the report had been approved by the Police Committee earlier that day. It was noted that the core grant of the City Police had been reduced by £700,000 and that it was proposed to involve external consultants in addressing the emerging budget deficit.

In response to concerns from a Member that the adoption of external assistance was proving slower than anticipated, the Chairman of the Police Committee gave the assurance that this would be addressed as soon as possible.

In response to further questions from Members, the Chairman of Police replied that frontline policing, including in areas such as Bank Junction, would remain effective, and that officers continued to liaise with colleagues in the British Transport Police to ensure safety on the transport network in the City.

RESOLVED, that Members

- Note the latest forecast outturn for 2016/17 of a deficit of £2.6m, funded by a drawdown in the Reserve to £1.5m;
- Note the forecast budget deficit varying from £3.1m in 2017/18 to £5.9m in 2018/19 and £3.1m 2019/20 before mitigation;
- Recommend to the Court of Common Council the relaxation of the reserve threshold of £4m and approve the use of reserves in 2016/17 totalling £2.6m and 2017/18 totalling £1.5m;
- Agree that the City Corporation should meet the revenue contribution to fund capital schemes already budgeted for in 2017/18 and 2018/19 of £1.4m and £1m respectively and that the additional headroom on business rate premium is applied to help meet the increased budget pressures;
- Agree in principle the use of City capital resources to finance the Police capital programme in future, subject to a further report;
- Agree the revision of current vacancy factors and efficiency targets within the force as an efficiency option over this MTFP, pending outcome of external review; and
- Note that the usual report detailing revenue and capital estimates will be submitted to Police committee in January following settlement of the Police grant from the Government.

14. REQUEST FOR FUNDS - FRANCO-BRITISH YOUNG LEADERS' PROGRAMME GALA DINNER 2017

Members considered and approved a report of the Director of Economic Development regarding a funding request for a Franco-British Young Leaders' Programme Gala Dinner.

RESOLVED, that Members

- Agree that the City of London Corporation provides the Guildhall as a dinner venue and cover catering costs for the event totalling not more than £17,000; these costs are to be met from the Committee's *Policy Initiatives' Fund* for 2017/18, categorised under the *Events* section of the *Fund* and charged to City's Cash.

15. SPONSORSHIP OF A BREXIT- RELATED SERIES CONVENED BY THE INSTITUTE FOR GOVERNMENT

Members considered and approved a report of the Director of Economic Development regarding sponsorship of a Brexit-related series convened by the Institute for Government.

RESOLVED, that Members

- Agree to sponsor a series of Brexit-related events in partnership with the IfG at a cost of £18,000 to be met from your Committee's Policy Initiatives Fund for 2016/17, categorised under Events and charged to *City's Cash*.

16. POLICY INITIATIVES FUND AND COMMITTEE CONTINGENCY

Members received a report of the Chamberlain on the Policy Initiatives Fund and Committee Contingency.

RESOLVED, that the report be noted.

17. INTEGRATED COMMISSIONING MODEL FOR HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE

Members considered a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services regarding Integrated Commissioning for Health and Social Care. A Member commented that the partnership with Hackney would be of benefit for the City.

RESOLVED, that Members agree that Officers,

- Explore development of a single integrated health and social care commissioning model for the City of London with City and Hackney CCG, subject to further detail and due diligence;
- Explore entering into a pooled budget with City and Hackney CCG;
- Receive a further, more detailed report and make a final decision on the proposed arrangements in early 2017.

18. APPLICATION OF ASSET OF COMMUNITY VALUE (ACV) DESIGNATION - STILL & STAR PUBLIC HOUSE

Members considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding an application for the designation of Asset of Community Value (ACV) Status for the Still & Star Public House. The Town Clerk noted that a letter for representation had been received from the owner of the premises and circulated to Members outside of the meeting, alongside a representation from the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA). Furthermore, appendix one of the report, which had been omitted from the agenda, had likewise been circulated outside

of the meeting. All relevant documents were provided in hardcopy to Members at the meeting.

Members noted that the application met many of the City's ACV guidelines and therefore a vote was held on the motion that the Still & Star be awarded ACV status. The motion was carried by 13 votes to 4.

RESOLVED, that the Still & Star Public House be designated as an Asset of Community Value.

19. **POLICY CHAIRMAN'S VISIT TO NEW YORK AND WASHINGTON DC, NOVEMBER 2016**

Members received a report of the Director of Economic Development regarding the Policy Chairman's recent visit to the United States.

RESOLVED, that the report be noted.

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

There were no questions.

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

There was no urgent business.

22. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

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

23. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

23a. The non-public minutes of the meeting held on 17 November 2016 were approved.

23b. The draft minutes of the Ceremonial Protocols Working Party meeting held on 10 November 2016 were received.

23c. The draft non-public minutes of the Projects Sub Committee meeting held on 24 November 2016 were received.

23d. The draft non-public minutes of the Courts Sub Committee meeting held on 2 December 2016 were received.

24. **NON PUBLIC APPENDIX TO ITEM 11 [PROJECT FUNDING UPDATE]**

Members received the non-public appendix for the item on Project Funding.

RESOLVED, that the non-public appendix be noted.

25. **MUSEUM OF LONDON PROPOSED RELOCATION - HEADS OF TERMS UPDATE**

Members considered a report of the City Surveyor regarding the Museum of London proposed relocation Heads of Terms update.

26. **CENTRE FOR MUSIC - PROJECT UPDATE**

Members considered and approved a report of the Managing Director of the Barbican Centre regarding the Centre for Music Project.

27. **CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION GRANTS REVIEW: GRANT FUNDING FOR CHRIST'S HOSPITAL AND KING EDWARD'S SCHOOL WITLEY**

Members considered a resolution of the Education Board and a report of the Town Clerk regarding grant funding for Christ's Hospital and King Edward's School Witley.

At this point of the meeting Members agreed to extend the meeting beyond two hours in line with Standing Order 40.

28. **GUILDHALL CHARGING REVIEW**

Members considered and approved a report of the Chamberlain and the Remembrancer regarding the Guildhall Charging Review.

29. **MODERNISATION OF THE CITY'S COURTS**

Members considered and approved a report of the Town Clerk regarding the modernisation of the City's Courts.

30. **GUILDHALL SCHOOL - SUSTAINABILITY (OPERATING MODEL REVIEW) BY PA CONSULTING**

Members received a report of the Town Clerk and Chamberlain regarding the Guildhall School Sustainability Operating Model Review.

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

Members received a report of the Town Clerk detailing a decision taken under delegated procedure since the last meeting regarding the Poultry Market Major Repairs Project.

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

There were no questions.

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

Request for Delegated Authority – Police Accommodation Project

Members considered and approved a delegated authority request from the City Surveyor to deal with three reports concerning the Police Accommodation Project outside of the meeting.

34. REORGANISATION OF THE CULTURE, HERITAGE AND LIBRARIES DEPARTMENT

Members considered a report of the Town Clerk considering a proposed reorganisation of the Culture, Heritage and Libraries Department.

35. CITY OF LONDON CHORISTER OF THE CHAPEL ROYAL

Members considered a report of the Remembrancer regarding a City of London Chorister at the Chapel Royal.

The meeting ended at 4.01 pm

Chairman

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

PROJECTS SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 14 December 2016

Minutes of the meeting of the Projects Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee held at Committee Rooms, 2nd Floor, West Wing, Guildhall on Wednesday, 14 December 2016 at 10.00 am

Present

Members:

Sir Michael Snyder (Chairman)
Keith Bottomley
Mark Boleat
Marianne Fredericks

Christopher Hayward
Deputy Catherine McGuinness
Graham Packham
James Tumbridge

Officers:

Peter Lisley	- Town Clerk's Department
Christopher Braithwaite	- Town Clerk's Department
Ian Schofield	- Town Clerk's Department
Craig Spencer	- Town Clerk's Department
Arshi Zaman	- Town Clerk's Department
Caroline Al-Beyerty	- Chamberlain's Department
Mona Lewis	- Chamberlain's Department
Mark Lowman	- City Surveyor's Department
Peter Young	- City Surveyor's Department
Carolyn Dwyer	- Director of Built Environment
Simon Glynn	- Department of the Built Environment
Iain Simmons	- Department of the Built Environment
Jim Turner	- Barbican Centre
Neal Hounsell	- Community and Children's Services Department
Mike Saunders	- Community and Children's Services Department
Tony Cairney	- City of London Police
David Drane	- City of London Police
Jonathan Frost	- City of London Police
Alan Gooden	- City of London Police
Dave McGinley	- City of London Police
Martin O'Regan	- City of London Police
Pauline Weaver	- City of London Police
Andrew McCleave	- City of London Freeman's School
Sue Williams	- City of London Freeman's School

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Jeremy Mayhew, Hugh Morris and James Tumbridge.

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

There were no declarations of interests.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED – That the public minutes and summary of the meeting held on 23 November 2016 are approved as an accurate record.

4. **GATEWAY APPROVAL PROCESS**

RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee notes the Gateway Approval Process.

5. **BANK JUNCTION EXPERIMENTAL SAFETY SCHEME - GATEWAY 4/5 DETAILED OPTIONS APPRAISAL AND AUTHORITY TO START WORK**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment which sought approval to commence the implementation of the proposed Experimental Safety Scheme at Bank Junction.

A representative of the Licensed Taxi Drivers Association attended the meeting to speak regarding the Scheme. He commented that:

- The safety record of licensed taxis was very good;
- The Mayor of London was supporting that taxis should be given equal priority to buses as modes of transport;
- It would be more appropriate if taxis were allowed to access the junction in some directions, with certain turns being restricted.
- It may be appropriate, from the end of 2018, for access to the junction to be granted only to zero emission taxis, which would incentivise the use of such vehicles across London.

The Chairman reminded Members that the role of this Sub-Committee was to ensure that the appropriate approach was used for projects and that the principle of whether a project should be pursued was a consideration for consideration by the Policy and Resources Committee, which would meet the following day. In relation to this, the Chairman of the Planning and Transportation Committee noted that the Town Clerk had received a letter from the Greater London Authority's Commissioner of Transport, to which the Chairman of the Planning and Transportation Committee had responded. Members agreed that it would be beneficial if the letter and response were circulated to Members of that Committee in advance of the Committee.

The Chairman commented that the information provided within the report regarding the works and staff costs for the project was not sufficiently detailed. He requested that further information be provided regarding these costs so that Members were aware of the specifics of the costs.

A Member asked that further information be provided regarding the process for ensuring that Satellite Navigation systems were updated to avoid drivers still attempting to use the junction. The Director of the Built Environment agreed that this could be provided.

The Chairman noted that he was not yet convinced as to the accuracy of the modelling which was referred to within the report, but was meeting with the Chairman of the Planning and Transportation Committee and the Director of the Built Environment the following day to discuss this issue.

RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee, subject to being provided with the information requested in relation to the issues outlined above:

- a) Approves the recommendation to proceed to implementation of the experimental safety scheme at Bank to be bus and cycle only Monday to Friday, 0700 -1900 for a period of up to 18 months by use of an experimental traffic order.
- b) delegates authority to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, to agree the procurement for the temporary enforcement cameras if not within the estimated budget range.
- c) Approves the budget of £792,000 to implement, monitor and report back to committee the outcome of the experimental scheme within 18 months of the scheme becoming operational.
- d) Approves the inclusion of any further Transport for London funding to the project budget that arises after this committee decision.

6. **MONUMENT AND LOWER THAMES STREET JUNCTION - PUBLIC REALM ENHANCEMENT PROJECT - UPDATE (GATEWAY 4)**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment which provided an update regarding the Public Realm Enhancement Project (Update) for the Monument and Lower Thames Street Junction. The report explained that the project design had been approved by Committees in 2008, but had not been progressed at that time due to a shortfall in Transport for London funding. This funding was now available and therefore approval was sought to progress the project.

The Sub-Committee noted that the report did not provide sufficient information regarding the procurement and therefore agreed that the project should progress on the Regular Route.

RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee:

- a) Agrees that the project proceeds to Gateway 5 on the Regular Route, at a total estimated cost up to £260,032, to be funded from Transport for London (£111,532), the 20 Fenchurch Street Section 106 Agreement (£97,500 plus interest accrued and indexation) and further funding of approximately £50,000 to be identified and confirmed at the next reporting stage – see paragraph 3, Next Steps..
- b) Agrees the funding of £32,500, required to reach the next stage of reporting, to be funded from Transport for London (£111,532) – see details in table 2.

- c) Agrees that this project proceed on the light route of the project procedure.

7. EASTERN CITY CLUSTER - PUBLIC ART (YEAR SIX AND YEARS SEVEN TO NINE)

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment which provided Members with an update on year six of the Sculpture in the City project delivered in 2016; advised on preparations for year seven (2017); and reviewed the funding approval for the delivery of years eight and none of the project, which would be implemented in 2018 and 2019.

A Member asked for further information regarding why staff costs increased by 50% between years six and seven of the project. The Director of the Built Environment explained that this was because in previous years some of the staff costs had been through in-kind contributions but, due to the increased scale of the project, the full staff costs were now reflected going forward.

The Chairman commented that all projects must include their full staff costs at all stages of the project so that Members were able to assess projects on the basis of accurate information.

RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee:

- a) Notes the contents of this update report;
- b) Agrees to retain the project in-house for the next three years;
- c) Agrees that any underspend from previous years is transferred to future years of the project;
- d) Approves the appointment and/or procurement of all services associated with the delivery of the project for years 2017-19 in accordance with Section 5 of the report; and
- e) Delegates authority to the Director of Transportation and Public Realm and Head of Finance to adjust the project budget between staff costs, fees and works (and between years seven to nine), providing the overall budget is not exceeded.

8. CITY-WIDE PEDESTRIAN MODEL - GATEWAY 6 UPDATE REPORT

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment which provided an update on the project to develop a City-Wide digital pedestrian model.

The Chairman commented that the report focused only on pedestrians and requested that, where this modelling data was used, all transportation methods were considered. The Director of the Built Environment explained that the purpose of this project was to develop pedestrian modelling data, as Transport for London (TfL) did not provide pedestrian modelling. The Director of the Built Environment confirmed that this pedestrian modelling data would be used alongside the modelling data provided by TfL.

RESOLVED –That the Sub-Committee:

- a) notes the contents of this report; and
- b) authorises officers to extend the project budget by £137,600 in order to procure further enhancements to the model. This will be part funded by TfL (£80,000), and partly from departmental resources (£57,000).
- c) authorises a waiver of the Procurement Regulations to allow officers to procure these services directly from Space Syntax Ltd.

9. **CROSSRAIL URBAN REALM PROJECTS - GATEWAY 4 UPDATE REPORT**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment which provided Member with an update on the Crossrail Urban Realm Projects.

RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee:

- a) Note that the public realm proposals for the Crossrail Work Sites in the City have been submitted to the City, as Local Planning Authority under Schedule 7 of the Crossrail Act and a delegated decision is due by the end of 2016;
- b) Approve the proposed new loading bay, footway build-out and taxi rank on Lindsey Street (Farringdon East Station), subject to i) a Waiting and Loading Order being approved in respect of the loading bay and ii) the taxi rank being appointed by the Commissioner of the City of London Police; and
- c) Note that a new project will be initiated to manage the reinstatement of land at the Finsbury Circus construction shaft.
- d) Authorise officers to complete the design of the areas immediately adjacent to the Crossrail Works Sites at Liverpool Street and Moorgate (the Wider Work Areas) and authorise the release of additional funds for this purpose (£213k for Liverpool Street, and £218k for Moorgate, both to be funded by S106 funds).

10. **MIDDLESEX STREET, AVONDALE SQUARE, GOLDEN LANE AND YORK WAY ESTATES, EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL COMMON PARTS REDECORATION - ISSUE REPORT (GATEWAY 3/4)**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services which sought approval to combine the existing projects in respect of the redecorations to external and internal common parts for the Middlesex Street, Avondale Square, Golden Lane and York Way Estates.

The Chairman commented that he agreed with the proposed approach to combine these projects, but requested that information be provided regarding the costs of this approach, compared to progressing with the works as separate projects, so that the Sub-Committee could be satisfied that a similar approach would be appropriate for future projects.

A Member asked for clarification regarding why the works in relation to the flooring in the lift lobby areas and replacement of tenants' front doors at Petticoat Tower were not included within the combined project. The Director of Community and Children's Services explained that these aspects of the work were of a specialised nature and therefore it would be better value for money to progress these works independently of the main project.

RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee:

- a) Approves the combination of the two External and Internal Common Parts redecoration projects.
- b) Approves the separation of the additional works to Petticoat Tower from the scope of the External and Internal Common Parts redecoration project, so that they can be addressed separately as Revenue projects.
- c) Notes the revised total budget of £2,875,163.

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

There were no questions.

12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There were no items of urgent business.

13. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

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

Item No.

14 – 31

Paragraph No

3

14. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

The Sub-Committee approved the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 23 November 2016 as an accurate record subject to one amendment.

15. POLICE ACCOMMODATION PROGRAMME

The Sub-Committee considered and approved three joint reports of the Commissioner of the City of London Police, the Chamberlain and the City Surveyor, which provided Members with an update on the interlinked programmes within the Police Accommodation Strategy and sought approval for the next phases of work.

16. TEMPLE CHAMBERS - EXTERNAL REDECORATION AND REPAIRS - GATEWAY 3/4 OPTIONS APPRAISAL

The Sub-Committee considered and approved a report of the City Surveyor which sought approval of the preferred option for the external redecoration and repairs to Temple Chambers.

17. **LORD MAYOR'S STATE COACH: CONSERVATION AND REPAIR - ISSUE REPORT (GATEWAY 4)**
The Sub-Committee considered and approved a report of the City Surveyor which sought approval for the budget and appointment of contractors for the project regarding the conservation and repair of the Lord Mayor's State Coach.
18. **181 QUEEN VICTORIA STREET REFURBISHMENT OF BRIDGE HOUSE AND THE ADJOINING CAR PARK - ISSUE REPORT (GATEWAY 5)**
The Sub Committee considered and approved a report of the City Surveyor which sought an increase in the budget for the refurbishment of Bridge House and the adjoining car park at 181 Queen Victoria Street.
19. **CITY OF LONDON FREEMEN'S SCHOOL – 2016 MASTERPLAN - GATEWAY 2 PROJECT PROPOSAL**
The Sub-Committee considered and approved a joint report of the Headmaster of the City of London Freeman's School and the City Surveyor which proposed a project for the development of the City of London Freeman's School 2016 Masterplan.
20. **RELOCATION OF ADULT SKILLS AND EDUCATION SERVICES TO GUILDHALL BUSINESS LIBRARY - GATEWAY 2 PROJECT PROPOSAL**
The Sub-Committee considered and approved a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services which proposed a project to enable the relocation of Adult Skills and Education Services to the Guildhall Business Library.
21. **EMERGENCY SERVICES MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAMME (ESMCP) DIRECT NETWORK SERVICE PROVIDER - ISSUE REPORT (GATEWAY 2)**
The Sub-Committee considered and approved a report of the Commissioner of the City of London Police which sought additional funding to reach the next Gateway of the Emergency Services Mobile Communications Programme (ESMCP).
22. **FRAUDULENT ID DOCUMENTS DATABASE - GATEWAY 3/4 OPTIONS APPRAISAL**
The Sub-Committee considered and approved a report of the Commissioner of the City of London Police which set out the options to progress the project to create a national Fraudulent ID documents database.
23. **CASE, CUSTODY, CRIME AND INTELLIGENCE PROJECT - ISSUE REPORT (GATEWAY 5)**
The Sub-Committee considered and approved a report of the Commissioner of the City of London Police which sought approval of a collaborative approach with a strategic partner to implement the Case, Custody, Crime and Intelligence Project.

24. **ACTION AND KNOW FRAUD CENTRE - PROCUREMENT AND FUNDING - ISSUE REPORT (GATEWAY 5)**

The Sub Committee considered and approved a report of the Commissioner of the City of London Police in respect of procurement and funding for the Action and Know Fraud Centre.

25. **ELECTRONIC SOCIAL CARE REPORTING AND CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM - GATEWAY 3/4 OPTIONS APPRAISAL**

The Sub-Committee considered and approved a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services which sought approval for the preferred option for the Electronic Social Care Recording and Case Management System.

26. **BARBICAN CAMPUS PROGRAMME: AMBER AND RED PROJECTS**

The Sub-Committee noted a report of the Managing Director, Barbican Centre, which summarised all the current building related works and projects across the Barbican Campus and Guildhall School.

27. **HIGHWAYS AND PUBLIC REALM PROGRAMME: GREEN, AMBER AND RED PROJECTS**

The Sub-Committee noted a report of the Director of the Built Environment in respect of Green, Amber and Red Projects in the Highways and Public Realm Programme.

28. **OPEN SPACES RED, AMBER AND GREEN PROJECTS UPDATE**

The Sub-Committee noted a report of the Director of Open Spaces in respect of Green, Amber and Red Projects managed by the Department of Open Spaces.

29. **ACTION TAKEN BY THE TOWN CLERK UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY OR URGENCY PROCEDURES**

The Sub-Committee noted a report of the Town Clerk which provided information of action taken under delegated authority or urgency procedures since the last meeting.

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

There were no questions.

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

There were two items of urgent business.

The meeting ended at 11.05 am

Chairman

Contact Officer: Chris Braithwaite

Tel.no.: 020 7332 1427, christopher.braithwaite@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committee: Policy and Resources	Date: 19 January 2017
Subject: Terms of Reference of the Policy and Resources Committee	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Decision
Report Author: Angela Roach, Principal Committee and Members Services Manager	

Summary

1. All Committees are required to review their terms of reference on an annual basis. Since they were last considered two changes have been made.
2. Part 5 Chapter 3 of the Localism Act 2011 introduced provisions for the designation of certain buildings or land as Assets of Community Value (ACV). The legislation allows local community groups to nominate buildings or land as ACVs and requires local authorities, including the City Corporation, to make ACV designations. This emerging area of work now falls within this Committee's remit.
3. In addition, approval has been given to the Policy and Resources Committee overseeing all matters relating to the management of the City's Courts and to the creation of a dedicated Sub-Committee.
4. The Committee's terms of reference has therefore been amended to reflect these new areas of work.

Recommendations

5. It is recommended that the terms of reference of the Committee:-
 - be amended to reflect its responsibility for determining applications for designating land or property as an ACV and for overseeing the management of the City's Courts including the creation of a dedicated sub-committee as set out in the appendix to this report;
 - be submitted to the Court of Common Council for approval in the usual manner.

Main Report

1. As part of the post-implementation review of the changes made to the governance arrangements in 2011 it was agreed that all Committees should review their terms of reference annually. This will enable any proposed changes to be considered in time for the reappointment of Committees by the Court of Common Council.

2. The terms of reference of the Policy and Resources Committee are attached as an appendix to this report for your consideration.
3. Since it was last considered the Committee has become responsible for two new areas of work, the designation of certain buildings or land as an ACV and overseeing all matters relating to the management of the City's Courts, including the creation of a dedicated Sub-Committee.

Asset of Community Value

4. Part 5 Chapter 3 of the Localism Act 2011 introduced provisions for the designation of certain buildings or land as an ACV. The legislation allows local community groups to nominate buildings or land as ACVs and requires local authorities, including the City Corporation, to make ACV designations. This area of work now falls within this Committee's remit. Whilst it is not possible to anticipate all possible land uses that might be nominated as an ACV, nor provide comprehensive procedures on how each land use might be assessed, guidelines, which also covers the nomination of public houses, have been produced to assist the Committee and applicants with nominations.

Courts Sub-Committee

5. Earlier this year the Committee approved to the creation of a Courts Sub-Committee to enhance activities in this area of work over the next five years. The Sub-Committee's terms of reference has been agreed as follows:-

For a period of five years, from June 2016 to April 2021, to be responsible for oversight of the management of all matters relating to the Central Criminal Court, the City of London Magistrates' Court and the Mayor's and City of London Court so far as they concern the City of London Corporation but excluding the appointment of the Secondary and Under Sheriff and matters relating to the Shrievalty.

6. It is therefore suggested that paragraphs (l), (q) and (r) of the Committee's terms of reference are amended to acknowledge Committee's responsibility in relation to ACVs and the creation of the new Sub-Committee. Subject to your views, the terms of reference will be submitted to the April meeting of the Court for approval.

Contact:

Angela Roach

Telephone: 020 7332 3685

Email: angela.roach@cityoflondon.gov.uk

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

To be responsible for:-

General

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

Resource Allocation

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

Corporate Assets

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

Assets of Community Value

- (l) ***Determining applications for designating certain buildings or land as Assets of Community Value (ACV) in accordance with Part 5, Chapter 3 of the Localism Act 2011 and the guidelines for determining nominations approved by the Committee on 15 December 2016.***

Projects

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

Hospitality

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

Privileges

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

Sustainability

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

City Courts

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

Sub-Committees

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

City Courts

Projects

Public Relations and Economic Development

Outside Bodies

* Resource Allocation

†Hospitality

†Members' Privileges

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

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

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee	Dated:
Policy & Resources Committee	19 January 2017
Subject: Terms of Reference – Courts Sub-Committee	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Decision
Report author: Gemma Stokley, Committee & Members' Services Officer	

Summary

At its December 2016 meeting, your Courts Sub-Committee reviewed its Terms of Reference. These had been revised to take into account the fact that the new Sub Committee would now be responsible for oversight of the management of all matters relating to all of the City's Courts as opposed to just the Central Criminal Court. Members wanted to make it clear that, as seen from the decision of the Policy and Resources Committee establishing the Sub-Committee, it had always been the intention that there would be no change to the role of the Court of Aldermen in relation to the appointment of the Secondary and Under Sheriff and that all matters in relation to the activities and operation of the Shrievalty would be excluded from the work of this Sub Committee and that, ex-officio Members of the Committee would not have voting rights if they were not also directly elected Members of the Court of Common Council.

Recommendation

Members are asked to agree the proposed changes to the Courts Sub-Committee's Terms of Reference and Constitution.

Main Report

Background

1. The Courts Sub-Committee met for the second time on 2 December 2016. Members discussed the Terms of Reference which had been revised to reflect the fact that the Sub-Committee would now be responsible for oversight of the management of all matters relating to all of the City's Courts.
2. During discussion, Members of the Courts Sub-Committee agreed to recommend that these should make it clear that, as seen from the decisions of the Policy and Resources Committee establishing the Sub-Committee, it had always been the intention that there would be no change to the role of the Court of Aldermen in relation to the appointment of the Secondary and Under Sheriff and that all matters in relation to the activities and operation of the Shrievalty would be excluded from the work of this Sub Committee, and that ex-officio Members of the Committee would not have voting rights if they were not also directly elected

Members of the Court of Common Council and recommended that this be referred to under the 'Constitution' information of the Sub-Committee.

Current Position

3. The Policy & Resources Committee is asked to approve the revised wording to the information on the Sub Committee's Constitution and Terms of Reference (attached).

Appendices

Courts Sub Committee Constitution and Terms of Reference.

Gemma Stokley

Committee & Members' Services Officer
Town Clerk's Department

T: 020 7332 1407

E: gemma.stokley@cityoflondon.gov.uk

COURTS SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

1. Constitution

A Non-Ward Committee consisting of,

- Two Aldermen nominated by the Court of Aldermen;
- Four Members appointed by the Court of Common Council;
- The Chairman of the Policy and Resources Committee – the Chairman or one of his Deputy Chairmen to Chair the Sub Committee;
- A Deputy Chairman of the Policy and Resources Committee;
- One Member appointed by the Policy and Resources Committee;
- One Member appointed by the Finance Committee;
- Ex-officio the Recorder and the serving Sheriffs at the Central Criminal Court;

N.B. the Recorder and a Sheriff who is not an Alderman or Common Councilman shall have no vote

2. Quorum

The quorum consists of any three Members.

3. Terms of Reference

For a period of five years, from June 2016 to April 2021, to be responsible for oversight of the management of all matters relating to the Central Criminal Court, the City of London Magistrates' Court and the Mayor's and City of London Court so far as they concern the City of London Corporation ***but excluding the appointment of the Secondary and Under Sheriff and matters relating to the Shrievalty.***

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee: Policy and Resources	Date: 19 January 2017
Subject: Review of Deputy Chairmen	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Decision
Report Author: Angela Roach, Principal Committee and Members Services Manager	

Summary

1. In 2012, as part of the post-implementation review of the City Corporation's governance arrangements, the Court of Common Council agreed to the appointment of three Deputy Chairmen for this Committee to support and assist the Chairman on matters of policy and strategy.
2. At its meeting on 19 May 2016 the Committee requested that a review of the effectiveness of the appointment of its three Deputy Chairmen be undertaken towards the end of the year. It followed concerns about the elections process and about the merits of electing a "Chairman in-waiting", given that there was no guarantee that the Deputy Chairman holding that position in the final year would go on to become Chairman.
3. This report addresses both the effectiveness of having three Deputy Chairmen and the process for electing them. It has been prepared in consultation with the Chairman and with those who have served as Deputy Chairman since the inception of the new arrangements in 2013 and seeks your view on the merits of continuing to elect three Deputies and on the election process.
4. It should be noted that should the Committee be minded to change the current arrangement the approval of the Court would be required.

Recommendations

5. Members views are sought on the following:-
 - a) whether to continue with the election of three Deputy Chairmen of the Committee and, if so, whether any changes need to be made to their role; and
 - b) depending on your views in relation to (a) above, whether any changes need to be made to the protocol for the elections process.

Main Report

Background

1. As part of the 2011 post-implementation review of the City Corporation's governance arrangements, this Committee agreed to have three deputy chairmen to support and assist the Chairman on matters of policy and strategy. This was supported by the Court of Common Council at its meeting on 6 December 2012 on the basis that the volume of the Chairman's work in promoting the City was increasing, especially externally, and that this was an area that would benefit from additional support. It was also felt that such an arrangement would enable more Members to play an active part in promoting the City. An additional factor was the desire not to be seen to be selecting the Chairman four years in advance.
2. A protocol for the election of the Deputy Chairmen was established and the first of the three Deputy Chairmen elected in 2013. The new arrangements were reviewed by the Committee after a year of operation and at that time it was concluded that the new arrangement was working well and served the purpose for which it was intended.
3. At its meeting on 19 May 2016 the Committee requested that a review of the effectiveness of the appointment of its three Deputy Chairmen be undertaken towards the end of the year. It followed concerns about the elections process and the merits of electing a "Chairman in-waiting", given that there was no guarantee that the Deputy Chairman holding that position in the final year would go on to become Chairman.
4. This report therefore addresses both the effectiveness of having three Deputy Chairmen and the process for electing them.

Effectiveness of Arrangements

6. The main objective for having three Deputy Chairmen is to support and assist the Chairman on matters of policy and strategy. As part of the arrangements the Committee accepted that this should operate on the basis of each Deputy Chairman being allocated areas of activity and work (without any executive powers). The allocation of responsibilities is determined by the Chairman in consultation with the Deputy Chairmen and takes a number of factors into account such as experience, knowledge and the skill-set of the respective individuals. A number of areas of activity were identified initially and, amongst other things, this included diplomatic activities, Europe, London and the City Financial.
7. The views on how the initiative has worked over the last three years have been sought from the Chairman and the Members who have served as Deputy Chairman since the inception of the new arrangements. The Chairman is of the view that whilst the arrangement worked well initially, due to a number of factors, the overall objective has not been met as successfully as anticipated. The idea of "portfolios" in practice turned out to be not realistic as issues don't lend

themselves to simple categorisation. With regard to the process for the election of Deputy Chairmen in the final year of the Chairman's term of office, he pointed out that a two-stage election process had been adopted in order to build in time for Members to review their own positions but on reflection all three appointments could be made at one meeting.

8. In terms of the Deputy Chairmen, one Member did not feel that the arrangements had worked well in this instance. However it was felt that, given the volume of the work of the Chairman, better use could be made of the Deputy Chairmen. More thought could be given to the allocation of portfolios, possibly by constructing an appropriate trio of portfolios, perhaps around "People, Prosperity, Place" themes which mirror the officer groups. The risk is that this would give partial sight of the total picture only and would not be good for succession. Electing a presumed successor might benefit from a longer lead-in time - two years before (as with normal committees) might be better both in terms of handover and outside perception.
9. Another Member commented that whilst the arrangements have not worked well it is worth continuing. More could be done with the allocation of portfolios. In addition thought could be given to rotating portfolios (over the 3-4 year run-up) so that all three Deputy Chairmen get fuller exposure to a wider range of issues in a systematic way.
10. A view was expressed that with the ever increasing role of the Chairman, having three Deputy Chairmen can assist in spreading the workload providing they are given clear areas of responsibility in support of the Chairman and that the Chairman is able to utilise their talents and skills. There needs to be a good two way flow of information and they are there to support the Chairman should that be required. It also provides wider exposure to the role of Policy Chairman, increasing Member understanding and enabling preparations to be made should they be mindful to stand for Chairman.
11. Another Member also supported having three Deputy Chairmen but wanted them to be utilised more effectively. The roles were fundamental to increasing external engagement and effectiveness and there was also value in having them assist internally by, for example, chairing the Committee's sub-committees and working parties. The allocation of set policy areas was not considered essential as the City Corporation played its strongest hand when it was agile and flexible. Therefore Deputies needed to be deployed and utilised where best suited, this is where real value would be added. Their skills and interests should also to be taken into account before allocating specific areas of responsibility. Reference was made to the merits of the outgoing Chairman serving as Deputy Chairman. It was felt that this was unnecessary as status as a past Policy Chairman outweighed status as a Deputy Chairman. They should be 'employed' in whatever capacity added to effectiveness.

Election Process

12. It was accepted that the election of Deputy Chairmen of the Policy and Resources Committee should take place in accordance with standing orders and

agreed that the process for electing them, including the 'Chairman in waiting', should be dealt with by way of protocol. Details of the agreed protocol are set out in the appendix to this report for your information. It should also be noted that unless the number of candidates seeking to serve match the number of places available, candidates for election as one of the Deputy Chairmen are required to secure at least 50% of the vote.

13. Whilst the protocol for electing the Committee's Deputy Chairmen has worked well, concerns have been expressed about the arrangements which apply to the process in the final year of the Chairman's term of office i.e. whether it was necessary to operate a two-stage election process (see paragraph (f) of the appendix).

Conclusion

14. The system of appointing multiple Deputy Chairmen for this Committee has been in operation for four years. In May last year Members asked for this arrangement to be reviewed. This report provides feedback and information on how the system has operated. It also gives the Committee the opportunity to review the protocol for the elections process.

Background Papers:-

- Post-implementation Review of the Governance Arrangements – Court Report (6 December 2012)
- Election of Deputy Chairmen – Protocol – Committee Report (24 January 2013)

Angela Roach

Principal Committee & Member Services Manager

Town Clerk's Department

T: 020 7332 3685

E: angela.roach@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Election of Deputy Chairmen of the Police and Resources Committee – Protocol

- a) In each year, the Policy & Resources Committee will have three Deputy Chairmen;
- b) In the first year of a new Chairman's term of office:
 - the outgoing Chairman may exercise his or her right under Standing Orders to become one of the Committee's three Deputy Chairmen. For that year, the outgoing Chairman shall exercise the formal responsibilities of Deputy Chairman of the Committee, i.e. dealing with requests for decisions under the urgency procedures or under delegated authority and chairing meetings of the Committee and/or representing the Chairman at the Court if the Chairman is unavailable;
 - the Committee will elect two further Deputy Chairmen;
- c) In the event that the outgoing Chairman decides not to exercise his or her right to become a Deputy Chairman, the Committee will elect three Deputy Chairmen. The Chairmen, in consultation with the three Deputy Chairmen, will decide which of them will exercise the formal responsibilities of Deputy Chairman for the coming year, i.e. dealing with requests for decisions under the urgency procedures or under delegated authority, and chairing meetings of the Committee and/or representing the Chairman at the Court if the Chairman is unavailable;
- d) For subsequent years (excluding the final year of the Chairman's term of office), exercising the formal responsibilities will be rotated amongst the office holders, with the rota being settled by the Chairman, in consultation with the Deputy Chairmen;
- e) It will be customary for the Deputy Chairman having the formal responsibilities to sit beside the Chairman in meetings of the Committee;
- f) In the final year of the Chairman's term of office the Committee will undertake a two-stage election process for the three Deputy Chairmen as follows:
 - a separate election solely for the position of the Deputy Chairman who is most likely (subject to election at the first meeting) to serve as the Committee's future chairman (i.e. the 'chairman in waiting'). For that year, the individual will exercise the formal responsibilities of Deputy Chairman of the Committee, i.e. dealing with requests for decisions under the urgency procedures or under delegated authority and chairing meetings of the Committee and/or representing the Chairman at the Court if the Chairman is unavailable;

- a further election for the remaining two Deputy Chairmen. This will take place at the next meeting of the Committee as clearly the outcome of the first election may influence a decision on whether to stand and such decisions are best taken after a time for reflection;
- g) in the event that the Committee's Chairman leaves before completing the maximum term of 5 years (for example if he or she decides not to stand for re-election), all three Deputy Chairmen will be required to stand-down once the Chairman has announced his or her intention, although they will remain in office until such time as they are re-elected or a successor elected. This would be followed by the two-stage election process set out in f) above.
- h) In the event of the Chairman resigning or dying in office, the Chairman will be elected at the next meeting. If one of the three Deputy Chairmen is elected Chairman, the vacancy created will be filled at the following meeting.

Committee: Policy and Resources	Date: 19 January 2017
Subject: London Councils Grants Scheme	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Decision
Report Author: Angela Roach, Principal Committee and Members Services Manager	

Summary

1. The total expenditure to be incurred under the London Councils Grants Scheme ("the Scheme") and the City of London Corporation's contribution to it are considered on an annual basis. This Committee is responsible for both approvals.
2. The City Corporation is also responsible for issuing the subscription levies to all the London Local Authorities for their contributions to the Scheme's budget. This element of the Scheme's operation can only be approved by the Court of Common Council and that decision cannot be taken before 1 February 2017, the date by which the total expenditure for the Scheme must be agreed by constituent councils. The Court is therefore required to make its decision as levying body early in February as, in accordance with regulations, levies must be issued before 15 February 2017. The Court of Common Council is not due to meet within this period and therefore its decision will need to be sought under urgency procedures.
3. For 2017/18 London Councils is recommending that the overall level of expenditure under the Scheme is set at £8.668m, a reduction on last year's budget of £1.332m. The proposed expenditure is made up of £7.668m in contributions from London local authorities (the amount to be levied) and £1m of European Social Fund (ESF) grant. London Councils is also proposing to transfer £231,000 from London Councils Grants Committee's (which is responsible for the Scheme) reserves.
4. Subscriptions to the Scheme are calculated on the basis of residential population and for 2017/18 the City Corporation's contribution will be £7,744, £762 less than last year.

Recommendations

5. It is recommended that:-
 - approval is given to the total amount of expenditure to be incurred in 2017/18 under the Scheme (£8.668m) and to the City Corporation's subscription for 2017/18 (£7,744) as set out in Appendices A and B of this report; and

- subject to the Court of Common Council's approval (as levying body for the Scheme), the levy of £7,668,152 (as set out in Appendix B) be agreed. It should be noted that the Court's approval will be sought using the urgency procedures and is subject to at least two-thirds of the constituent councils agreeing the total expenditure to be incurred before 1 February 2017.

Main Report

Background

City Corporation Subscription and Overall Budget

1. The Scheme operates under section 48 of the Local Government Act 1985 ("the LGA 1985") which requires that at least two-thirds of the constituent councils (i.e. 22 out of 33 of the London local authorities) must approve the total expenditure to be incurred under the Scheme each year.
2. This approval must be given before the **1 February** in the year in which that financial year begins. Where this approval is not given by that date, under the Grants to Voluntary Organisations (Specified Date) Order 1992 made under the LGA 1985, the total expenditure will be deemed to be the same as that approved in the previous year i.e. £10.486m.
3. The Leaders Committee of London Councils is recommending a total expenditure of £8.668m under the Scheme for 2017/18 comprising £8.053m in grants expenditure, £555,000 in administrative expenditure and £60,000 for London Funders Membership Fees. Of the total expenditure, £7.668m will be funded from local authority subscriptions and £1m from an ESF grant.
4. For 2017/18 only, London Councils is also proposing to repay £156,000 from the Scheme's uncommitted reserves to the constituent councils. £56,852 of which will be returned to 12 London boroughs in the form of a direct repayment. The balance, £99,148, will be transferred to Leaders' Committee managing a new borough ESF programme which the remaining 21 local authorities have each agreed to participate in. A further £75,000 from London Councils Grants Committee's uncommitted reserves will be applied to fund a post to work with the City Bridge Trust to provide support to the third sector to support the transition to the new London Councils grants programmes which do not include a theme for funding the third sector. In total, London Councils is therefore proposing to transfer £231,000 from London Councils Grants Committee's reserves.
5. Local Authority subscriptions to the Scheme are calculated on the basis of total resident population as a proportion of the resident population of the whole of Greater London.
6. Appendix A to this report sets out details of London Councils' Grants Committee's Income and Expenditure Budget for 2017/18, and Appendix B sets out the subscriptions that each constituent council will be required to make. The

City Corporation's subscription for 2017/18 is £7,744 (a decrease of £762 over the preceding year).

Equalities Impacts arising from the City Corporation's Subscription

7. Under the Equality Act 2010, the City Corporation must have due regard to:
 - (a) the need to eliminate discrimination (and other prohibited conduct) on the grounds of race, age, disability, gender, sexual orientation, religion or belief, pregnancy, maternity and gender reassignment ('the protected characteristics');
 - (b) the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it (including to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic, to take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it, and to encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low); and
 - (c) the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not.
8. Having 'due regard' means that a public body must consider the impact of its decisions on protected groups and 'due regard' is regard which is appropriate in all the circumstances.
9. The Assistant Director of Community and Children's Services has considered whether there may be any adverse effects arising from the decision of the City Corporation to contribute to the Scheme as proposed and to agree the overall expenditure to be incurred under the Scheme in 2017/18. The view remains that the City Corporation's funding contribution to the Scheme is proportionally so small that it is unlikely to have any effect on a recipient organisation's ability to continue trading and will not impact upon the City Corporation's funding and support of local services. City Officers continue to work with partner boroughs and London Councils to monitor the impacts of the overall Scheme and to scrutinise its value for money.

Levy on the London Local Authorities

10. The City of London Corporation has been the designated council responsible for issuing the levies to all the constituent councils for their contributions to the Scheme since 1 February 2004. The City Corporation is defined, for these purposes, as a levying body under sections 74 and 117 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 and the Levying Bodies (General) Regulations 1992.

11. These Regulations require the City Corporation, as levying body, to issue the levies **before the 15 February of each year**. As such, the Court of Common Council is required to approve the annual levy on all the constituent councils (i.e. both the total contributions from them and the apportionment of that total between them) so that contributions can be collected from these local authorities towards the total expenditure on the Scheme.
12. The decision of the Court of Common Council as levying body cannot be taken until such time as the total expenditure under the Scheme is agreed i.e. the decision cannot be taken before 1 February. The Court is therefore required to take its decision as levying body between 1 and 15 February to enable the levies to be issued before 15 February (for the reasons noted at paragraph 10 above). As the Court of Common Council is not due to meet within that period, the decision to issue the levy will therefore be sought under the urgency procedures.

Background Papers:
London Councils Leaders' Committee Report dated 6 December 2016.

Angela Roach
Principal Committee & Member Services Manager
Town Clerk's Department
T: 020 7332 3685
E: angela.roach@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Grants Committee Income and Expenditure Budget 2017/18

Expenditure	Revised Budget 2016/17 £000	Developments £000	Inflation £000	Original Budget 2017/18 £000
Payments in respect of Grants				
London Councils Grants Programme	7,505	-1,332	0	6,173
Membership Fees to London Funders (for all boroughs)	60	0	0	60
City Bridge trust Liaison	0	75	0	75
European Social Fund Co-Financing	1,880	0	0	1,880
Sub-Total	9,445	-1,257	0	8,188
Operating (Non-Grants) Expenditure				
Contractual Commitments				
Maintenance of GIFTS Grants IT system	10	0	0	10
	10	0	0	10
Salary Commitments				
Officers	353	0	0	353
Members	19	0	0	19
Maternity provision	10	0	0	10
	382	0	0	382
Discretionary Expenditure				
Staff training/recruitment advertising	6	0	0	6
Staff travel	2	0	0	2
	8	0	0	8
One-off payment to boroughs	486	-330	0	156
Total Operating Expenditure	886	-330	0	556
Central Recharges	155	0	0	155
Total Expenditure	10,486	-1,587	0	8,899
Income				
Core borough subscriptions				
Contribution to grant payments	8,600	-1,332	0	7,268
Contribution to non-grants expenditure	400	0	0	400
	9,000	-1,332	0	7,668
Other Income				
ESF Grant Income	1,000	0	0	1,000
	1,000	0	0	1,000
Transfer from Reserves	486	-255	0	231
Central Recharges	0	0	0	0
Total Income	10,486	-1,587	0	8,899
Net Expenditure	0	0	0	0

This page is intentionally left blank

Borough Contributions towards the Grants Scheme 2017/18

Page 49

ONS Mid-2014 Estimate of Population ('000)	%	2016/17 Base Borough Contribution (£)		ONS Mid-2015 Estimate of Population ('000)	%	2017/18 Base Borough Contribution (£)	Base Difference from 2016/17 (£)
234.85	2.71%	247,537	Inner London	241.06	2.78%	213,113	-34,424
8.07	0.09%	8,506	Camden	8.76	0.10%	7,744	-762
268.68	3.10%	283,195	City of London	274.80	3.17%	242,941	-40,253
263.15	3.03%	277,366	Greenwich	269.01	3.10%	237,823	-39,543
178.37	2.06%	188,006	Hackney	179.41	2.07%	158,610	-29,396
221.03	2.55%	232,971	Hammersmith and Fulham	227.69	2.63%	201,293	-31,677
156.19	1.80%	164,628	Islington	157.71	1.82%	139,426	-25,202
318.22	3.67%	335,411	Kensington and Chelsea	324.43	3.74%	286,818	-48,593
291.93	3.37%	307,701	Lambeth	297.33	3.43%	262,859	-44,841
302.54	3.49%	318,884	Lewisham	308.90	3.56%	273,088	-45,796
284.02	3.27%	299,363	Southwark	295.24	3.40%	261,012	-38,352
312.15	3.60%	329,013	Tower Hamlets	314.54	3.63%	278,074	-50,939
233.29	2.69%	245,893	Wandsworth	242.30	2.79%	214,209	-31,684
Westminster							
3,072.49	35.42%	3,238,473		3,141.18	36.21%	2,777,011	-461,461
			Outer London				
198.29	2.29%	209,002	Barking and Dagenham	201.98	2.33%	178,564	-30,438
374.92	4.32%	395,174	Barnet	379.69	4.38%	335,671	-59,503
239.87	2.77%	252,828	Bexley	242.14	2.79%	214,068	-38,760
320.76	3.70%	338,088	Brent	324.01	3.74%	286,446	-51,642
321.28	3.70%	338,636	Bromley	324.86	3.75%	287,198	-51,438
376.04	4.34%	396,354	Croydon	379.03	4.37%	335,088	-61,267
342.12	3.94%	360,602	Ealing	343.06	3.96%	303,288	-57,314
324.57	3.74%	342,104	Enfield	328.43	3.79%	290,354	-51,750
267.54	3.08%	281,993	Haringey	272.86	3.15%	241,226	-40,767
246.01	2.84%	259,300	Harrow	247.13	2.85%	218,479	-40,821
245.97	2.84%	259,258	Havering	249.09	2.87%	220,212	-39,046
292.69	3.37%	308,502	Hillingdon	297.74	3.43%	263,222	-45,280
265.57	3.06%	279,917	Hounslow	268.77	3.10%	237,610	-42,306
169.96	1.96%	179,142	Kingston upon Thames	173.53	2.00%	153,412	-25,730
203.52	2.35%	214,515	Merton	204.57	2.36%	180,853	-33,661
324.32	3.74%	341,840	Newham	332.82	3.84%	294,235	-47,606
293.06	3.38%	308,892	Redbridge	296.79	3.42%	262,382	-46,510
193.59	2.23%	204,048	Richmond upon Thames	194.73	2.25%	172,154	-31,894
198.13	2.28%	208,833	Sutton	200.15	2.31%	176,946	-31,888
268.02	3.09%	282,499	Waltham Forest	271.17	3.13%	239,732	-42,767
5,466.23	63.02%	5,761,527		5,532.55	63.79%	4,891,141	-870,387
8,538.72	98.44%	9,000,000	Totals	8,673.73	100.00%	7,668,152	-1,331,848

9,000,000

7,668,152

Share of repayment in 2017/18 (£)	Returned to borough (£)	Transferred to Joint Committee (£)	Net payment 2017/18 (£)
-4,336	0	-4,336	213,113
-158	0	-158	7,744
-4,942	-4,942	0	237,999
-4,838	-4,838	0	232,984
-3,227	0	-3,227	158,610
-4,095	0	-4,095	201,293
-2,836	0	-2,836	139,426
-5,835	0	-5,835	286,818
-5,348	0	-5,348	262,859
-5,556	0	-5,556	273,088
-5,310	0	-5,310	261,012
-5,657	0	-5,657	278,074
-4,358	0	-4,358	214,209
-56,495	-9,781	-46,715	2,767,231
-3,633	-3,633	0	174,931
-6,829	0	-6,829	335,671
-4,355	-4,355	0	209,713
-5,827	0	-5,827	286,446
-5,843	-5,843	0	281,355
-6,817	-6,817	0	328,271
-6,170	0	-6,170	303,288
-5,907	0	-5,907	290,354
-4,907	0	-4,907	241,226
-4,445	0	-4,445	218,479
-4,480	0	-4,480	220,212
-5,355	0	-5,355	263,222
-4,834	0	-4,834	237,610
-3,121	-3,121	0	150,291
-3,679	0	-3,679	180,853
-5,986	-5,986	0	288,249
-5,338	-5,338	0	257,044
-3,502	-3,502	0	168,652
-3,600	-3,600	0	173,346
-4,877	-4,877	0	234,855
-99,505	-47,071	-52,434	4,844,070
-156,000	-56,852	-99,148	7,611,300

156,000

7,611,300

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s):	Date:
Policy and Resources Committee Resource Allocation Sub Committee	19 January 2017
Subject: Policing the City Bridges	Public
Report of: The Chamberlain and the Comptroller and Comptroller and City Solicitor	For Decision
Report authors: Karen Atkinson and Deborah Cluett	

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report addresses a request to the City Corporation as trustee of Bridge House Estates ("BHE") from the Police Committee on behalf of the City of London Police ("CoLP") for annual funding for CoLP from Bridge House Estates of £214,000.
- 1.2 The request by the CoLP is within the criteria for funding by BHE, and similar funding has been provided in the past.
- 1.3 In considering whether or not to expend the funds as requested by CoLP, the City Corporation, as sole trustee of BHE, must ensure that the expenditure is compliant with the duty on the City Corporation as sole trustee to act in the best interest of BHE (see Annex 2 for a summary of the principal duties and responsibilities of charity trustees).
- 1.4 The report advises that CoLP have satisfactorily demonstrated that the annual sum requested reflects the costs of policing the bridges.
- 1.5 The report advises that the expenditure is within the City Corporation's powers as sole trustee of BHE, and recommends that the request be agreed subject to regular review.

Recommendations

That the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee approves the provision of funding totalling £214,000 from BHE revenue budget to fund the cost of policing of the City Bridges on an annual basis, subject to:-

- the concurrence of the Policy and Resources Committee, acting as sole trustee of BHE in respect of expenditure of BHE funds;
- the sum being kept under review; and
- the City Corporation as sole trustee of BHE remaining satisfied that such expenditure is in the best interests of BHE).

2. Background and historical context

- 2.1 A recent Law Officer's Opinion (of the City of London Law Officers i.e. the Comptroller and City Solicitor, the Remembrancer and the Recorder) (see Appendix 1 of the Report to Police Committee which is attached as Annex 1 to this report) confirmed that in respect of London Bridge, Blackfriars Bridge and Southwark Bridge, there was a duty on BHE to fund the policing of those three bridges. In respect of Tower Bridge and the Millennium Bridge, it is open to the City Corporation as trustee of BHE to fund the policing of those bridges on the grounds that such activity contributes to the "maintenance and support" of those bridges, which is the primary purpose of the BHE charity, subject to the City Corporation as trustee being satisfied that such funding is in the best interests of the charity.
- 2.2 Although BHE has historically funded the policing of the City bridges, this had been suspended pending clarification of the statutory position.
- 2.3 Following clarification in the recent Law Officer's Opinion, on 3 November Police Committee received a report from CoLP on the issue (see Annex 1) and agreed the recommendation to approach BHE for annual funding of £214,000.

3. Evaluation

- 3.1 The Chamberlain, through the Head of Charity and Social Investment Finance, acting for BHE, has reviewed the Estimated Costs Summary and Assumptions provided by CoLP in the report to Police Committee and is satisfied that they represent reasonable expenditure.
- 3.2 In respect of London Bridge, Blackfriars Bridge and Southwark Bridge, payment by BHE of the costs of policing those bridges would be compliant with BHE's statutory duties. In respect of Tower Bridge and the Millennium Bridge, expenditure on policing those bridges can reasonably be regarded as contributing to the maintenance and support of the bridges. The payment in respect of Tower Bridge and the Millennium Bridge is considered in the best interests of BHE (including the reputation of the charity) in order to ensure that the level of policing service appropriate to the bridges, including an adequate level of support to social services provision, can be maintained.
- 3.3 The provision of the funding by BHE is recommended. However, it would be prudent for BHE to keep under review whether such expenditure is in the best interests of the charity in future years, to ensure that any change in circumstances or other relevant issues can be taken into account, if applicable, before making further annual payments. It is anticipated that the annual payments will continue unless a change in circumstance or other relevant issue arises, in which case the matter would be reported to your Committee.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 It is open to BHE to provide annual funding of £214,000 as requested and this is recommended.

Annex 1 – Report to Police Committee 3 November 2016 and related Minute from meeting

Annex 2 – Summary of Trustee Duties

This page is intentionally left blank

ANNEX 2

Summary of Charity Trustees' role

The City Corporation, acting through the Court of Common Council and committees to which functions of the Bridge House Estates Charity have been delegated, is the sole trustee of the Charity. Therefore all Members of the Court (or those committees) collectively, perform that role. All Charity trustees must always act in the best interests of the Charity and manage any conflicts of interest or loyalty accordingly.

¹When Members of the Court (at the Court itself or across committees) are dealing with business associated with the Charity, they must ensure that the best interests of the Charity are paramount.

The City Corporation, as trustee of Bridge House Estates has the following main duties:-

1. To ensure the charity is carrying out its purposes for the public benefit.
2. To comply with the charity's governing documents and the law.
3. To act in the charity's best interests.
4. To manage the charity's resources responsibly.
5. To act with reasonable care and skill.
6. To ensure the charity is accountable.

The courts have developed principles of trustee decision-making which trustees should be able to show that they have followed. These are that in making decisions about the charity, trustees must:

1. act within their powers (i.e. consistent with the charity's objects and powers.)
2. act in good faith, and only in the interests of the charity.
3. make sure they are sufficiently informed, taking any advice they need.
4. take account of all relevant factors.
5. ignore any irrelevant ones.
6. manage conflicts of interest.
7. make decisions that are within the range of decisions that a reasonable trustee body could make in the circumstances.

While the City Corporation is acting in its general corporate capacity as trustee of Bridge House Estates, the Charity Commission's guidance for Local authorities acting as a charitable Trustee is helpful in providing clarification where an organisation must balance its competing duties and interests (available on their website at : <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-authorities-as-charity-trustees>); as is the Charity Commission's Conflicts of Interest Guidance, CC29 (also available on their website at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/343408/CC29- PDF.pdf)

The report presented to Court of Common Council on 16 January 2014 entitled "The role of the City of London Corporation as Trustee of the Bridge House Estates" clarifies the distinct functions and responsibilities of Committees that conduct business relating to the Charity as they existed at the time, and is listed as a background document to this report .

This page is intentionally left blank

TO: **POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

19 January 2017

FROM: **POLICE COMMITTEE**

3 November 2016

5. POLICING THE CITY BRIDGES - BUSINESS REQUIREMENT

The Committee considered a report of the Commissioner setting out information concerning the demand for and cost of providing policing services to the five vehicular and pedestrian bridges crossing the River Thames in the City of London.

Members noted that Bridge House Estates was a charity responsible for the upkeep of the Bridges and, therefore, if funding was being sought from this source, it was vital that it was within the Charitable Objects of the charity.

Members discussed the proposals for additional funding from Bridge House Estates and agreed that the additional funding for Counter Terrorism deployments on the Bridges and for patrol and response to calls on the Bridges were likely to be within the Charitable Objects of Bridge House Estates.

However, Members agreed that the additional funding for a Marine Support Unit Constable was not likely to be considered to be within the Charitable Objects and therefore agreed that this funding should be removed from the funding request to Bridge House Estates.

Members noted that, given that the additional funding was related to staff costs, the funding should be increase in future years in line with pay increases.

RESOLVED – That:-

- a) the report be noted; and
- b) that approval be given to a formal approach being made to the Bridge House Estate for annual funding of £214,000, to cover the cost of policing services on the five City Bridges, with increases in future years to account for pay increases.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s):	Date:
Police Committee	3 rd November 2016
Subject: Policing the City Bridges	Public
Report of: Commissioner of Police Pol 48-16	For Decision
Report authors: Superintendent Helen Isaac	

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report provides information on the demand for and cost of providing policing services to the five vehicular and pedestrian bridges crossing the River Thames in the City of London. Following the Opinion received from The Remembrancer in September 2016, it is believed there is a case from statute for the Bridge House Estate (BHE) to fund the policing of Blackfriars, London and Southwark Bridges and a case also to support funding of policing services for Tower and Millennium Bridges. In considering the case for funding, this report concentrates in particular on the additional policing services provided to the City Bridges, which are largely demanded due to their location, structure and prominence as important thoroughfares across the River Thames.
- 1.2 The report summarises legal opinion on the case for funding over the last 100 years, considers the findings of a £224,000 business case for funding from the BHE made in 2011 and uses information gathered for an updated case for funding compiled in 2015. It refers to Royal National Lifeboat Institution (RNLI) and Corporation of London data gathered for a recent report into the growing demand for policing services in response to welfare issues on City Bridges.
- 1.3 The report includes an estimation of costs incurred in particular through the provision of intelligence-led counter terrorism deployments on bridges, bridge patrols, and responding to calls over concern for the safety of individuals. It includes the cost incurred by the force through the permanent attachment of an officer to the Metropolitan Police Marine Support Unit (MSU), who respond to many of our concern for safety calls by boat in support of City of London Police (CoLP) officers. The cost of CCTV and ANPR cameras has been excluded from this latest report due to their inclusion in the wider Ring of Steel project, to be presented separately.
- 1.4 The cost of providing policing services to the five City Bridges, taking account of the available data, is estimated at £272,000 per annum.

Recommendation

It is recommended that members:

- 1) Note this report.

- 2) Approve a formal approach to the Bridge House Estate for annual funding of £272,000.

2. Background and historical context

- 2.1 In considering the obligations of the BHE, on the 14th December 1917 Law Officers concluded in a report, *"We are therefore of opinion that the Bridge House Committee have the duty imposed upon them "if they see occasion" to appoint watchmen and defray the cost of watching"*. With regard to Tower Bridge, the Law Officers concluded *"no obligation to watch or to pay for watching is imposed"*. The Law Officers refer to a 'compact' entered into by the Bridge House Estates Committee in 1895 and say *"[that compact] appears to have been based upon a good consideration to pay £2000 in respect of watching the several Bridges. That compact stands"*.
- 2.2 An Order of the Court of Common Council on 20th October 1938 declared that the amount of payment for watching bridges was fixed at £7000 per annum. A subsequent Order dated 16th December 1943 declared the amount be reduced to £5800 per annum. The last payment made to the Force was in 2004/5 when the contribution was £11,800. Material has not been found to suggest why the payment was not routinely increased with inflation, although using a historical inflation rates calculator, £5800 in 1943 would be worth approximately £246,500 in 2016.
- 2.3 In 2005, the Comptroller and City Solicitor reviewed the opinion expressed by Law Officers in 1917 and agreed with their conclusion.
- 2.4 In 2011 a business case was compiled by City of London Police (CoLP) in response to a letter from the Remembrancer, which invited the Force to bid for additional resources from BHE to provide security for the Bridges. This stated, "Historically a contribution was made to the City of London Police from Bridge House Estates to pay for Watchmen to watch the Bridges. The primary objective of the Bridge House Estates Fund is for "the maintenance and support of London Bridge, Blackfriars Bridge, Southwark Bridge, Tower Bridge and Millennium Bridge" with any surplus funds being applied to charitable purposes under a Cy-Pres scheme."
- 2.5 The service overview in the current Service Level Agreement between City of London Police and Bridge House Estates, states the following:

"The City of London Police currently provide a service whereby officers are tasked to specifically patrol all the named bridges within the City of London. These patrols are provided by a combination of our mobile patrols, foot patrols and our Mounted Section.

In addition to the above the City of London Police has an officer on a full time basis to the Marine Policing Unit based at Wapping Police Station on the River Thames a short distance from Tower Bridge. The Marine Unit also provides a visible 24 hour presence on the Thames in support of the broader river community."

- 2.6 A briefing note compiled in April 2015 by the Chamberlain's Department states that "following correspondence between the Chamberlain's Department and the City Police, the contribution ceased as justification was not provided to demonstrate what extra duties the Police were performing in relation to the bridges. BHE has not been used to relieve the City from public sector funding constraints and it was considered inappropriate to meet expenditure on general policing from the charity."

3. Current legal position

- 3.1 In appendix one, the Remembrancer sets out detailed Opinion dated September 2016 on policing of the City Bridges and the obligation on the Bridge House Estates to provide funding. This document concludes:

"The private acts governing London Bridge, Blackfriars Bridge and Southwark Bridge make it clear that an obligation to fund the policing of the bridges is cast on the Bridge House Estates. In respect of Tower Bridge, although there is no overt reference to an obligation on the Bridge House Estates to fund the watching or policing of the bridge, a case can be made that certain police resource attributable to policing Tower Bridge may be funded by Bridge House Estates. This can be inferred from the reference to the "maintenance and support" of the bridge by the Bridge House Estates provided for by section 65 of the Act. Such an approach seems to be taken by the SI 2004 No. 4017 in dealing with the Millennium Bridge."

4. 2011 business case for funding policing services

- 4.1 The 2011 business case concluded that four specific activities were undertaken by the Force in policing the City's Bridges:
- a) Day to day and pre-briefed patrol activity on foot and by specialist uniformed officers, such as the Dog and Mounted Sections, Support Group, Roads Policing Unit and the firearms department at an estimated cost of **£105,000** per year.
 - b) Permanent attachment of an officer to the Metropolitan Police Marine Support Unit with responsibility for policing the river Thames and checking the security of the bridges from the river at a cost of **£50,000** per year.
 - c) Staffing the London Bridge police entry point (during peak hours Monday to Friday, this was one of the Force's counter terrorism tactics at the time) at an estimated cost of **£37,000** per year.
 - d) CCTV cameras and ANPR cameras covering vehicle traffic and pedestrians entering and leaving the City using the bridges at a cost of **£32,000** per year.
- 4.2 The total annual estimated cost of policing the City Bridges in 2011 was **£224,000**.

5. Assumptions

Table 1: PC and PS cost assumptions

Rank	Band	Annual Costs			Monthly Costs	Daily Cost	Hourly Rate
		Low	Mid or Near Mid	High	Top of Band		
		£	£	£	£	£	£
Constables	1-11	39,777	50,443	57,975	4,831	242	34.51
Sergeants	23-26	60,141	61,897	64,671	5,389	269	38.49

Source: CoLP Finance Department

- 5.1 Table 1 above sets out the figures used to estimate the cost of policing the City's Bridges. For the purpose of these calculations, the cost includes national insurance and pension contributions. The highest band constable (£57,975 per annum) and sergeant (£64,671 per annum) costs are assumed in this report.
- 5.2 This report takes account of the most recent Opinion from the Remembrancer dated September 2016 and therefore assumes inclusion of all five vehicular and pedestrian bridges within the City of London in calculations, these being Tower, London, Southwark, Millennium and Blackfriars Bridge respectively.

6. Costs of policing the City Bridges

Table 2: Summary of estimated costs 2016/17

Function	Category of Cost	Costs (Top of Band)	
		Weekly	Annual
		£	£
Costing for tasked Counter Terrorism deployments on City Bridges	1 x Sergeant - 10 hours per week- at highest grade of rank	365	20,015
	4 x Constables - 20 hours per week - at highest grade of rank	2,761	143,572
Total		3,416	163,587
Costing for patrol of and response to calls for service on City Bridges	2 x Constables - 2 hours per day, 7 days a week - at highest grade of rank	966	50,247
Total		966	50,247
Costing for Marine Support Unit Constable	1 x Constable - annual cost	1,230	57,975
Total		1,230	57,975
Overall total		5,612	271,809

Source of costings: CoLP Finance Department

- 6.1 The position in 2016 is similar to 2011, with revised costs and activities summarised in table two above and explained in the text below. CCTV and ANPR costs included in the earlier report have been removed as these are included in the wider Ring of Steel project which will be for separate consideration. The current estimated cost of providing policing services to the five City Bridges is £272,000.

Tasked counter terrorism deployments

- 6.2 Following the 2011 business case, the Force has moved on from entry point counter terrorism tactics and now has in place the scientifically developed and evaluated Project Servator. The Force has a permanent Project Servator team and in addition to this, other uniformed and covert departments deploy Project Servator tactics in teams around the clock as part of the tasking directed by the fortnightly meetings of the Force's Security Group.
- 6.3 Deployments to locations are unpredictable and intelligence-led, with teams directed to areas by the CoLP Counter Terrorism Co-ordinator. Security Group meetings consider these deployments and agree the locations against the intelligence and as high profile, high traffic and in most cases iconic locations for vehicles and pedestrians crossing into the City, the bridges regularly feature as tasked locations, depending on intelligence at the time.
- 6.4 Tasked locations have been extracted from 22nd February to 30th October 2016 and this data shows that on average, twenty counter terrorism deployments each week take place on City Bridges. These deployments are not always directed by a sergeant depending on the team involved, hence the difference in weekly hours between sergeant (ten hours) and constable (twenty hours) hours attributed. Deployment costs assume four constables, although depending on the team deployed this could be significantly more or slightly less, part of the unpredictable nature of the tactics. This activity equates to a total cost of **£163,587** per annum as shown in table 2 above.

Directed patrols and response to calls for service on City Bridges.

- 6.5 Although it is not possible to calculate the *exact* amount of time and cost spent carrying out patrols and responding to incidents on City Bridges, this figure has been calculated estimating two officers patrolling/responding on bridges for two hours per day, seven days a week.
- 6.6 Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) data extracted for a year from 30th July 2014 to 29th July 2015 for a previous report on policing of the bridges showed a considerable number of calls for police services at City Bridges. Due to the need for a lengthy manual search of annual CAD data to sift out inaccurate location information and the time available for completion of this task, quarterly data from 11th October 2015 to 11th January 2016 was extracted and sifted to provide a more recent portrayal of calls from the last year for police attendance. This data has been multiplied by four for an estimated annual total and shows a similar demand for Southwark, London and Blackfriars Bridges when compared against the 2014/15 data captured for the 2015 report.

- 6.7 Due to earlier legal opinion excluding Tower and Millennium Bridges, the data for these was not captured and included in the 2015 report. However, the quarterly data shows that Tower Bridge experienced 48 calls for service, an estimated total of 192 for the last year and Millennium Bridge 18 calls, an estimated total of 72 for the year.
- 6.8 From the 2014/15 data Southwark Bridge had 67 calls recorded, including concern for safety reports, abandoned calls for assistance and concerns about suspicious circumstances being reported. From the quarterly data there were 24 calls equating to an estimate of 96 for the last year.
- 6.9 London Bridge is by far the busiest bridge in terms of calls for service, with 589 CADs in 2014/15, including concerns for safety, suspicious circumstances, violence and road traffic collisions. From the quarterly data there were 109 calls equating to an estimate of 436 for the last year.
- 6.10 Blackfriars Bridge saw 131 calls for service in 2014/15, with concerns for safety and suspicious circumstances again common reasons for police assistance being required. The quarterly data showed 39 calls equating to an estimate of 136 for the last year.
- 6.11 Sadly, City Bridges are an increasing draw for vulnerable people who may also be suffering from mental health issues. Officers are called to incidents on a regular basis following reports of someone having jumped into the Thames or considering or attempting to do so. There were 239 concern for safety CADs to City Bridges in the year 11th October 2015 to 11th October 2016, the actual figure as opposed to an estimate from quarterly data as less sifting was required due to the ability to search on a specific code for concern for safety CADs.
- 6.12 A 'concern for safety' CAD is a call for assistance where there is a concern for a person's safety and could be reported by a member of the public, member of the emergency services, by the individual themselves, or a friend or family member. In relation to the concern for safety CADs on City Bridges, the call could relate to a suicide, or attempted suicide. It could also relate to a person in crisis and in need of support, for example, if a passerby notices someone upset or distressed on a bridge and telephones the police, this would be recorded as a concern for safety. This may be totally unrelated to suicidal thoughts.
- 6.13 Officers are tasked throughout the week with carrying out daily patrols of the bridges to look for and where possible, interact with those who may be a cause for concern. When officers are involved in an interaction with an individual resulting in detention under section 136 of the Mental Health Act 1983, (either as a result of a concern for welfare call or through coming across someone on patrol), incidents are often protracted and involve the abstraction of at least two officers, sometimes for hours at a time, to wait with the individual for hospital transport and carry out a handover at the hospital, prior to being released to continue policing duties.

- 6.14 Data from the RNLI report 'River Safety in Central London,' shows that 25% (117) of the Tower Lifeboat Station's 255 bridge incident calls in 2015 were for City Bridges. This is a sobering figure as the City stretch of the river forms only a small proportion of the 16 miles of Tidal Thames covered by the Tower Lifeboat Station. RNLI data for the current calendar year is available to the 7th August and shows that 47% (85) of their 182 bridge incident calls have involved City Bridges. Proportionally to 7th August, this figure (85) is already 77% of all calls received for City Bridges for the whole of 2015. It should be noted that these calls were calls for service and there may not have been any real risk of someone jumping; this does however help to illustrate the demand on policing services at City Bridges, as calls will inevitably have involved a policing response from CoLP officers.
- 6.15 To add another level of context to the RNLI data, statistics from the Corporation of London's high harm and high vulnerability analyst have been collated and are presented for illustration in table three below. This data is an accumulation from various sources, but is primarily police data from CADs (calls received from members of public or victims) and intelligence reports submitted by officers. Each CAD and intelligence report has been reviewed by the analyst to ensure the data collection is accurate.
- 6.16 This data includes only incidents of suicide or attempted suicide and does not include the remainder of the picture i.e. those calls to the bridges to deal with people for whom there is a concern for safety, which may be a person in crisis or a cry for help. These other calls would not be classed as an attempted suicide or suicide and will vary from overall concern for safety CAD data for this reason. The incidents in table three range from completed suicide attempts resulting in death, to people saved from the river and those involving successful intervention before someone was able to jump in.

Table 3: Suicide and Attempted Suicide within the City of London Attributable to City Bridges

Data Collection Period	Attempted Suicides Within the City of London Attributable to City Bridges
April 2014-March 2015	41
April 2015-March 2016	46
April 2016 to 5th September 2016	52

Source: City of London Corporation

- 6.17 This data is useful in illustrating clearly the impact of bridge related demand on the CoLP. Used with other data sets it paints a vivid picture of an increasing demand, with suicide and attempts from five months of data for this year already higher than the last full year.
- 6.18 From quarterly data, an estimated total of 932 calls for service on the five bridges occurred over the year to 11th October 2016, an average of 2.55 per

day. This is not dissimilar to the actual number of 2.11 calls per day quoted in the 2015 Policing the Bridges report, but is slightly higher, taking into account that the earlier report did not include data for Tower or Millennium Bridges.

- 6.19 The police response to these calls and the increasingly protracted nature of many of these, combined with the tasked daily foot, mounted and mobile security patrols on bridges leads to the conclusion that the cost of two PCs for two hours per day, seven days a week would be a reasonable estimate for this activity, at a total cost of **£50,247** per annum.

Permanent attachment of an officer to the Metropolitan Police Marine Support Unit

- 6.20 The force continues to attach an officer to the Marine Support (MSU) at a cost of **£57,975** per annum. The MSU has responsibility for policing the River Thames and checking the security of bridges from the river and will inevitably be called out to assist CoLP officers in the event of someone jumping or threatening to jump from one of the City Bridges. The prime purpose in continuing this attachment is to ensure the security and safety checks around City Bridges continue as an essential part of our policing response, at the cost of providing one officer to this specialist team.

7. Conclusion

Recent legal opinion agrees with the historical view that a case is made in statute for funding of the policing of London, Southwark and Blackfriars Bridges by the Bridge House Estate. The Opinion dated September 2016 concludes there is also a case to support the funding of the policing of Millennium and Tower Bridges. Demand data for the five City Bridges has been considered and whilst the overall number of calls for police service is reasonably consistent, there has been a marked increase in the number of people either committing or attempting to commit suicide from City Bridges, with an associated impact on police resources. Estimated costs for three specific areas of policing activity on City Bridges have been calculated, these being; patrol and response to calls for service, tasked counter terrorism deployments and an officer attached to the Marine Support Unit, with the total cost of policing estimated at £272,000 per annum.

Recommendation

It is recommended that members:

- 1) Note this report.
- 2) Approve a formal approach to the Bridge House Estate for annual funding of £272,000.

Appendices

Appendix one: Policing the Bridges and allocation of costs to the Bridge House Estates: Opinion

This page is intentionally left blank

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Policing the Bridges and allocation of costs to the Bridge House Estates

OPINION

Introduction

1. This Opinion considers the nature and extent of the City's obligations as to the policing of the City's bridges and the extent to which those costs may be attributed to the Bridge House Estates. It focuses on general policing responsibilities rather than any specific project, although the issue has recently received renewed attention as the result of a project to install river cameras at the bridges. Issues concerning the quantum of any contribution and a Trustee's general duty to act in the best interests of Trust are not dealt with in this Opinion.
2. In order to provide context and to inform interpretation, some historical constitutional background is included. This has however been confined to material which assists in deciding the extent of the obligations and sources of funding rather than providing a broader narrative. After a short account of the history of the 'Watch', each bridge is considered in turn, concluding, in each case, with an assessment of the position under current legislation.

Establishment of Watches and the Bridges

3. In what appears to be a remarkably coordinated national move, the Statute of Winchester 1285 (13 Edw. I), commanded that watch be kept in all cities and towns and that two Constables be chosen in every "Hundred" or "Franchise"; specific to the City, the Statuta Civitatis London, also passed in 1285, regularised watch arrangements so that the gates of London would be shut every night and that the City's twenty-four Wards, would each have six watchmen controlled by an Alderman. This system, where each householder

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

took a turn at being an unpaid watchman, remained more or less unchanged until the early 18th century.

4. The first (un-numbered) section of the City of London Police Act 1839 (2 & 3 Vict c.xciv) stated that “the Mayor Aldermen and Commoners of the City of London, in Common Council assembled, are willing and desirous to contribute out the Revenues and Possessions of the Mayor and Commonalty and Citizens of the said City a portion of the expense of the said Police Force”.
5. The Act consolidated and rationalised a system of policing in the City which had evolved from medieval times. The 1839 Act did not create a wholly new body, as by 1832 the “new” Force was effectively in existence in the form that it was to take by statute. It did, however, put it onto a statutory footing as was the case with the Metropolitan Police and other police forces established throughout the country after 1829.
6. The 1839 Act provided by section LVII that the City was required to pay one quarter of the expenses of the City Force from City’s Cash. By section LVIII, the remaining three quarters were to be met by a local police rate. Watching the bridges was accounted for separately and recorded as a reimbursement from the Bridge House Estates before the quantum was calculated. In 1896 the City of London Police Committee reported to the Court of Common Council the three sources of police funding, viz City’s Cash, Bridge House Estates and a local Police rate. At this point, all City Police funding came from the City (in whatever guise) and none came from central Government.

London Bridge

Historical background

7. A bridge across the Thames in approximately the same position as the current structure built in the late 1960s has existed since Roman times.
8. The title of the Corporation to the Bridge House Estates is very ancient and arose before the doctrine of trusts was fully developed. The early conveyances and grants, dating from

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

the twelfth century, contain the words ‘to the Proctors’ or ‘Wardens of London Bridge’ or ‘the brethren and sisters of the Chapel on the Bridge’, or more simply ‘to God and the Bridge’.

9. In the minutes of the Court of Common Council for 1 Feb 1817, watch stations are recorded as covering the wards of Bridge, Candlewick, Billingsgate and Dowgate. The same Common Council record shows that the watch house for those 4 wards was at the “Bridge Watch House”. Watch houses, the record continues, were to be open all day and night with patrols every 2 hours. It seems highly probable, especially in light of the strong criticism of the behaviour of various watches and the natural desire on the City’s part to make sure its money was prudently spent, that patrols would cover the full extent of their territory and would, therefore, patrol the whole of the ward - across London Bridge to the southern ward boundary. The contemporary recognition of the boundary of the City as being on its southern side is evidenced by documents of the period; for instance the Robert Morden and Philip Lea map, first published around 1700 and re-issued c1715 and which is particularly detailed, shows the ward boundary on the southern side.

Current Position

10. From the Corporation of London (Bridges) Act 1911 onwards, “the Corporation” has been defined to mean “the Mayor and Commonalty and Citizens of the City of London Trustees of the Bridge House Estates”, recognising the Corporation’s distinct trustee capacity.
11. The current London Bridge was constructed pursuant to the powers contained in the London Bridge Act 1967 (1967 c.1).
12. Section 35(1) of the 1967 Act provides “Whereas the existing London Bridge is wholly within the city and is exempt from all assessments, now it is hereby declared as follows:-

(a) the bridge as reconstructed under this Act shall be wholly within the city”...

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

13. The obligation on Bridge House Estates to pay for policing on the bridge is set out in s35(1)

“(c) The bridge shall be vested in the Corporation and shall be maintained, repaired, cleansed, lighted and policed at the cost of the rents and profits of the Bridge House Estates”.

14. The term 'policed' used in section 35 of the 1967 Act does not receive further explanation. The Act which authorised the building of the bridge replaced under the powers conferred by the London Bridge Act 1967 - the London Bridge Act 1823 (4 GeoIV c.50) - does, however, provide a greater indication of what the term might be taken as encompassing.

15. Section 93 of the 1824 Act provided for the appointment of the Watch (the advent of the City of London Police then being 15 years distant) in the following terms -

“That the said Mayor, Aldermen and Commons, in Common Council assembled, or such Committee or Committees as aforesaid, are hereby empowered from time to time, if they see Occasion, to appoint such Number of fit and able bodied Men as they shall think proper, to be armed and clothed in such Manner as the said Mayor, Aldermen and Commons, in Common Council assembled, shall direct, to be employed as Watchmen, Guards or Patroles, either on Foot or Horseback, upon the said Bridge, or temporary Bridge (if any), and to appoint any Person or Persons to be Superintendent or Superintendents thereof, and from time to time remove any of the said Superintendents, Watchmen, Guards or Patrole, and to appoint others in their Room, and from time to time to make such Rules, Orders and Regulations for the better governing the Superintendents, Watchmen, Guards or Patrole, and for the watching and guarding the said Bridge, and keeping the Peace thereon, as the said Mayor, Aldermen and Commons, in Common Council assembled, or such Committee or Committees as afore said, shall think proper”.

16. Section 94 set out the duties of the Watch as follows -

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

“And be it further enacted, That the Superintendents, Duty Watchmen, Guards and Patroles, shall use their best Endeavours to prevent Fires, Murders, Burglaries, Robberies, Disturbances, Obstructions, Stoppages, Breaches of the Peace and all Outrages, Misdemeanours and Disorders on or near to the said Bridge, and to that End are hereby jointly and severally empowered and required, without further Warrant, to arrest, apprehend and detain in the Watchhouse of the Ward of Bridge, or in any other Watchhouse or convenient Place, (whether provided or appointed by the said Mayor, Aldermen and Commons, in Common Council assembled, or such Committee or Committees as aforesaid, or otherwise,) all Malefactors, Rogues, Vagabonds and other disorderly and suspicious Persons, who shall be found committing any Disorder or Offence, or loitering, wandering or wantonly or negligently obstructing the Passage, or misbehaving themselves, or whom the said Superintendents, Watchmen, Guards and Patroles shall have just cause or reason to suspect of any evil Design, and the Person or Persons so apprehended to convey as soon as conveniently may be, before One or more of the said Aldermen of the said City, to be examined and dealt with according to Law”.

17. It seems clear from the drafting of these sections that the intention was to apply a wide interpretation to the duties of the obligations of those employed as 'Watchmen, Guards or Patroles' both on and near to the Bridge. Accordingly, there are reasonable grounds to assume that the interpretation of the term 'policed' in the 1967 Act should be a broad one. Moreover there would appear no reason to adopt a different approach to interpretation when considering other City Private Acts which refer to the watching or policing of bridges without additional statutory elucidation. (The Law Officers' Opinion of 1874 referred to below acknowledged that there was a general police duty to patrol the bridges, as with other public highway, but pointed to the fact that there was no express relief for the Corporation from its statutory duties to watch the bridges [London, Southwark and Blackfriars], and therefore it was justified in making arrangements to contribute to police expenses in respect of those bridges.) .

Blackfriars and Southwark Bridges

Historical Background

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

18. Blackfriars Bridge was the second bridge to span the river within the City's boundaries. First built in 1760, the original Blackfriars Bridge was erected pursuant to statutory powers and the current bridge is also a statutory bridge.
19. In its first recital the Blackfriars Bridge Act 1756 (29 GeoII c.86) gives "the City of London in Common Council assembled" the power and authority to build and maintain the bridge. The Act provides that the "mayor, aldermen, and commons, shall also, from and after the said bridge shall be created and made passable... appoint such a number of able-bodies watchmen as they shall judge necessary to be kept upon the bridge for the Safety and Protection of Persons passing over the same". The Act authorises the "mayor, aldermen, and commons, in Common Council assembled" to levy tolls for passage over the bridge. The Act then sets out the toll rates. By way of explanation for the toll, the Act records that repairing, preserving, supporting, making streets, purchasing houses [to be demolished], will amount to a "considerable charge and expense". It goes on to record that the money raised shall "also [be] for repairing, lighting and watching the said bridge".
20. Southwark bridge was not, originally, a City of London Corporation bridge. It was erected in 1815 by a private company. It appears that the City disliked the tolls levied by the private company and in 1864 the City leased the bridge and abolished the private toll.

Current Position

21. The present Blackfriars Bridge was constructed pursuant to the Blackfriars Bridge Act 1863 (26 & 27 Vict c.LXii), section 16 of which provides -

"[The] Bridge shall be maintained, supported, repaired paved, watched lighted, watered and cleansed, out of the rents and profits of the Bridge House Estates, and any funds now applicable to those purposes shall form part of the Bridge House Estates."

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

22. The Corporation of London (Bridges) Act 1911 (2 Geo.V c.cxx) authorised the reconstruction of Southwark Bridge and set out the basis of contributions towards the costs of policing. Section 61 of the Act 1911, states that Southwark Bridge – a ‘new bridge’ under the Act - is to be “policed by the Corporation out of the funds of the Bridge House Estates”. In Southwark Bridge’s case, the pillars on the southern side also seem to be within the City.

Tower Bridge

Historical Background

23. The bridge was built in response to public agitation for cross - river facilities below London Bridge occasioned by a large increase in vehicular traffic in the latter part of the 19th century. The Corporation promoted the Bill to authorise construction of the bridge in 1884 and it was passed in 1885. The bridge was opened in 1894.

24. The costs of policing the bridge featured in Opinions of the Law Officers delivered in 1895 and 1917 referred to further below. The general approach was that there was no obligation on Bridge House Estates to pay for the policing of Tower Bridge. However, there was found to be justification for the “compact” between Bridge House Estates Committee and Police Committee (in respect of the Bridge House Estates contribution to policing the bridges) to include policing costs in respect of Tower Bridge, on the basis of the number of men engaged daily in watching Tower Bridge.

Current position

25. Section 58 of the Corporation of London (Tower Bridge) Act 1885 (48 & 49 Vict. c.cxcv) provides that,

“Subject to the provision of this Act the Corporation may from time to time make such byelaws as they think proper for the opening and shutting of the Tower Bridge and for the regulation and management of the traffic on the Tower Bridge and on so much of the approaches and other works authorised by this Act as the Corporation

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

shall therein specifically define as places to which such byelaws shall be applicable and may from time to time alter vary or repeal such byelaws or any of them as they shall think fit so as the same be reduced into writing and be under the common seal of the Corporation and be allowed by the Board of Trade and the Tower Bridge and all places to which such byelaws shall be applicable shall for the purposes of such regulation and management and for the enforcement of such byelaws and for the recovery of any penalties for the breach or non-performance thereof be deemed to be within the city and liberties thereof and the jurisdiction powers authorities rights privileges and duties of justices of the peace and of the police and peace officers of the city shall extend to all such places”

26. The Corporation of London (Blackfriars and other Bridges) Act 1906 (6 EdwVII c.clxxx) confirms that Tower Bridge is to be treated as being within the City for the purposes of policing and the criminal law.
27. These Acts do not explicitly state that the City Corporation is to underwrite the costs of policing Tower Bridge. They do, however, make clear the City’s regulatory responsibilities under byelaws and for the jurisdiction of the City’s police and Justices of the Peace.
28. Section 65 of the Act also provides for the application of the rents and profits of the Bridge House Estates to the in the “maintenance and support” of Tower Bridge as is the case for (in varying terminology) the other City bridges. The supplementary Royal Charter governing the Bridge House Estates granted in 1957 (which enlarged the Corporation's purchase and investment powers as Trustees of the Bridge House Estates) did not distinguish the Tower Bridge Act 1885 from the principal Acts governing the other bridges.
29. Since the passage of the Act it appears that Bridge House Estate’s responsibility for “maintenance and support” of Tower Bridge has been taken to include responsibility for meeting the expenditure of policing the bridge where this is justified by the extent of the policing resource sought in respect of the bridge.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

30. This assumption of responsibility is consistent with the approach taken by the Law Officers when advising on the policing of the Bridges. In the opinions in 1895 and 1917 referred to at para 23 above, the Law Officers expressed the obligation as a 'compact' between the (then) Bridge House Estates Committee and the Police committee by which the former was to contribute an annual sum to policing costs. The actual sum was a matter for negotiation between them. However, different approaches appears to have been adopted between London Bridge, Blackfriars Bridge and Southwark Bridge (subject to statutory duties in respect of watching or policing the bridges), and Tower Bridge (where there is no such express duty, and the expenditure was based upon the specific [additional] police resource requested).

The Millennium Bridge

Historical background

31. This bridge is unlike the other City bridges in not being a construction initiated by the Corporation or governed by a City Private Act. The responsibility for the Bridge was conferred by The Charities (Bridge House Estates) Order 2001 (SI 2001 No 4017) made by the Charity Commission. The Commission obtained locus as the result of the cy-pres scheme authorised by The Charities (The Bridge House Estates) Order 1995 (SI 1995 No 1047).

Current position

32. The 2001 Order adds the Millennium and describes its object (in the appendix) as to enable the Charity to “own and maintain” it. No further guidance on interpretation is given. The Order refers (in paragraph 2 of the scheme set out in the appendix) to the “ownership and maintenance” of the other City Bridges “as provided for in the subsisting trusts”. The opening paragraph of the Scheme set out in the appendix states the Bridge House Estates as being regulated by (inter alia) the Private Acts currently governing each bridge. This appears to infer that “own and maintain” is to be taken as encompassing the rights and obligations contained in those Acts, being the Acts by which the Charity is

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

regulated. It therefore appears that “own and maintain” as used in the Order is to be construed broadly. If so, it may be taken as including reference to policing.

Conclusion

33. The private acts governing London Bridge, Blackfriars Bridge and Southwark Bridge make it clear that an obligation to fund the policing of the bridges is cast on the Bridge House Estates. In respect of Tower Bridge, although there is no overt reference to an obligation on the Bridge House Estates to fund the watching or policing of the bridge, a case can be made that certain police resource attributable to policing Tower Bridge may be funded by Bridge House Estates. This can be inferred from the reference to the “maintenance and support” of the bridge by the Bridge House Estates provided for by section 65 of the Act (para 28 above). Such an approach seems to be taken by the SI 2004 No. 4017 in dealing with the Millennium Bridge (para 31 above).

34. Alternatively, were that interpretation found wanting, the general trustee duty to maintain trust property may be sufficient to provide locus in respect of Tower Bridge (and the Millennium Bridge). In any event, there would seem to be insufficient reason to depart from the previous Opinions of the Law Officers in supporting the view that the obligation cast on the Bridge House Estates may extend to the costs of policing the bridges, and describing the arrangements for meeting them from the Estates as being in the nature of a “compact” as referred to in para 30 of this Opinion.

35. In relation to the other City Bridges, it is clear that an obligation to fund the policing of the bridges arises by statute.

P R E Double

City Remembrancer, for the Law Officers

Guildhall

September 2016

Committee(s):		Date(s):
Resource Allocation Sub	For decision	19 January 2017
Policy and Resources Committee	For decision	19 January 2017
Subject: Project Funding Update		Public
Report of: The Chamberlain		For Decision
Report author: Caroline Al-Beyerty, Chamberlain’s Department		

Summary

This report seeks approval to one-off funding of up to £413k to allow three new project proposals to be progressed. The Priorities Board, the officer group created to provide a more holistic approach to the allocation of project finance, proposes that £380k be met from the 2016/17 annual provisions for new schemes and £33k be met from the On Street Parking Reserve.

Annual provisions have been set aside in both City Fund (£2m net) and City's Cash (£3m) to provide a degree of flexibility to fund smaller value new capital schemes as they arise. A summary of the forecast position for the 2016/17 annual provisions is shown below:

	City Fund £m	City's Cash £m
2016/17 provisions	2.000	3.000
Allocations previously agreed	(0.835)	(0.036)
New Requests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Electronic Social Care Reporting and Case Management System Replacement Guildhall Stonework Repairs 	(0.250)	(0.130)
Unallocated balance remaining	0.915	2.834
Future potential requests	(0.125)	(1.518)
Forecast Headroom after allowing for Future Potential Requests	0.790	1.316

If both of these requests were agreed the balance remaining for City Fund would be £915k and for City's Cash £2.834m. After allowing for future potential requests, the headroom balances remaining for City Fund and City's Cash would amount to £790k and £1.316m respectively.

The remaining request relates to funding of £33k from the On Street Parking Reserve to progress to the next gateway the project for essential repairs to the Dominant House Footbridge. This sum can be accommodated within the balance available on the reserve.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that Members agree to allocate:

- funding of up to £250k from the 2016/17 City Fund provision for new schemes to meet the cost of replacing the Electronic Social Care Reporting and Case Management System, the final amount being dependent on the project sum agreed by the Chief Officer following procurement;
- funding of £130k from the 2016/17 City's Cash provision for new schemes to meet the cost of progressing the Guildhall Stonework Repairs project to the next gateway, subject to the requisite approval by the Projects Sub Committee; and
- a sum of £33k from the On Street Parking Reserve to meet the cost of progressing a project to repair the Dominant House Footbridge to the next gateway, subject to the requisite approval by the Projects Sub Committee.

Main Report

Background

1. The Policy and Resources Committee have agreed to set aside sums of £24m (£3m per annum) over the period from 2012/13 to 2019/20 in both the City Fund and City's Cash financial forecasts (£48m in total) to provide a degree of flexibility to fund smaller value new capital schemes as they arise.
2. In June 2012, the Policy and Resources Committee agreed that only projects that are considered essential and which fit within the following categories may be approved at Gateways 1-4 of the Project Procedure, until further notice:
 - 1) Health and safety compliance
 - 2) Statutory compliance
 - 3) Fully/substantially reimbursable
 - 4) Spend to save or income generating, generally with a short payback period (as a rule of thumb within 5 years)

In addition, under exceptional circumstances, other projects considered to be a priority by the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee will be allowed to proceed.

3. The majority of projects working their way through the early gateways are to be funded either from internal ring-fenced sources such as the Barbican Centre and GSMD Capital Caps and the City Surveyor's Designated Sales Pools or from external sources such as Section 106 deposits and Government/Transport for London grants which are restricted for specific purposes.
4. Decisions about the allocation of resources for those projects that do not have access to these sources of funding are generally taken when a scheme reaches Gateway 4a – Inclusion in Capital Programme, although requests at earlier gateways are also arising on a more frequent basis. To help members to prioritise the allocation of City resources to projects from a wide range of funding sources, the Priorities Board has been created to provide a more holistic approach to the allocation of project finance, by considering bids for funding from a range of available (less constrained) sources, including in particular future receipts from the unallocated pots of the City's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
5. The 2016/17 provisions for new schemes amount to £2m for City Fund (£3m less £1m for the existing Museum building) and £3m for City's Cash.

Requests for Funding

6. There are three requests for funding totalling £413k.

2016/17 Annual Provisions for New Schemes

7. The Corporate Priorities Board has identified the 2016/17 annual provisions for new schemes as the most appropriate sources of funding for two of the requests totalling £380k:
 - Electronic Social Care Reporting and Case Management System Replacement – funding of up to £250k from the 2016/17 City Fund provision. This proposal is classified as an **essential** scheme required to fulfil **statutory** local authority duties to deliver services relating to children's and adults social care, special educational needs and disabilities. The anticipated cost of delivery ranges from £40k to £250k, the final sum required being subject to the procurement exercise to be undertaken before authority to start work is granted under Chief Officer delegation.
 - Guildhall Great Hall Stonework Defects – funding to reach the next gateway of £130k from the 2016/17 City's Cash provision. This proposal is classified as an **essential health and safety** scheme to repair high level cracks to the stone pinnacle. The sum of £130k now requested, which is subject to approval by the Projects Sub-Committee, is to cover the costs of scaffolding and assessments; a further request for funding will be made once the estimated cost of the repairs has been determined at the next gateway.
7. The forecast position for the 2016/17 annual provisions is shown in the report summary above.
8. If the City Fund request was agreed, a balance of £915k would remain. A number of future potential requests amounting to £125k have been identified to date, which would result in a headroom balance of £790k if all were progressed to the relevant gateway before the end of 2016/17. This headroom balance is somewhat higher than the £28k anticipated in the December report, due to the deferral of some of the future potential schemes.
9. If the City's Cash request was agreed, a balance of £2.834m would remain. Future potential requests amounting to £1.518m have been identified (excluding a provision for the West Ham Park Nursery site which as yet is unquantified) which would result in a forecast headroom of £1.316m if all were to be progressed. This headroom balance is also somewhat higher than the £657k reported in December, due to the deferral of some of the future potential schemes.
10. Details of the schemes requiring funding in 2016/17 and potential requests for funding in the current and future years is provided in the Appendix.

On Street Parking Reserve

11. The Corporate Priorities Board has identified the On Street Parking Reserve as the most appropriate source of funding for the third request for funding of £33k as the nature of the scheme aligns with the legally permissible applications of this reserve.
 - Dominant House Footbridge Repairs – funding to reach the next gateway of £33k. This proposal is classified as an **essential health and safety** scheme, primarily to repair the movement joint between the staircase and supporting pier (with an option to extend the scope to include other structural repairs), subject to the approval of the Projects Sub-Committee.

The modest sum required at this stage can be accommodated within the balance available on the reserve.

Conclusion

12. There are three requests for funding of up to £413k and the Corporate Priorities

Board has concluded that the 2016/17 annual provisions for new schemes provides the appropriate source of funding for two of the schemes totalling £380k.

13. There are adequate resources available to meet both of these requests. After allowing for the future potential requests for funding identified to date, the City Fund and City's Cash unallocated balances are currently forecast at £790k and £1.318m respectively.
14. The Corporate Priorities Board has concluded that the third request for funding of £33k can most appropriately be met from the On Street Parking Reserve, as the nature of the scheme aligns with the legally permissible applications of this reserve.

Appendix – Detailed schedule of projects requiring funding from the 2016/17 and future year provisions for new schemes

Background papers:

- Electronic Social Care Reporting and Case Management System – Gateway 3 / 4 Options appraisal report; and
- Guildhall Great Hall Stonework Repairs – Gateway 1 / 2 project proposal report.

Caroline Al-Beyerty
Financial Services Director, Chamberlain's Department
T: 020 7332 1164
E: caroline.al-beyerty@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committees:		Dates:
Establishment Committee (For Information)		17 January 2017
Policy and Resources Committee (For Decision)		19 January 2017
Projects Sub-Committee (For Decision)		31 January 2017
Corporate Asset Sub-Committee (For Information)		10 February 2017
Subject: Accommodation and Ways of Working	Issue Report: Complex	Public
Report of: Comptroller & City Solicitor Report Author: John Galvin, Town Clerk's Department		For Decision
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Summary</u></p> <p>Dashboard:</p> <p>Project Status: Amber Last Approved budget: £165,000 Spend to date: £68,775</p> <p>Latest Gateway approved</p> <p>Gateway 1/2 project proposal was approved by Project Sub Committee on 7th September 2016.</p> <p>Progress to date including resources expended.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Following approval of the Gateway 1/2 report, the Accommodation and Ways of Working (AWoW) programme team have been consulting with the Department of the Built Environment (DBE) and Open Spaces teams. This has been in order to understand the workplace requirements, develop options for the Pilot Office including workspace designs, consider the financial and non-financial benefits of the programme and further evaluate the risks associated with delivery of the IT necessary to make the pilot office a success. £38,775 of Programme Manager Consultancy costs and £30,000 of work place design costs and advice have been incurred to date. Programme costs to date of £68,775 have been met from an initial budget of £165,000. Of this sum, £145,000 was funded from the Transformation Fund, with the remaining £20,000 funded from the local risk budgets of DBE and Open Spaces. This funding was for leadership and co-ordination of the programme, development of the business case and model office design and options. To this point, the programme has not incurred any costs requiring funding from the Capital Programme budget for new schemes. <p>Summary of issue</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The AWoW Programme Board has reviewed a number of concerns raised by the Programme Deliver Team. These were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benefits identification Technology 		

- Costs
 - Programme timescales
 - Alignment with HR programmes
 - Project ownership
4. An Options Paper, which is included as Appendix A, was presented to the AWoW Programme Board. It outlined the key benefits and risks associated with three potential ways forward:
 1. Continue with the existing proposed plan to introduce a Model Office in the spring of 2017.
 2. Re-focus the programme between now and autumn on supporting activities
 3. Pursue traditional accommodation moves
 5. The recommendation of the AWoW programme board, endorsed by Strategic Resources Group (SRG) and Summit Group is to pursue option two.
 6. Between now and autumn 2017, the focus of activity will be on testing mobile devices and piloting alternative work settings on the 1st and 6th floors of the Guildhall. This will provide experience and feedback with which to further inform the design of any recommended options for a future model office. This activity, and other supporting activities, is detailed in Appendix B – Short Term Activities.
 7. The Programme Board will continue to meet on a reduced frequency, and appraise progress of the supporting activity. Once these have developed to a sufficient level the Board will give consideration to recommencing the programme.
 8. The Programme will report back to Project Sub Committee with its further recommendations for consideration in September 2017. This will either be in the form of a Gateway 3/4 report, or an alternative proposal.
 9. Communications have been developed for staff outlining the way forward and thanking them for their on-going support.
 10. Expenditure to date totals £68,775. This has been necessary in terms of identifying and codifying activities required to successfully deliver an Accommodation and Ways of Working Programme. This identification of issues has been useful, and it provides the organisation with the information required to progress the aims identified for this programme.

Recommendations

1. Members are asked to agree Option 2 with additional project costs not to exceed £10,000. No additional funding is being sought at this stage.
2. Members should note that a further report will be submitted to Project Sub-Committee in September 2017 advising on how it is intended to progress the programme. This will either be a Gateway 3/4 report, or an alternative proposal.

Main Report

1. Issue description	<p>The AWOw programme was designed to modernise organisational working practices, improve collaboration and co-creation, optimising our buildings and facilities and co-ordinate the delivery of supporting IT.</p> <p>The Programme Delivery Team has identified a number of concerns in relation to the AWOw programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits – There are limited cashable benefits delivered solely by the pilot, with property savings accruing to other programmes. Most of the anticipated AWOw benefits relate to improving services and staff wellbeing, where performance is not seen as an issue • Technology – The current ability of the IT team to support the pilot with mobile devices and a stable infrastructure and the misalignment of the pilot with the Desktop Transformation Programme and Network Upgrade Programme • Costs – Total costs for the 1st floor Pilot are circa £800k • Programme – There will be a 5 month lag from the Gateway 3/4 report being submitted to occupation, previously this looked at occupation in March 2017, currently this is likely to be June 2017 • HR – Alignment of the AWOw programme with wider HR strategy and understanding of the level of change support required • Project ownership – Currently the programme is owned corporately by the Town Clerk, with DBE and Open Spaces as ‘customer’ departments; this does not necessarily give the departments the level of ownership or control they are looking for
2. Last approved limit	<p>The Gateway 2 report agreed an initial budget of £165,000. Of this sum, £145,000 was funded from the Transformation Fund, with the remaining £20,000 funded from the local risk budgets of DBE and Open Spaces. To date, £68,775 has been spent.</p>
3. Options	<p>The Options Paper as presented to the AWOw Programme Board has been included as Appendix A to this report. This paper noted three options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue with the existing proposed plan for the Guildhall North Wing first floor 2. Delay the pilot office to allow for supporting technology programmes to progress sufficiently and enable greater alignment of organisational strategies. 3. Deliver the move of DBE staff into the Guildhall North Wing first floor as a conventional accommodation move, not as a pilot for agile working. This would be paid through

	<p>DBE Local Risk.</p> <p>The full list of pros and cons for these options are contained in Appendix A - Options Paper.</p> <p>The recommendation of the Programme Board, endorsed by Strategic Resources Group and Summit Group, was to progress with option two. This refocuses the programme in the medium term and will delay the full deployment of the model office. However it will also offer a number of benefits and opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A significant reduction in the costs of the Pilot Model Office, particularly related to IT costs, of around £200,000. • Enabling supporting programmes to align with the AWoW objectives, particularly in relation to IT Desktop Transformation programme and the Network Upgrade. • Greater opportunity to align key organisational strategies, particularly the interaction between Property, HR and Technology. As these strategies are drawn together, the ability of the AWoW programme to support cultural change, property rationalisation and promote flexible and agile ways of working will become more compelling. • More work can be undertaken on quantifying cashable benefits of the programme, whether this can be directly attributable to AWoW, or where this supports other organisational initiatives. This will include further benchmarking with other organisations. <p>Continuing under the existing programme plan would not address any of the issues identified above, and on this basis, Option One was not recommended.</p> <p>Whilst Option Two entails a delay, it is not anticipated that the Corporation will incur significant costs through this re-profiling. A number of on-going activities have been identified as being required to be progressed over the period between now and the autumn and these are identified in Appendix B – Short Term Activities. It is expected that these undertakings will be delivered through business-as-usual. These activities will be co-ordinated internally, and will not involve the retention of external consultants.</p> <p>Whilst Option Three could be reasonably cheaply deployed initially, it did not offer any of the wider organisational benefits of the AWoW programme. This included the lack of a wider accommodation strategy, the delivery of an agile and modern workspace, enhanced ability to collaborate, or the inclusion of Open Spaces. Whilst initially appearing as a low cost option, expenditure would continue to be incurred by the Corporation for future tactical office moves through departmental expenditure. Also, this programme would not support the vacation of Irish Chambers, potentially an activity which would enable us to either</p>
--	--

	minimise cost or maximise income.
--	-----------------------------------

Appendices

Appendix A	Options Paper as presented to the Programme Board on 29 November 2016.
Appendix B	Short Term Activities that will be undertaken between now and the autumn

Contact

Report Author	John Galvin
Email Address	John.galvin@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 1275

Appendix A – Options Paper

Introduction

1. Progress on the Accommodation and Ways of Working (AWoW) programme is currently paused, pending confirmation of the required strategic direction for the programme.
2. The current scope for the programme as defined in the Gateway 1/2 report, identified the intention to develop a Pilot Model Office for the Department of the Built Environment (DBE) and Open Spaces, and take the learning from the delivery and initial period of occupation to inform a business case for wider changes to the workplace for the organisation.
3. There are currently a number of concerns related to the AWoW programme, in particular the Pilot Model Office. The key concerns can be summarised as:
 - Benefits – There are limited cashable benefits delivered solely by the pilot, most of the anticipated benefits are related to improving services and staff wellbeing, which are not seen as an issue
 - Technology – The ability of the IT team to support the pilot with mobile devices and a stable infrastructure and the misalignment of the pilot with the Desktop Transformation Programme and Network Upgrade Programme
 - Costs – Total costs for the 1st floor Pilot are circa £800k
 - Programme – There will be a 5 month lag from the Gateway 3/4 report being submitted to occupation, previously this looked at occupation in March 2017, currently this is likely to be June 2017
 - HR – Alignment of the AWoW programme with wider HR change programmes and understanding of the level of change support required
 - Project ownership – Currently the programme is owned corporately by the Town Clerk, with DBE and Open Spaces as ‘customer’ departments; this does not necessarily give the departments the level of ownership or control they are looking for

Technology

4. The delivery and stability of an effective technology solution is key to the delivery of the type of workplace identified for DBE and Open Spaces.
5. The current experience of DBE in sourcing test devices to provide critical systems / software will run on mobile devices has not improved the confidence levels that the pilot can be delivered.
6. The current approach for the pilot was to use existing technology solutions for both devices and infrastructure. While this approach would provide tried and tested devices they would need to be delivered with dedicated resources, involve complex individual device builds which will be migrated onto Windows 10 within the next year. Within the current total costs of circa £800k the costs for delivering the current IT solution is circa £270k.
7. Currently the advice from the IT department is that the Infrastructure and Windows 10 deployment will be complete by the end of 2017. The rollout

of the Windows 10 deployment is anticipated to start in May 2017. The approval (Gateway 5) for Infrastructure is targeted for June 2017.

Options appraisal

8. An options appraisal has been tabulated for the proposed high level options. The options considered are:
 - Option 1 – Continue with the existing proposed plan for the Guildhall North 1st floor
 - 4. Option 2 – Delay the pilot office to allow for supporting technology programmes to progress sufficiently and enable greater alignment of organisational strategies. This delay is expected to be at least six months.
 - Option 3 – Deliver the moves into Guildhall North 1st floor as a conventional accommodation move (not as a pilot for AWoW)

Recommendation

9. The recommendation of the project team is to progress with Option 2 - Delay the pilot office for at least 6 months. This will allow:
 - The associated Technology programmes to align
 - Alignment of wider HR change programmes and work on agile working with the AWoW programme
 - Alignment of Property / Accommodation strategy with the AWoW programme
 - Clarification of the short and long term objectives
10. Understanding the wish of DBE to make some progress in the short term it is proposed that:
 - With limited changes to the space plan introduce alternative work settings on the 6th floor, these to be advised by the Workplace Architects and align with the plans for the 1st floor
 - Continue with the test devices, so the wider deployment of devices can be progressed without delay later in 2017
11. This would provide DBE with a sense of progress during the AWoW programme hiatus, managing the reputational risk amongst staff.
12. There will need to be some carefully worded communications to advise both the DBE and Open Spaces teams on the rationale for the proposed delay.
13. It is proposed that the AWoW Programme board meets bi-monthly while the programme is paused, to align the restart of the programme with the progress made on the Technology and other corporate programmes.

Option:	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Description:	Continue with the existing proposed plan for the Guildhall North 1st floor	Delay the pilot office for 6 months to allow the associated Technology programmes to align	Deliver the moves into Guildhall North 1st floor as a conventional accommodation move (not as a pilot for AWoW)
Pros:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will deliver an agile workplace Will support progressive desk sharing ratios, initially 7.5:10 with options to increase Will provide a model for the wider accommodation strategy Aligns with what staff have been told will happen 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced IT costs, savings of circa £200k Workplace delivered with new Windows 10 devices and stable infrastructure Improved confidence in alignment with property strategy for Wallbrook Wharf and Irish Chambers Opportunity to align pilot aspirations with wider corporate change programmes, including HR and Knowledge Management Will deliver an agile workplace Will support progressive desk sharing ratios, initially 7.5:10 with options to increase Will provide a model for the wider accommodation strategy Aligns with what staff have been told will happen 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal delivery costs Can be delivered quickly Meets the DBE short term accommodation requirements Moves DBE staff from Wallbrook Wharf assisting the rationalisation of property (will not totally vacate WW)
Cons:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IT solutions are sub-optimum and will need to be updated in the next 12 months IT resources are deflected from the main EUDR and Infrastructure programmes Delivery costs of over £800k, including circa £270k of IT costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delay in delivery, nominally 6-12 months Delay in delivering property rationalisation / Irish Chambers for other uses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open Spaces not involved in solution Irish Chambers not vacated Will not deliver an agile workplace Will not provide a model for the wider accommodation strategy Will not facilitate a 6:10 desk sharing ratio Staff perception, no clear trade-off for reduced space Lack of support to managers to change working practices Does not aligns with what staff have been told will happen The space will need to be revisited if the AWoW programme proceeds Continued risk of IT failure

Appendix B – Short Term Activities

1. The following have been identified as needing to be progressed over the next six months to enable the programme to have the best chance of succeeding once it is restarted.
2. These have been identified under the following five headings / workstreams:
 - i. Technology
 - ii. HR
 - iii. Accommodation / Property
 - iv. Knowledge and information management
 - v. Procurement
3. The key deliverables for each workstream are summarised below:
 - I. Technology
 - a. Mobilise the Desktop Refresh programme
 - b. Finalise the desktop solutions based on work styles (Devices and build)
 - c. Finalise tests to establish mobile devices can run all relevant software
 - d. Mobilise the infrastructure update delivery
 - e. Define standards and delivery model for collaboration tools, including presentation screens / projectors, interactive white boards, video conferencing, digital signage
 - II. HR
 - a. Identification of benefits from agile working through dialogue and reviews of what other organisations have discovered. This will also better identify any cashable savings.
 - b. Consideration and alignment of existing work on agile working resulting from the finding and experience of the AWoW programme investigation.
 - c. Explore and define the HR support required to deliver agile work place, reviewing how to embed our managing people standards, Senior Management Team leadership / role modelling and consideration of any additional support that may be necessary with regards to training and guidance for managers.
 - III. Accommodation / Property
 - a. Alignment of the strategic accommodation / property programme with AWoW, and better identify cashable savings.
 - b. Identification of how aggressive AWoW needs to be to achieve the strategic accommodation objectives
 - c. Provide clarity on the approach and costs of achieving the strategic accommodation objectives without AWoW
 - IV. Knowledge and information management
 - a. Confirm ownership of knowledge and information management
 - b. Confirm strategic approach to the storage and sharing of knowledge and information
 - c. Clarity of the intentions regarding electronic knowledge management
 - d. Definition and sign-off of retention policies for all departments (particularly any groups identified for a pilot office)
 - V. Procurement

- a. Establish buying arrangements for products and services required corporately and eventually by AWoW, these include:
 - i. A furniture agent framework
 - ii. Fit-out works, between £100-200k, assuming a single floor, with options to scale to larger areas
 - iii. Move management / contractor services for churn moves

Committee(s)	Dated:
Policy & Resources Committee	19 January 2017
Subject: City of London Corporation's membership of TheCityUK	Public
Report of: Director of Economic Development	For Decision
Report author: Giles French	

Summary

TheCityUK was established in 2009 in response to the global financial crisis. Its broad remit was to restore the reputation of the financial and professional services industry in the UK, to strengthen the industry's voice on policy and regulatory matters, and to promote the UK's financial and professional services industry internationally. It is a membership body, and its membership is drawn from across the industry's sectors.

The City of London Corporation is a founder member of TheCityUK, and played a full role in establishing the organisation. The City Corporation continues to be a full member of TheCityUK, and has a unique relationship with it as a founder, member and partner.

Arguably, the role of TheCityUK is more important than ever, as the post-referendum landscape provides both challenges and opportunities for UK-based financial and professional services. By securing the ongoing strategic partnership between the two organisations, the City Corporation can play its full part in ensuring the continued success of the industry.

The City of London Corporation has recently (July 2016) renegotiated its membership agreement with TheCityUK. Under the renewed terms, the City Corporation reduces its membership fee by 20% to £400,000 per annum, but receive enhanced membership benefits (details in report).

The City Corporation would also continue to pay a ring-fenced contribution towards rental costs for TheCityUK's office space. This is predicated on the condition the office is within part of the City Corporation's property portfolios.

Recommendation

- On the basis of the new terms, Officers recommend to Members that they endorse the new agreement.
- If Members choose to endorse the new agreement, they are requested to agree the allocation of the funding required to meet the terms of the renewed

membership agreement and the rental contribution for the financial years 2016/17 – 2018/19.

- The funding for the membership fee will continue to be allocated from Your Committee's base budget, and the rental contribution will be allocated from Your Committee's Policy Initiatives Fund for the financial years 2016/17 – 2018/19.

Main Report

Background

1. TheCityUK was established in 2009 in response to the global financial crisis. Its broad remit was to restore the reputation of the financial and professional services industry in the UK, to strengthen the industry's voice on policy and regulatory matters, and to promote the UK's financial and professional services industry internationally. It is a membership body, and its membership is drawn from across the industry's sectors.
2. The City of London Corporation is a founder member of TheCityUK, and played a full role in establishing the organisation. When TheCityUK was originally established, the City Corporation provided around 30% of the funding, as well as office accommodation. The City Corporation continues to be a full member of TheCityUK.
3. The City Corporation has a unique relationship with TheCityUK as a founder, member and partner. In the early days of TheCityUK, this occasionally led to a challenging working relationship between the organisations, as the precise nature of the relationship was uncertain. However, the relationship has been strong for some time and the membership renewal was negotiated by both parties with a determination to embed the strong collaborative culture. The organisations work in partnership, rather than competition, and seek to play to their respective strengths. This will ensure our joint efforts have the best possible impact to the benefit of the UK-based financial and professional services industry.
4. The report produced last year by Sir Simon Fraser of Flint Global, *Promoting the City*, strongly recommended the City Corporation's continued active membership of TheCityUK. This report was submitted to Your Committee at its meeting on 18 February 2016.
5. The role of TheCityUK is more important than ever, as the post-referendum landscape provides both challenges and opportunities for UK-based financial and professional services. Following the City Corporation's decision to increase the resources dedicated to the support and promotion of the industry, this is the right moment to work even more closely to ensure the continued success of the industry and contribution to the UK's long-term prosperity.

Current Position

6. The City Corporation had a three-year funding agreement with TheCityUK that expired on 31 March 2016. The terms of that agreement meant a membership contribution of £500,000 per annum.
7. In addition, the City Corporation has a three-year agreement with TheCityUK to provide £100,000, to be ring-fenced towards rental costs for the organisation's office. The terms of this agreement ensure that TheCityUK's office must be within a property in the City of London (Square Mile), and which is part of one of the City Corporation's property portfolios. TheCityUK's office is in Salisbury House on London Wall, part of the Bridge House Estates.
8. In 2015, the City Corporation informed TheCityUK that when the membership agreement was renewed in 2016, our membership fee would be reduced to £400,000 per annum, a reduction of 20%. Members endorsed this proposition at the meeting of Your Committee on 17 March 2016.
9. The terms of the membership were renegotiated by officers in the Economic Development Office, and now provide enhanced member benefits for the City Corporation. The membership benefits for the City Corporation are considerably better than those for the other top tier members of TheCityUK. For example, the City Corporation has two places on the Advisory Council and on the Board; is entitled to a representative on any of the Market Advisory Groups or Sector Advisory Groups; the research teams coordinate activity and the City Corporation has full access to all reports and publications; a guaranteed place at all TheCityUK Chairman's dinners and other senior events; guaranteed membership of all Steering Committees; as well as a framework of regular engagement with senior Members and officers. A copy of the new membership agreement is attached as *annex 1*.
10. In contrast, the other top tier members of TheCityUK have the following benefits of membership: one place on the Advisory Council; one Board place for a fixed term; one in five opportunities to attend a Chairman's dinner; opportunity to join a Market Advisory Group or Sector Advisory Group on request; and a quarterly review meeting. Whilst those top tier members pay a lower membership fee than the City Corporation, those organisations have had increased subscription fees this financial year, when the City Corporation's have decreased by 20%.
11. Officers recommend to Members that the revised membership fee represents an appropriate reduction in contribution, whilst maintaining significant City Corporation representation in TheCityUK's governance structures, and active participation in a breadth of forums providing access to industry practitioners expertise and priorities.
12. To reflect the City Corporation's unique status with TheCityUK, a new *Memorandum of Understanding* (MoU) was agreed as part of the membership package. This aims to strengthen the collaboration and coordination of work between the City Corporation and TheCityUK, to represent and support the UK based financial and professional services industry. Officers note that the

coordination and collaboration between the two organisations has already improved since the MoU was agreed. A copy of the Memorandum of Understanding is attached as *annex 2*.

13. Taken together, the membership agreement and the memorandum of understanding secure a strong, complementary relationship, where both organisations can operate to their respective strengths, providing an essential partnership to the benefit of the whole industry. The new increased capacity within EDO enables the City Corporation to participate more fully in the opportunities provided by the membership agreement. In turn, this strengthens our own work, complementing and informing our work on promoting exports and investments, supporting the UK regions, and delivering a strong programme of engagement with policy makers in the UK, EU and internationally.
14. Currently, there is provision for the £400,000 membership fee in Your Committee's base budget for the financial year 2016/17.
15. At the meeting of Your Committee in May 2013, it was agreed to pay £100,000 per annum towards rental costs from the *Policy Initiatives Fund* and charged to City's Cash. The breakdown of this payment was as follows:

2013/14	£25,000
2014/15	£100,000
2015/16	£100,000
2016/17	£75,000

Proposal and Financial Implications

16. In order to continue the renegotiated membership arrangement for another two years, Members are requested to agree to the allocation of £400,000 per annum from Your Committee's base budget, for the financial years 2017/18 and 2018/19, to pay for the City Corporation's membership of TheCityUK until 31 March 2019.
17. In addition, Members are requested to agree to the allocation of £25,000 for the financial year 2016/17, and £100,000 per annum from Your Committee's *Policy Initiatives Fund*, categorised under Promoting the City section of the Fund and charged to City's Cash, for the financial years 2017/18 and 2018/19, to pay for the City Corporation's ring-fenced contribution towards TheCityUK's rental costs until 31 March 2019. The breakdown of this payment would be as follows:

2016/17	£25,000
2017/18	£100,000
2018/19	£100,000
18. The current uncommitted balance available within Your Committee's Policy Initiatives Fund 2016/17 amounts to £202,400, for 2017/18 £645,300, and for 2018/19 sufficient funds will be available prior to any allowance being made for other proposals on today's agenda.

19. This would also align the two financial contributions to the same cycles for approval and allocation.

Conclusion

20. If Members decide to approve the revised membership terms, and approve the requested budgets, the City Corporation would be able to pay its membership fee, and rental contribution, as detailed in the revised terms of the membership agreement. This will enable the City Corporation to continue to play a full and active role in the work of TheCityUK, the leading cross-sectoral financial and professional services membership body.

Giles French
Assistant Director of Economic Development
giles.french@cityoflondon.gov.uk
020 7332 3644

This page is intentionally left blank

Membership Proposal between TheCityUK and the City of London
Corporation

Membership Proposal for the City of London Corporation

MEMBERSHIP SUBSCRIPTION

Membership is held at a corporate level and is for 3 years, subject to review annually after years 1 and 2, from 1st April 2016.

The membership fee for the above level of activity is £400,000 per annum, plus £100,000 per annum contribution to rental costs, payable quarterly in advance.

Membership will be reviewed annually and any issues resolved between the Director of EDO and CEO of TheCityUK.

Details of the benefits of membership are laid out below. The strategy of TheCityUK, as agreed by its Board, is laid out in Appendix 1.

The City of London Corporation membership with TheCityUK

Please find below a table of the main features of membership comparing the current membership offer to CoLC to that of a senior member of the Advisory Council.

Membership of TheCityUK is seen and valued by members as both a strategic investment and something from which members seek direct benefits for their organisation. This is very clearly borne out by the member research. Members view their fees in this context.

As you know, TheCityUK, as the practitioner group for our industry, puts members at the heart of all we do. We develop our work programme with them, drawing in expertise as needed. We also work with our most senior members to provide the opportunities for brand and profile where relevant. Above and beyond the strategic investment, we seek to deliver value to each member in a tangible way. Again, this is borne out by the recent member survey.

However, it is only the City of London Corporation, as our founder member, who are at the heart of every activity we undertake, briefed on all initiatives across the spectrum and are our partner in the implementation of our strategy. We ensure that the City of London Corporation has the opportunity to take advantage of all engagement activities and provide access points across TheCityUK's work programme, leveraging the full range of our expertise to support the Corporation's objectives.

Account management: TheCityUK operates a comprehensive and proactive account management programme ensuring each member gets the attention they need to maximise their membership. Your Account Director will ensure you are kept up-to-date on all activities of interest and will hold monthly review meetings to track progress and engagement.

Please note that we have not included activities related to 'partnership' including support for the LM delegations, IRSG secretariat, collaboration on events and research, running the LOTIS committee, briefing wider stakeholders, collaboration across PR and Marketing etc.

The City Corporation's offer to TheCityUK

In addition to the formal membership arrangements, the City Corporation is keen to be an active partner to TheCityUK and coordinate resources and opportunities that enable a bigger impact to the benefit of UK based financial and professional services.

These resources include: access to established City networks; access to wider industry; access to senior domestic and international policy makers; knowledge, expertise and capacity in the teams; international reach through export and investment programme, and overseas offices; research programme; Special Representative to the EU; venue and events; expertise in complementary policy areas such as planning, infrastructure and education; and as a non-membership organisation, the City Corporation can sometimes speak more freely on particular issues.

When combined with TheCityUK's strengths, this should make for an effective partnership that benefits the industry and the UK.

Membership Features – Advisory Council Member	Membership features – City of London Corporation as Founder Member
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One seat on the Advisory Council for the duration of membership • Opportunity to have one Board seat for fixed term of 3 years (only 1 in 4 board seats held by the most senior member firms therefore a low likelihood of any senior member holding a board seat at any one time) • Invitations to Chairman’s dinners and senior events on a non-preferential basis – members from this group might attend 1 in 4 or 5 of such dinners • Invitation to join senior committees when a space becomes available – members might typically sit on two or three of our five senior committees • Invitations to join Steering Committees and other senior groups leading our priority ‘task and finish’ programmes • Opportunity to join Market and Sector Advisory Groups on request • Quarterly account reviews and annual CEO briefing for Advisory Council member 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two seats on the Advisory Council, including the Lord Mayor’s presidency of the Advisory Council for the duration of membership • Guest invitation to the Advisory Council on a standing basis for the next Mayoral candidate • Two permanent seats on the Board of Directors of TheCityUK, including Deputy Chairman • Guaranteed place at all Chairman’s dinners and other senior events with flexibility on alternates if AC and Board members unavailable • Guaranteed position on all TheCityUK senior committees – see appendix 2 • Guaranteed membership of Steering Committees and other senior groups leading our priority ‘task and finish’ programmes • Briefings and discussions on all planned pieces of work before they are shared with other members • Collaboration on and full access to TheCityUK research programme • TheCityUK Chief Executive briefing meetings with Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee as well as regular (monthly) meetings with the Director of Economic Development • Periodic (quarterly) membership between Director EDO and Commercial and Marketing Director TheCityUK • Fortnightly account review meetings with Assistant Director of the Economic Development Office • Dedicated briefings and support for new members of the team, for example the Special Representative of the City • Annual meetings between two teams to broaden out networks and mutual collaboration • Full calendar of events shared regularly to provide insight into planned events

This page is intentionally left blank

Partnership Memorandum of Understanding
Between TheCityUK and the City of London Corporation

Partnership Memorandum of Understanding between TheCityUK and The City of London Corporation

AN INTRODUCTION TO THECITYUK

TheCityUK champions the UK-based financial and related professional services industry. We are a membership body, lobbying on the industry's behalf, producing evidence of its importance to the wider national economy. In the UK, the EU and internationally, we seek to influence policy which drives competitiveness, creating jobs and lasting economic growth. Our authoritative research and economic insight brings together the highest level of government and most senior industry figures, to shape better policy decisions, for the sector and its consumers. Our strategy for the coming 2 years is outlined in the strategy document agreed with our Board in Appendix 2.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION

The City of London Corporation is the local authority for the Square Mile, and works to make London a great place to live and to work. It also has a long established role in promoting London as the world's leading international financial centre. It works in partnership with business, government, policymakers and regulatory authorities to promote the world class expertise based in the UK and to ensure the policy environment is globally competitive. The City Corporation operates in a way that plays to its strengths: as a politically neutral, independent, and non-member organisation, it is able to commit to long-term product development, as well as convene business, government and regulators to identify and tackle issues.

PRINCIPLES ON WHICH THIS AGREEMENT IS BASED

Both parties engage at the following levels:

- Senior strategic collaboration, where each party complements and reinforces each other's strategies as set by TheCityUK's Board and by CoLC's Policy & Resources Committee respectively
- Tactical and operational coordination, where we strengthen effectiveness and avoid duplication
- Strong coordination and clear information flows, where each side understands the others' strategies and work plans and celebrates one another's achievements and success.
- Recognition of the two organisations' complementary strengths, and develop implementation plans which utilise them to the fullest to the benefit of the industry.

HOW WE WILL WORK TOGETHER TO ACHIEVE THE PRINCIPLES

- TheCityUK CEO & EDO Director will report quarterly to their respective Chairs on the implementation of the principles. To do this they will meet regularly to:
 - o Collaborate during the annual planning cycle

- Agree how to strengthen coordination and information flows, and ensure implementation
 - Identify and agree distinct policy areas where one or other organisation will focus, both will work with a complementary focus or both will coordinate on the same areas
 - Agree to mutually recognise and celebrate each organisation's achievements
 - Agree where to support and contribute to one another's work programmes
 - The same principles and processes to be applied to the work of the International Regulatory Strategy Group (IRSG)
- The leadership teams of both TheCityUK and EDO to meet regularly (biannual) to support the CEO and Director in achieving principles
 - TheCityUK COO & EDO Assistant Director to meet regularly (monthly) to ensure that the above is implemented at the operational and tactical level
 - All staff to meet annually.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s)	Dated:
Policy and Resources Committee	19 January 2017
Subject: Sponsorship to support <i>Chemistry Club, City</i>	Public
Report of: Damian Nussbaum, Director of Economic Development	For Decision
Report author: Peter Cunnane, Economic Development Office	

Summary

This is a request for sponsorship for ***Chemistry Club, City*** a series of high calibre networking events designed to enhance the City of London Corporation's credibility in the Cyber tech and related technologies in financial services sector by raising our profile with key stakeholders in government and businesses in that sector.

On Wednesday 9th November, the Bruton Group hosted its existing Chemistry Club networking event at Guildhall. This was the first time such an event had been hosted outside of Westminster. This event also brought together a carefully selected group of executives from the FinTech, Cyber and existing technologies in financial services sectors for an evening of targeted networking.

As a result of the success of this event, which your Chairman attended, the Bruton Group has approached us with a view to hosting four similar events during the twelve months from March 2017 to March 2018.

These events will be focussed on broadening the City Corporation's stakeholder engagement in the Cyber sector in particular. This would support our strategic aim of 'Promoting the City'.

Recommendation

Members' approval is therefore sought as follows:

- Based on the costs of the first event (which was capped at £10,000) a year's sponsorship of *Chemistry Club, City* would therefore require £40,000 in supporting sponsorship.
- This request would be met from your Committee's 2017/18 Policy Initiatives Fund, charged to City's Cash and categorised under 'Promoting the City'.

Main Report

Background

1. The Director of Economic Development was approached last year by the Bruton Group, a professional and executive networking and events company, with a view to collaborating on one of their successful *Chemistry Club* events at Guildhall.
2. The ethos of the Chemistry Club is to provide an environment for highly targeted networking. This is enabled by the use of both a high number of trained “co-ordinators”, whose role it is to ensure guests meet, by mutual consent, with anyone they have previously expressed an interest in meeting, who themselves are also assisted by a use of technology on the evening that facilitates interactions.

Current Position

3. The first event on Wednesday 9th November 2016 was held in The Crypts here at Guildhall. This event was branded *The Chemistry Club, City* and sought to bring together a very carefully selected group of executives from FinTech, Cyber and existing technologies in financial services businesses, as well as a mix of officials from government and related public sector agencies. Your Chairman also attended this event, as City Corporation host. The costs for this first event were covered from a local Economic Development Office budget.
4. Feedback from the event was broadly very positive, with City Corporation attendees agreeing that the use of technology and co-ordinators allowed for a high turnover of both new and useful contacts made on the evening. It is not comparable to any other kind of event which we currently support.
5. As a result of the success of this event, the Bruton Group has approached us with a view to hosting four similar events during the twelve months from March 2017 to March 2018.

Options

6. Your Officers have investigated the logistics of hosting four such events here at Guildhall in the year 2017/18. Based on the costs of the first event (which was capped at £10,000) a year's sponsorship of *Chemistry Club, City* would therefore require £40,000 in supporting sponsorship.

Proposals

7. This cost reflects our experience of the first such event in November 2016 being seen as a ‘pilot’ event, and follows a similar format in terms of venue hire and catering. Subject to your Committee's approval, the proposed events have provisionally been scheduled to occur in June, September, November 2017 and March 2018.

8. This programme of events would also enable the City Corporation to enhance our profile in the Cyber tech policy and business space in particular, drawing on the Chemistry Club's existing guest list but also enabling your Officers to recommend an individual focus for each event. For example, we could utilise one event to focus on opportunities for small business in the Cyber tech sector, or another to focus on export and investment opportunities for such businesses.
9. This series of events would also facilitate greater networking opportunities for City Corporation Members and your Officers, and enable City Corporation colleagues to make best use of the technology enhanced networking.
10. In support of this application for sponsorship, the Bruton Group have also offered to provide a *pro bono* session on how to approach high-level networking for City Corporation colleagues, should this be of interest.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

11. In addition to the above implications for raising and supporting the City Corporation's profile in this sector, our support for this initiative also contributes to the following theme of the City Together Strategy:
 - i. ...is competitive and promotes opportunities
12. It would also meet Key Policy Priorities 1 and 3 of the Corporate Plan: ('Supporting and promoting the international and domestic financial and business sector' and 'Engaging with London and national government on key issues of concern to our communities').

Implications

13. The proposed costs of £40,000 (based on £10,000 per event) would be met by your Committee's 2017/18 Policy Initiatives Fund, categorised under 'Promoting the City'. The current uncommitted balance of the Fund is £645,300 prior to any allowance being made for any other proposals on today's agenda.

Conclusion

14. With the rising challenge as well as the potential economic opportunity stemming from Cyber tech, this event presents the City Corporation with an opportunity over four targeted networking events, branded as *Chemistry Club, City*, to significantly raise our profile with both executives from business, investors and relevant government officials. Our partnership with the Bruton Group will also enable us to support for our own strategic objectives in the development of policy and the promotion of the future of financial services, especially around London's status as a global hub for both technology and finance.

Appendices

None

Peter Cunnane

Policy & Innovation Officer, Economic Development Office

T: 020 7332 3613

E: peter.cunnane@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committee	Dated:
Policy and Resources Committee	19 th January 2017
Subject Review and Reclassification of Former Finance Grants Sub-Committee Grants	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Decision
Report author: Scott Nixon, Project Manager	

Summary

In March 2016, the Policy and Resources Committee agreed that all on-going funding commitments formerly managed through the Finance Grants Sub-Committee (FGSC) would be transferred to the most appropriate Committee for on-going administration.

For all grants that had no set review date, it was requested that the funding commitment be reviewed and reported back to this Committee for approval via its managing Committee, or Chief Officer where appropriate. Each funding allocation has now been reviewed. This report provides a summary of the recommendations from the various Committees and Chief Officers for this Committee to approve (see Paragraph 13). It also seeks to regularise future reviews and recommends that it would be more appropriate for these funding allocations to be reclassified as 'payments', as opposed to 'grants' as per the definition provided in the SBR Effectiveness of Grants report (See paragraph 14). This would mean that moving forward these funding allocations would be incorporated into departmental budgets and reviewed by the relevant managing Committee in the usual way.

Recommendations:

- To agree the recommendations of the service committees/Chief Officers in respect of the on-going payments (See Paragraph 13).
- To agree that future reviews are undertaken regularly and submitted to the responsible Committee.
- To agree that each payment shown is incorporated into the responsible department's budget rather than be treated as a grant.

Main Report

Background

1. In May 2015, this Committee endorsed a revised overall approach to grant-giving across the City Corporation. That report highlighted a set of core principles designed to drive a more consistent, coherent and co-ordinated approach to grant-making.

2. It was agreed that the Finance Grants Subcommittee (FGSC) would cease its grant-making and that the most appropriate Committee would take responsibility for decisions on grants relating to areas within their remit, supported by a new Central Grants Unit (CGU). The CGU is located within the City Bridge Trust team to ensure grant-making good practice is followed and that there is consistency of approach. The CGU is funded through the charging of a management fee to each grant giving committee. The CGU is responsible for allocating new grants in line with a process agreed by the respective grant-giving Committee. The Finance Grants Oversight and Performance Sub-Committee (FGOPS) was established to maintain an overview of all grants issued on an on-going basis (other than City Bridge Trust which has a dedicated Committee).
3. The Policy and Resources Committee agreed that all payments previously agreed through Finance Grants Sub-Committee with no set review date should be reviewed by its managing Committee and the outcomes reported back.
4. The Effectiveness of Grants Review classified payments as “grants” only if they were ‘awarded to an external organisation or individual from CoLC’s City Fund, City’s Cash or CoLC-controlled or CoLC-administered Charities to undertake an activity or produce an outcome which CoLC is not required to do under statutory obligation and has been awarded as a result of an openly publicised and transparent process of prioritisation against clearly pre-defined objectives’. The payments highlighted within this report are therefore not classified as grants under this definition.

Summary of Payment Review Recommendations

5. The paragraphs below set out the payment review recommendations of the relevant Committees/Chief Officers and they are summarised in Table 1 (at Paragraph 13).
6. In January 2017, a report was submitted to the Establishment Committee on the City of London Corporation Staff Sports and Activities Club (COLSSAC). Members agreed to continue to provide funding to COLSSAC, at a reduced rate of £11,225 per year, for the next three years (2017-2019) and that the next review of the funding take place between years two and three.
7. In October 2015, a report was submitted to Establishment Committee on the City of London Pensioners’ Annual Lunch. Members agreed to adopt the model proposed by the Pensioners’ Lunch Organisation Committee, reducing the total net grant to £27k per annum, with an increase in the price for attending the lunch from £5 to £10. In this same report to Establishment Committee it was agreed that if there were to be further increases to the ticket price for the Pensioners’ Association Lunch, it would also be appropriate to increase the ticket price of the Staff Annual Lunch, which was £11 at that time (and which has since been increased to £15). The total contribution to the Staff Annual lunch was agreed at £53,400 per annum.
8. In October 2016, a report was submitted to the Establishment Committee on the City of London Marathon Team. The Committee agreed to continue to provide

the current level of funding (£3,500) to the Marathon Team for three years and for a review to take place between years two and three.

9. In November 2016, a report was submitted to the Port Health and Environmental Services Committee on the Thames Fishery research event, which is delivered annually by the Department of Markets and Consumer Protection team. Members agreed that the payment from City's Cash of £5,332 to partially fund the 2017 event be approved.
10. In December 2016, the Acting Director of Community and Children's Services agreed that two payments that were no longer required would be ceased: an annual allocation of £2,000 which had not been used since 2003 and which was used by the former Department of Social Services to provide clients with small social needs payments (kitchen equipment, transport costs, furniture etc.); and an annual payment of £2,200 used to support resident-led activities on City of London Corporation housing estates which had not been utilised since 2010.
11. In December 2016, the Acting Director of Community and Children's Services agreed that an annual payment of £5,000 to fund the cost of services provided by central CoLC departments to the City of London Almshouses Trust should be continued. This provision, which stood at £46k for several years, has also been used in the past to fund deficits incurred by the Trust. However, because the Trust has generally achieved modest surpluses in recent years, the provision was reduced to £5k by the Finance Grants Sub-Committee in 2010/2011 to cover services provided by central departments only.
12. The Acting Director of Community and Children's Services has asked for this report to note that the City of London Almshouses Trust may incur a deficit in the future and should that situation arise, he would raise this as a separate issue with the Chamberlain.
13. Details of the previously agreed payments (as reported to the Policy and Resources Committee in March 2016) and the amounts to be approved by this Committee are summarised in Table 1 below:

Table 1

Activity and Committee/Chief Officer Responsible for Review	Annual amount previously approved (as per the report to Policy and Resources Committee March 2016)	Revised amount agreed by Committee or Chief officer
City of London Corporation Staff Sports and Activities Club (Establishment Committee)	£16,875	£11,225
Annual Londoners Pensioners Association Lunch	£27,000	£27,000

Activity and Committee/Chief Officer Responsible for Review	Annual amount previously approved (as per the report to Policy and Resources Committee March 2016)	Revised amount agreed by Committee or Chief officer
(Establishment Committee)		
Staff Annual Lunch	£53,400	£53,400
(Establishment Committee)		
Marathon Team	£3,500	£3,500
(Establishment Committee)		
Thames Fishery research event	£5,332	£5,332
(Port Health and Environmental Services Committee)		
Social Needs Payments	£2,000	£0.00
(The Acting Director of Community and Children's Services)		
Housing Payments	£2,200	£0.00
(The Acting Director of Community and Children's Services)		
Almshouses	£5,000	£5,000
(The Acting Director of Community and Children's Services)		
TOTAL	£115,307	£105,457

14. The Grants Review was the catalyst for the above payments to be reviewed, but the payments all fall outside of the definition of grant provided in that review, namely: payments '*awarded to an external organisation or individual from CoLC's City Fund, City's Cash or CoLC-controlled or CoLC-administered Charities to undertake an activity or produce an outcome which CoLC is not required to do under statutory obligation and has been awarded as a result of an openly publicised and transparent process of prioritisation against clearly pre-defined objectives*'. It is therefore recommended that the payments are treated as part of the responsible department's budget rather than grants.

Background Papers:

- Port Health and Environmental Services Committee, 24 November 2016, '44th City of London Thames Fishery Research Experiment 2016'.
- Establishment Committee, 25th October 2016 'City of London Corporation Marathon Team'.
- Establishment Committee, 17th January 2016, 'City of London Corporation Staff and Sports and Activities Club'.
- Establishment Committee, 28th October 2015, 'Future Funding of the Pensioners' Annual Lunch'.

Scott Nixon

Project Manager, Town Clerk's Department

T: 020 7332 3722

E: Scott.Nixon@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s) Policy and Resources Committee	Dated: 19 January 2017
Subject: Cheapside Business Alliance Update	Public
Report of: The City Surveyor	For Information
Report author: Simon McGinn, City Surveyors Department	

Summary

1. This report provides an overview of activity and progress to date in relation to the Cheapside BID (Cheapside Business Alliance) constituted in March 2015 for a 5 year term.
2. The report summarises activities relating to the key themes set out in the approved Business Plan and demonstrates the strong progress that has been made to date against each theme and the approved budgets set out in the Plan. This includes the appointment of an Ambassador service to meet and greet visitors coming in to the Cheapside area, an employment service that has put 56 local people into jobs in within the Cheapside footprint, delivery of a new website and development of a Cheapside App to promote a range of discounts by local shops and catering outlets to workers in the area. The Cheapside Business Alliance has also been a key partner of the 2016 London Nocturne and the Great Fire 350.

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- Note the report

Main Report

Background

1. In 2014 your Committee resolved to support what was the Cheapside Initiative in working towards becoming a more formal business vehicle in the form of a Business Improvement District - branded the Cheapside Business Alliance (CBA). The agreement was that the City Corporation would be the BID proposer and therefore are the formal promoter for the BID.
2. A perception analysis was undertaken with businesses asking for their views on a number of theme areas relating to the Cheapside area, covering matters such as:

proposed boundary, appetite to be involved in a formal BID, employment and training, retail and cultural offer, business community engagement and marketing and promotion. Following the analysis a formal BID Proposal (Business Plan) was drawn up and approved by your committee and the Common Council in October 2014. In March 2015 there was a formal ballot of businesses with over 40% responding (considered to be a high response rate compared to what has been experienced with other BID areas) with 90% stating that they support or maybe support the concept of a BID and only 10% saying they did not.

3. The BID was formally constituted in May 2015 and has enabled an alliance to be formed, providing the opportunity for businesses to work in partnership with the City Corporation delivering a range of activities that would enable businesses to directly benefit from working together, alongside the City Corporation. The term of the BID is 5 years.
4. The CBA holds quarterly Board meetings and steering group meetings to determine priorities in accordance with the themes set out in the Business Plan. Alistair Moss represents the City Corporation at Board meetings in addition to The City Property Advisory Team Manager who is responsible for day to day supervision of a team procured to deliver the themes set out in the Business Plan.
5. As previously agreed, the focus of the BID would not revolve around delivery of improved services such as policing or maintaining the environment, as these are already well provided for by the City Corporation. The BID mechanism would allow CBA to develop activities around areas that would not normally be expected to be the focus for local authority activities.

Current Position

6. The CBA complements the exemplary services delivered by the City Corporation; seeking to add value to local businesses. It provides an excellent demonstration of how partnership between the public and private sectors can deliver long-term, tangible and meaningful enhancements, working across five core areas of work:
 - Employment, enterprise and training;
 - Environmental enhancements;
 - Tourism and culture;
 - Marketing and promotion;
 - Business awareness and networking
7. There have been significant achievements over the last 18 months in relation to these areas of work.

Employment, enterprise and training

8. Implementing programmes and initiatives to support the business community, and importantly looking at how businesses access training, employment and development programmes, is central to what CBA delivers across Cheapside. CBA has engaged an employment and training agency to deliver jobs and

apprenticeship opportunities and through this programme the CBA has placed 56 local people into employment; worked with 50 employers and is working with the developers of “The NED” on filling 700 job vacancies that will become available in advance of its opening in 2017.

9. CBA is also exploring opportunities to partner with the Livery companies within the footprint, with a view to sharing best practice and facilitating networking and business development across the area and has worked closely with Heart of the City to ensure businesses are provided with opportunities to develop and deliver their CSR agendas.

Environmental enhancements

10. At a strategic level, the CBA has worked closely with the City of London Corporation on phasing and implementation of the Cheapside and Guildhall Area Enhancement Strategy and is represented on the All Change at Bank Steering Board to inform the Bank Junction change project. In addition to this work, CBA has established an Environmental and Sustainability steering group that has identified programmes which complement the wider sustainability agenda for the City of London and benefit business. The following priorities have been identified as the area of focus by the CBA under this strategic theme.

- Air Quality
- Joint procurement/consolidation of services
- Waste collection
- Green infrastructure

11. Earlier this year CBA were successful in applying for funding through the Mayor’s Air Quality Fund, leveraging in £33,000 to be spent over the next 2 years. With this the CBA is looking at a number of initiatives, including the installation of diffusers across 10 sites within the BID boundary, to measure air quality underpinned with a number of volunteers from local businesses working with us to address air quality issues. In March the partnership also participated in Global Action Day addressing traffic idling in the area.

12. The CBA Ambassador programme has resulted in over 100 graffiti incidents and 2 instances of illegal advertising being reported with over 117 environmental incidents being reported through to the City Corporation.

13. Over the next 12 months the partnership will focus on developing a programme together with the City Corporation to share best practice in consolidation and procurement of services to reduce the number of deliveries coming into the City and to enhance open spaces with green infrastructure working with the City Public Realm team.

Tourism and culture

14. An important area of work under this theme has been the introduction of an Ambassador programme. The CBA has created a small team of street guides/ambassadors to enable business visitors and tourists to better navigate the area – making Cheapside a more welcoming place to visit. The ambassadors

are also additional 'eyes and ears' on the ground and have reported several environmental issues and collected important data to inform future work, interacting with over 35,000 visitors. The Ambassadors work closely with the City Visitor Centre to both signpost its existence and assisting in promotion of events where necessary. CBA ensures that the business community and its interests are represented at the City Visitors Attractions and Retail Group (VARG) which meets quarterly to coordinate events and mutually beneficial marketing schemes for all who live, work and visit.

Marketing and promotion

15. The CBA is working alongside businesses and retailers to enhance the perception of Cheapside as a destination to both work and relax, aligning with the City of London's Visitor and Cultural Strategies.
16. The Cheapside Privilege Card was introduced by the Cheapside Initiative before the BID ballot and continues to grow with 11,000 cards distributed with over 80 offers from retail outlets and restaurants. This past year, the CBA team has worked to raise awareness of the Privilege Card has seen many new businesses coming on board with offers, and the profile of the loyalty scheme is continuing to increase, with the addition of the Privilege Card App, to enable people to download all current offers.
17. The CBA has created a new website with links to partner websites and a dedicated portal provided for Bow Lane Traders. The CBA also produces a monthly newsletter that goes to all businesses providing information on all key events and initiatives.
18. In relation to events CBA has sponsored London Nocturne on Cheapside for the first year with over 19,000 people coming into Cheapside to watch the event and with media coverage and TV coverage we had a reach of 32 million, which resulted in generating an estimated economic impact of £0.5m. The CBA is also an official partner for the Great Fire 350 celebrations contributing £50,000 towards the event. The CBA will continue to support the Nocturne in future years and will also seek to promote activity around events such as the World Athletics Marathon whose course comes through the Cheapside area on 6 August 2017.
19. The CBA has also funded 2 x 20m Christmas trees to include a switch on event undertaken by the Lady Mayoress.

Business awareness and networking

20. The CBA has created networking events to bring the business community together, encouraging businesses to share best practice and foster business development opportunities including:
 - Hosted the launch of the Cheapside Business Alliance held at the Grange Hotel with over 100 CBA members attending covering a range of topics and themes
 - Held an AGM with drinks reception attended by 70 members

- Worked in partnership with the City of London Counter Terrorism advisory team and presented to over 70 CBA members
- Four open days organised by CBA in new corporate offices with over 100 businesses attending, providing the opportunity Network and to share best practice around specific themes
- One exclusive shopping event held for a CBA corporate client
- Engaged with over 150 stakeholders throughout the year
- Promotion and information sessions on the new Apprenticeship Levy and the opportunities amongst members to offer apprenticeships to those residents within the City of London and fringe boroughs

Budget Implications

21. The budget for year 1 is set out in appendix 1, showing projected income and spend against each of the strategic themes. All BID budgets are profiled on the basis of a 95% levy collection rate. A surplus of £111k has been carried forward into year 2. Unlike public sector funding, BIDs throughout their term can carry forward surplus income. The rationale for this is to enable larger capital projects to be invested in, such as public realm schemes. Unlike other BIDs across London which collect between 95%-97% of the BID levy, the Cheapside Business Alliance has been successful in collecting 100% of levy income.
22. Levy collection is undertaken by the ratings team within the City Corporation and all associated costs incurred are met by the Cheapside Business Alliance and were factored into the budget throughout the BIDs term.

Conclusion

23. CBA plays a unique role in contributing and shaping Cheapside as a business location and destination. The City Corporation has worked positively across a number of Departments with the CBA to support the delivery of their programme of activities. Much of the work undertaken by the CBA complements areas of activity within the City Corporation and it is anticipated that the coming years will deliver an ongoing and positive relationship with businesses in the area.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Income and Expenditure Statements BID year 1

Simon McGinn, CPAT Manager

T: 020 7332 1226

E: simon.mcginn@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Appendix 1

Cheapside Business Alliance Income and Expenditure Statement for the period May 15 to 31 March 16 – BID YEAR 1

	Budget 2015/16 £	Actual 2015/16 £	Variance 2015/16 £
Expenditure			
Project Management	103,000	102,280	(720)
Employment, Enterprise and Training	44,000	10,070	(33,930)
Environment, Signage & Way-finding	50,000	532	(49,468)
Tourism & Culture	85,000	59,645	(25,355)
Marketing & Promotion	48,000	43,209	(4,791)
Business Awareness/Networking	44,000	19,809	(24,191)
Total Expenditure	<u>374,000</u>	<u>235,545</u>	<u>(138,455)</u>
Income			
BID Funds	(314,000)	(331,152)	(17,152)
Privilege Card Sales (303 card sales)		(2,521)	(2,521)
Voluntary Contributions	(60,000)	(13,000)	47,000
Total Income	<u>(374,000)</u>	<u>(346,673)</u>	<u>27,327</u>
Net (income)/expenditure	<u>-</u>	<u>(111,128)</u>	<u>(111,128)</u>

Notes:

1. Net income for the year of £111k has been carried forward to 2016/17 as a receipt in advance (being third party monies earmarked for projects).
2. Project Management includes contributions to the Cross River partnership and the Baker St Quarter Partnership.
3. Voluntary contributions includes £3k from CPAT for COL business alliance development work.

Committee(s)	Dated:
Policy and Resources Committee	19 January 2017
Subject: Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 – update report	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Information
Report author: Neil Davies, Town Clerk's Department	

Summary

The Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 regulates surveillance carried out by public authorities in the conduct of their business, specifically the monitoring, recording and interception of communications; the requisition, provision and handling of communications data; and the use of directed covert surveillance.

To ensure that the City Corporation remains compliant with the requirements set by the Office of Surveillance Commissioners during their visit in September 2015, and the relevant Codes of Practice, this report confirms that no requests under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act (RIPA) 2000 have been received by the RIPA Monitoring Officer/Co-ordinator since the last report to the Policy and Resources Committee in July 2016.

Following the departure of the Deputy Town Clerk, the role of Senior Responsible Owner has been assumed by the Town Clerk.

Recommendation:

Members are asked to note this report.

Main Report

Background

1. In September 2015, the Office of Surveillance Commissioners inspected the City Corporation's process and procedure for ensuring compliance with RIPA. The inspector concluded that the City Corporation is keen to set and maintain high standards and has a sound RIPA structure, with good policies and procedures. Three recommendations were made, relating to: amendments to the Policy and Procedure manual; central record keeping and monitoring, and refresher training. All of the recommendations have been accepted and acted upon.
2. The revised Policy and Procedure manual was approved by the Policy and Resources Committee on 21 January 2016. The Committee also approved a proposal discussed with the inspector to change the frequency of reporting of RIPA uses to this Committee from quarterly to six monthly.

Current Position- Authorisations

3. Since the last report to the Committee in July 2016, no requests under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 have been received by the RIPA Monitoring Officer/Co-ordinator.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

4. The existing Policy and Procedure manual is compliant with legislation and continues to accurately reflect the City of London Corporation's practices. Following the departure of the Deputy Town Clerk and the deletion of that post, the role of Senior Responsible Owner has been assumed by the Town Clerk. The manual will be amended accordingly.

Conclusion

5. Following an inspection by the Office of Surveillance Commissioners in September 2015, and in accordance with the inspector's recommendation, this six-monthly update report sets out the Corporation's use of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 since July 2016. Since then, no authorisations have been sought in accordance with the Corporation's Policy and Procedure.

Appendices: None

Neil Davies

RIPA Monitoring Officer/Co-ordinator
Town Clerk's Department

T: 0220 7332 3327

E: neil.davies@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committee: Policy and Resources	Date: 19 January 2017
Subject: Policy Initiatives Fund/Committee Contingency	Public
Report of: Chamberlain	For Information
Report Author: Ray Green	

Summary

1. The purpose of the Policy Initiatives Fund (PIF) is to allow the Committee to respond swiftly and effectively with funding for projects and initiatives identified during the year which support the City Corporation's overall aims and objectives.
2. The Committee contingency is used to fund unforeseen items of expenditure when no specific provision exists within Committee budgets such as hosting one-off events.
3. In identifying which items would sit within the PIF the following principles were applied:
 - Items that relate to a specific initiative i.e. research;
 - Sponsorship/funding for bodies which have initiatives that support the City's overall objectives; and
 - Membership of high profile national think tanks
4. The attached schedules list the projects and activities which have received funding for 2016/17. Whilst the schedule shows expenditure to be incurred in this financial year, some projects have been given multi-year financial support (please see the "Notes" column). It should be noted that the items referred to have been the subject of previous reports approved by this Committee.
5. The balances that are currently available in the Policy Initiatives Fund and the Committee contingency for 2016/17 are £177,400 and £152,200 respectively.

Recommendations

6. It is recommended that the contents of the schedules are noted.

Contact:

Ray Green

020 7332 1332

ray.green2@cityoflondon.gov.uk

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE - POLICY INITIATIVES FUND 2016/17

<u>ALLOCATIONS FROM PIF</u>					<u>STATUS OF BALANCE</u>	
<u>COMMITTEE</u> <u>DATE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>RESP</u> <u>OFFICER</u>	<u>ALLOCATION</u> £	<u>ACTUAL</u> <u>PAID</u> TO 06/01/17 £	<u>BALANCE</u> <u>TO BE SPENT</u> £	<u>NOTES</u>
	Events					
21/11/13	London Councils' London Summit - the City is to host the annual conference for 3 years	DOC	16,100	15,100	1,000	3 year funding: £16,100 final payment in 2016/17
23/06/15	Institute for Government - Programme on "Government and Regulation": City of London to sponsor a series of public seminars and private roundtables to be held in partnership with the Institute	DPR	25,000	25,000	0	Originally allocated from 2015/16; deferred to 2016/17
18/02/16	Labour Party's "New Economics" lecture series and events: Sponsorship of a lecture by Yanis Varoufakis and an event with the former Shadow Chancellor Chris Leslie MP	DED	12,000	0	12,000	Originally allocated from 2015/16; deferred to 2016/17
17/03/16	Centre for Policy Studies Margaret Thatcher Lecture 2016 - the City Corporation to support this Lecture with George Osborne MP	DED	22,500	20,854	1,646	
19/05/16	Think Tank Membership 2016/17: Renewal of COL's membership to Chatham House (£13,750) & New Local Government Network (£12,000)	DED	25,800	25,750	50	
16/06/16	Sponsorship of Events with the Centre for European Reform: COL partnering with the Centre for European Reform (CER) in hosting 2 high-level conferences a) 2016 Ditchley Park Conference & b) a post-EU referendum Conference	DED	30,000	20,000	10,000	
07/07/16	Party Conferences Funding - the City Corporation to hold private roundtables and dinners at the 2016 party conferences of the Liberal Democrats, Labour and Conservatives. The roundtables will focus on skills and employability	DED	17,500	8,250	9,250	
07/07/16	Sponsorship of Battle of Ideas Festival - the City Corporation to sponsor the festival, organised by The Institute of Ideas, taking place on 22-23 October 2016 in the Barbican	DED	16,000	15,000	1,000	
06/10/16	Centre for London Conference - The City Corporation to sponsor the CFL's 2016 London Conference on 16 November 2016. The CFL is a politically-independent, not-for-profit think-tank and charity focused on exploring economic and social challenges across London	DED	22,000	0	22,000	

<u>ALLOCATIONS FROM PIF</u>					<u>STATUS OF BALANCE</u>	
<u>COMMITTEE</u> <u>DATE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>RESP</u> <u>OFFICER</u>	<u>ALLOCATION</u> £	<u>ACTUAL</u> <u>PAID</u> TO 06/01/17 £	<u>BALANCE</u> <u>TO BE SPENT</u> £	<u>NOTES</u>
15/12/16	Sponsorship of a Brexit - Related Series Convened by the Institute for Government (IfG) - The City Corporation to sponsor a series of Brexit-related events in partnership with the IfG. Corporation to host two private roundtables	DED	18,000	0	18,000	
	Promoting the City					
02/05/13	TheCityUK: CoL's additional funding	DED	75,000	75,000	0	3 year funding: £75,000 final payment in 2016/17
20/02/14	Sponsor the "New FinTech UK" Initiative - Creation of a new body to promote and support the 'FinTech' (financial technology) sector - Innovate Finance	DED	250,000	187,500	62,500	3 year funding: £250,000 final payment in 2016/17.
26/03/15	City of London Advertising - continuation of placing advertisements in CityAM to promote services provided by COL	DOC	45,000	30,000	15,000	2 year funding: £45,000 final payment in 2016/17
24/09/15	Additional Events and Topical Issues Programme: continuation of the extended contact programmes to ensure that the City of London Corporation remains fully engaged with key audiences and strategic issues, both in the UK and abroad	DED / DPR	39,600	39,421	179	Originally allocated from 2015/16; deferred to 2016/17
14/04/16	Wilton Park's 2016 British-German Forum: The City of London to sponsor this annual event which facilitates both increased shared understanding and the building of strong relationships between influential young Britons and Germans	DED	15,000	15,000	0	
19/05/16	USA Engagement Programme - Sponsorship of British American Business (BAB): CoL to sponsor/partner a flagship transatlantic conference on the theme of "Future Cities: Smart, Sustainable, Social".	DED	15,000	13,291	1,709	
08/09/16	Additional sponsorship to support Innovate Finance	DED	100,000	100,000	0	Additional year's sponsorship for Innovate Finance in the sum of £350,000 to be used flexibly
06/10/16	IPPR - Economic Justice Commission - City Corporation to become one of the sponsors of the IPPR Commission on Economic Justice. The IPPR is a registered charity and independent think-tank	DED	85,000	37,500	47,500	2 year funding: £100,000 in 2017/18

<u>ALLOCATIONS FROM PIF</u>					<u>STATUS OF BALANCE</u>	
<u>COMMITTEE</u> <u>DATE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>RESP</u> <u>OFFICER</u>	<u>ALLOCATION</u> £	<u>ACTUAL</u> <u>PAID</u> TO 06/01/17 £	<u>BALANCE</u> <u>TO BE SPENT</u> £	<u>NOTES</u>
06/10/16	European Financial Service Chariman's Advisory Committee (EFSCAC) - The City Corporation to pay a contribution towards the costs of EFSCAC. The EFSCAC was set up following the EU referendum vote to help co-ordinate industry responses and enable high level dialogue between government and financial services sector representatives.	DED	20,000	0	20,000	

<u>ALLOCATIONS FROM PIF</u>					<u>STATUS OF BALANCE</u>	
<u>COMMITTEE</u> <u>DATE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>RESP</u> <u>OFFICER</u>	<u>ALLOCATION</u> £	<u>ACTUAL</u> <u>PAID</u> TO 06/01/17 £	<u>BALANCE</u> <u>TO BE SPENT</u> £	<u>NOTES</u>
	Communities					
20/02/14	Access Europe - City Corporation to become one of four core supporters of a European Funding hub to improve access to EU funding for London's public and voluntary organisations	DED	50,000	50,000	0	3 year funding: £50,000 final payment in 2016/17
20/02/14	TeenTech City 2014 - 2017 - support for annual events aiming to change perceptions of STEM careers in the UK	DED	10,000	7,500	2,500	3 year funding: £10,000 final payment in 2016/17
20/03/14	STEM and Policy Education Programme - funding of the Hampstead Heath Ponds Project	DOS	54,900	28,851	26,049	The Director of Open Spaces has reviewed the phasing as follows: £37,500 in 2016/17 & £23,850 in 2017/18 and £17,400 has been deferred from 2015/16 to 2016/17
11/12/14	Sponsorship of Tech London Advocates (TLA): further sponsorship to support the delivery of 2 major bi-annual summit events and the development and promotion of TLA's series of themed, advocate-led workstreams	DED	50,000	37,500	12,500	4 year funding: £50,000 in 2016/17 & £37,500 in 2017/18
26/03/15	New Entrepreneurs Foundation (NEF): further sponsorship of NEF, a not-for-profit organisation focussing on equipping young entrepreneurs to run scalable businesses	DED	20,000	20,000	0	3 year funding: £20,000 in 2016/17 & 2017/18
28/05/15	Support for a Study to Strengthen the City's Role in working with London's Communities: City of London to undertake a study on the challenges facing unemployed young Londoners	DED	2,700	2,256	444	Originally allocated from 2015/16; deferred to 2016/17
	Research					
28/05/15	Sponsorship of New Local Government Network (NLGN) research project: Social Capital - How Public Investment Can Drive Public Value: City of London's sponsor to host and shape events relating to NLGN's project including the launch	DPR	15,000	15,040	(40)	Originally allocated from 2015/16; deferred to 2016/17
16/07/15	Sponsorship of the King's Commission on London: City of London Corporation to be one of 4-6 core outside sponsors of a two-year research project on the future challenges and issues facing London.	TC	50,000	50,000	0	2 year funding - £50,000 final payment in 2016/17

This page is intentionally left blank

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE - POLICY INITIATIVES FUND

		2016/2017 £
POLICY INITIATIVES FUND		
- Balance remaining prior to this meeting		202,400
<u>Less possible maximum allocations from this meeting</u>		
TheCityUK	25,000	
	<hr/>	25,000
Balance		<hr/> <hr/> 177,400

Caroline Al-Beyerty
Deputy Chamberlain

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE - CONTINGENCY 2016/17

<u>ALLOCATIONS FROM CONTINGENCY</u>					<u>STATUS OF BALANCE</u>	
<u>COMMITTEE</u> <u>DATE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>RESP</u> <u>OFFICER</u>	<u>ALLOCATION</u> £	<u>ACTUAL</u> <u>PAID</u> TO 06/01/17 £	<u>BALANCE</u> <u>TO BE SPENT</u> £	<u>NOTES</u>
23/01/14	Career fairs - City of London Corporation to host up to three events per year to enhance employability of young people in neighbouring communities	DED	77,200	15,241	61,959	3 year funding: £77,200 deferred from 2015/16. Final payment in 2016/17
20/03/14	800th Anniversary of the Magna Carta - additional financial support for a number of additional activities as the 2015 anniversary approaches	DPR	1,500	0	1,500	2 year funding: £1,500 deferred from 2015/16. Final payment in 2016/17
08/05/14	City of London Scholarship - Anglo-Irish Literature: CoL to award a yearly scholarship to a single student to continue their studies in the field on Anglo-Irish Literature	TC	25,000	0	25,000	3 year funding - £25k per year until 2017/18
11/12/14	Encourage City Developers to buy from local and SMEs: to boost local economies within deprived London boroughs and to support small business growth	DED	25,000	14,292	10,708	3 year funding - £25k per year until 2017/18
19/02/15	Supporting the Commonwealth (CWEIC): to engage with the Commonwealth further by becoming a partner of the Commonwealth Enterprise and Investment Council	TC	57,100	19,950	37,150	Originally allocated from 2015/16; £57,100 deferred to 2016/17
21/01/16	Voter Registration: various registration activities during 2016 to assist with increasing the level of voter registration in the City	TC	90,000	55,901	34,099	

ALLOCATIONS FROM CONTINGENCY					STATUS OF BALANCE	
COMMITTEE DATE	DESCRIPTION	RESP OFFICER	ALLOCATION £	ACTUAL PAID TO 06/01/17 £	BALANCE TO BE SPENT £	NOTES
17/03/16	Lord Mayor's Show Fireworks: City of London Corporation to hold a public fireworks display following the LM's Show. Funding to cover all aspects of the planned display including the fireworks display itself, and all the traffic management, public safety and crowd and related events management issues.	DOC	125,000	123,074	1,926	3 year funding - £20k per year until 2018/19
17/11/16	Co-Exist House: City of London Corporation to fund a learning institution and centre in London dedicated to promoting understanding of religion and to encourage respect and tolerance	DED	20,000	-	20,000	
17/11/16	Police Arboretum Memorial Fundraising Dinner: City Corporation to host a fundraising dinner at Guildhall	DED	30,000	-	30,000	
			450,800	228,457	222,343	
	BALANCE REMAINING		152,200			
	TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET		603,000			
	ANALYSIS OF TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET					
	ORIGINAL PROVISION		300,000			
	APPROVED BROUGHT FORWARD FROM 2015/16		303,000			
	TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET		603,000			

NOTE: The Committee date records the actual approval meeting; in some instances approval is given for multi-year support for a project but the financial details in this table only show the expenditure due in the current year (2016/17). It should be noted that actual payments sometimes are made towards the end of a financial year.

KEY TO RESPONSIBLE OFFICER:-

CH	Chamberlain	DOC	Director of Communications	CGO	Chief Grants Officer
DED	Director of Economic Development	CPO	City Planning Officer	DBE	Director of the Built Environment
TC	Town Clerk	CS	City Surveyor	DCCS	Director of Community & Childrens Services
DOS	Director of Open Spaces			DMCP	Director of Markets & Consumer Protection
DCHL	Director of Culture, Heritage and Libraries				

CAROLINE AL-BEYERTY - DEPUTY CHAMBERLAIN

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE - CONTINGENCY

		2016/2017
		<u>£</u>
CONTINGENCY		
- Balance remaining prior to this meeting		152,200
<u>Less possible maximum allocations from this meeting</u>		
-	<u>0</u>	0
Balance		<u>152,200</u>

Caroline Al-Beyerty
Deputy Chamberlain

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