



Members Privileges Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee

Date: THURSDAY, 21 SEPTEMBER 2017

Time: 10.00 am

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

Members: Wendy Mead (Chief Commoner) (Chairman)
Simon Duckworth
Ann Holmes
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Deputy Edward Lord
Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Richard Regan
John Scott (Ex-Officio Member)
Jeremy Simons
Michael Welbank

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

Refreshments will be available at the Meeting

**John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive**

AGENDA

Public Agenda

1. **APOLOGIES**
2. **MEMBERS DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**
3. **MINUTES**
To agree the public minutes and summary of the meeting held on 22 June 2017.
For Decision
(Pages 1 - 6)
4. **RECOGNITION OF DEPARTING MEMBERS AT COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL**
Report of the Town Clerk.
For Decision
(Pages 7 - 12)
5. **MEMBERS' BRIEFING AND PAST MEMBERS**
Report of the Director of Communications.
For Decision
(Pages 13 - 16)
6. **DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY OR URGENCY POWERS**
Report of the Town Clerk.
For Information
(Pages 17 - 18)
7. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**
8. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
9. **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 1 of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda

10. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**
To agree the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2017.
For Decision
(Pages 19 - 22)

11. **DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY OR URGENCY POWERS**
Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information
(Pages 23 - 24)
12. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**
13. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB-COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

This page is intentionally left blank

MEMBERS PRIVILEGES SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Thursday, 22 June 2017

**Minutes of the meeting of the Members Privileges Sub (Policy and Resources)
Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 10.30 am**

Present

Members:

Wendy Mead (Chief Commoner) (Chairman)
Ann Holmes
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Deputy Edward Lord
Deputy Richard Regan
John Scott (Ex-Officio Member)
Michael Welbank

Officers:

Charlotte Taffel	-	Town Clerk's Department
Fiona Hoban	-	Assistant Remembrancer
Amy Poole	-	Remembrancer's Office
Dorian Price	-	Guildhall Manager
Alan Dingley	-	Head of Maintenance and Projects
Jim Graham	-	Assistant Director of Cleansing
Adam Collins	-	Department of Built Environment
Angela Roach	-	Committee and Member Services Manager

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Deputy Catherine McGuinness and Jeremy Simons.

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

There were no declarations.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 2017 be approved as an accurate record.

4. OUTSTANDING REFERENCES

The Sub Committee noted that all actions were complete.

RECEIVED.

5. **APPLICATION OF THE CORPORATE TRANSPORT POLICY TO ALL MEMBERS - UPDATE**

The Sub Committee received a joint report of the Director of HR and the Director of Transportation & Public Realm regarding an update on the Corporate Transport Policy to all Members.

A Member queried the section of the Corporate Transport Policy which related to Members using their own vehicles in relation to City Business. The General Risk Assessment Form noted that Officers had not identified any examples where Members driving their own cars is a City Corporation business activity. Members noted however that the use of one's own vehicle to, for example, drive to a train station to attend a Corporation event or meeting in London should be regarded as a City Corporation Business activity. The Assistant Director of Cleansing agreed to investigate the issue and report back to the Sub Committee.

RESOLVED – That the Assistant Director of Cleansing be requested to investigate the issue of Members using their own vehicles in relation to City business and to report back to the Sub Committee.

6. **ORDER OF SENIORITY**

The Sub Committee received a report of the Town Clerk outlining the Order of Seniority.

Members agreed that the following amendments be made to the wording of the Court of Common Council Seniority report, and that such amendments be taken to the next meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee for decision:-

- a) To include the following paragraph under 2.3 – **Alderman, whether former Common Councilmen or not, who are elected to serve as Common Councilmen after their service on the Aldermanic Court, would take their seniority to their total length of service on Common Council, including as an Alderman.**
- b) To include the following amendment under paragraph 3.2 – The Senior Committee Chairman (i.e. particularly the Chairman of Policy and Resources, Finance, Planning and Transportation, Police **and Establishment**) are normally taken out of their seniority order.

RESOLVED – That:-

- a) **The Seniority report be amended as above; and**
- b) **The amended Seniority report be taken to the next meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee for decision.**

7. PROVISION OF EVENING WEAR

The Committee and Member Services Manager raised the issue of the expense of purchasing evening wear, in particular white tie, which had been brought to the fore following the recent election of the Court of Common Council. The Committee and Member Services Manager asked Members' views on the suggestion that the City of London Corporation acquire a selection of evening wear to be utilised by Members for events under the ownership of the Guildhall Club.

Discussion ensued on the wider issue of remuneration for Members, which was a matter likely to be considered by the Resource Allocation Sub Committee. Members suggested that a basic allowance for Members could be used for the purchase of evening wear. Members also noted that while the provision of white tie evening wear for gentleman would require the purchasing of a number of suits, providing evening wear for ladies would be a more complex task.

The wider issue of dress code was also discussed. The Sub Committee were of the opinion that certain standards and formalities should be upheld. Members suggested that the dress code should be reviewed as a matter of policy, and a Member advised that the issue would be considered as part of the work being undertaken by the Ceremonials Protocol Working Party. Members noted that any decision taken on the issue of dress code would require wide consultation with Members. The Chairman, who was also a Member of the Ceremonials Protocol Working Party, stated that any recommendations should be referred to the Member Privileges Sub Committee for consideration.

RESOLVED – That it be recommended to the Policy and Resource Committee:-

- a) The Resource Allocation Sub Committee be requested to look into the issue of Member allowances as part of wider discussion on remuneration by considering the cost of evening wear; and**
- b) Any recommendation made by the Ceremonials Protocol Working Party with regard to the City of London Corporation's dress code be brought back to the Member Privileges Sub-Committee for further consideration.**

8. MEMBER BRIEFINGS

The Past Chief Commoner was heard on the issue of Member Briefings following the election of the Court of Common Council. The Past Chief Commoner noted that many past Members were interested in keeping up to date with the City of London Corporation, and asked whether the Member Monthly Briefing could be circulated to past Members should they wish to subscribe. The Sub Committee agreed that there was no reason that the Member Briefing be non-public due to the innocuous nature of the content and requested that the Town Clerk investigate the issue.

The Sub Committee further noted that the process of recognising service of Members needed formalising, as there was disparity between those Members who stand down during their elected term and receive a formal resolution, and those who either do not stand for re-election or are un-elected. The Sub Committee requested that the Town Clerk look into formalising the process of recognising the service of past Members to ensure both clarity and consistence.

RESOLVED – That it be recommended to the Policy and Resource Committee that:-

- a) The Director of Communication be requested to investigate making the Member Monthly Briefing available to past Members of the Court of Common Council and report back the Sub-Committee on the proposal; and**
- b) The Town Clerk be requested to report back to the Sub-Committee on recognising the service of Members who stand down or are unelected from the Court of Common Council.**

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

A Member queried the role and status of the Chief Commoner in relation to seniority within the Court of Common Council. On the City of London Corporation's website, the Chief Commoner is listed as the 4th Key Councillor under the Lord Mayor, Chairman of Policy and Resources and the Chairman of Finance. Deputy Edward Lord recommended that the following wording regarding the role and status of the Chief Commoner be used on the website:-

First established in 1444, the office of Chief Commoner is the highest civic position to which a Common Councilman, as such, can hope to be elected. It is akin to being the Civic Mayor of a Borough Council or Chairman of a District or County Council, i.e. it is not a role of 'political' leadership, but rather the ceremonial head of the Commoners, their conscience and counsellor, their spokesperson, and the defender of their rights and privileges.

Given the high profile international nature of the Lord Mayor's ambassadorial role, it is expected that the Chief Commoner will undertake many of the domestic (i.e. internal to the City and Corporation) ceremonial duties which would usually be part of the schedule of a civic head in any other local authority. The Chief Commoner also takes the lead on the planning of all Corporation hospitality and in authorising the use of Guildhall.

In Civic Precedence, the Chief Commoner follows immediately behind the Lord Mayor and Sheriffs, and ahead of all other Aldermen and Common Councilmen. The Chief forms part of the 'Civic Team' and should be acknowledged as such when on duty at Guildhall, Mansion House, or elsewhere in the City, for example at a Livery Company event. Recognition of

the Chief Commoner's status will be made by appropriate placement on the seating plan, and in processions, as well as in the allocution.

Within the Court of Common Council, the Chief Commoner has a pastoral responsibility for the Councilmen and will provide advice and guidance to Members where necessary. The Chief also has an informal disciplinary and dispute resolution function, including the authority to withdraw Corporation hospitality or access to facilities where they deem it appropriate.

Discussion ensued on the role of the Chief Commoner, the highest civic position held on the Court of Common Council and one to which all Members can aspire to by virtue. The Sub Committee agreed that a clear statement was required to enhance the formality of the role.

The Sub Committee agreed and thanked Deputy Edward Lord for the work he had undertaken in preparing the suggested wording, and requested that the report be taken to the Policy and Resources Committee for decision.

RESOLVED – That it be recommended to the Policy and Resources Committee that the role and status of the Chief Commoner be formulised and that the revised wording as proposed by Deputy Edward Lord and as set out above be included on the website and used in all public facing City of London Corporation Material.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There was no urgent business.

11. 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 Local Government Act.

12. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 2017 be approved as an accurate record.

13. GUILDHALL WEST WING - PROVISION OF UPGRADED LAVATORIES AND CLOAKROOM FACILITIES FOR MEMBERS AND GUILDHALL GUESTS

The Sub Committee received a report of the City Surveyor on the provision of upgraded lavatories and cloakroom facilities for Members and Guildhall Guests.

RECEIVED.

14. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE WHICH THE SUB-COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

There were no non-public questions.

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

There was no non-public urgent business.

The meeting closed at 11.50 am

Chairman

Contact Officer: Charlotte Taffel
tel. no.: 020 7332 3801
charlotte.taffel@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committee(s): Members' Privileges Sub-Committee	Date(s): 21 September 2017
Subject: Recognition of departing Members at Court of Common Council	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Decision
Report Author: Greg Moore, Senior Committee & Member Services Officer	

Summary

At its June 2017 meeting, the Members' Privileges Sub Committee discussed the process by which Members departing the Court of Common Council were thanked formally for their service. In particular, the Sub-Committee observed the distinction between the procedures for those standing down from the Court during their term, those not seeking re-election, and those who sought but were unsuccessful in achieving re-election to office.

This report sets out the current position, outlines changes made in recent years in an effort to ameliorate the position for those losing seats at elections in a suitable manner, and proposes options for Members' consideration with regard to potential amendments for future years.

Recommendations

Members are asked to consider the various options set out at paragraphs 13-18 and determine what approach should be taken in future years.

Main Report

Background

1. At each meeting of the Court of Common Council, a standing agenda item exists to provide facility for various resolutions to be moved. These include congratulatory resolutions (for instance, upon the award of an honour from Her Majesty the Queen), memorial resolutions (i.e. expressing the Court's sympathies in respect of a Member who has died in office), and resolutions on retirement.
2. This last category of resolution was the subject of some debate at the June 2017 meeting of the Members' Privileges Sub-Committee, with Members suggesting that thought should be given to an appropriate similar mechanism for Members who did not necessarily retire from the Court during their term, but either decided not to stand for re-election at the natural expiry point of the term, or were unsuccessful in being re-elected.

Current Position

3. Presently, the only departing Members in receipt of a formal retirement resolution are those Members who resign from the Court during their term, or die in office. On such occasions, a resolution is moved at the next available meeting of the Court in the usual manner (i.e. making reference to their various contributions, thanking them, and wishing them well in their retirement). A recent example of such a resolution is provided at Appendix A.
4. However, those who lose their seats at elections – or choose not to seek re-election upon the expiry of their terms – do not receive a formal resolution. Given the relatively late introduction of quadrennial City-wide elections, as well as the traditionally low level of turnover of membership until recent years, this has only recently emerged as an issue meriting consideration.
5. Ahead of the 2013 City-wide elections, it became apparent that a number of Members would not be seeking re-election. Wanting to recognise their contributions, the Chief Commoner of the day read a short note thanking those affected at the meeting of the Court immediately preceding the election. This did not take the form of a formal resolution of the Court, but more an informal mention of the individual Members' contributions.
6. Following the further changes to the Court's membership occurring as a consequence of those elections, the decision was also then taken to make a short reference to those who had been unsuccessful in achieving re-election. Consequently, the Chief Commoner made a brief statement at the April meeting of the Court, expressing a general thank you and listing the names of those who had been unsuccessful.
7. Ahead of the 2017 City-wide elections it was clear that, once again, a number of Members had determined not to seek re-election; it was also possible, given the number of contested Wards, that a further number of Members might be unsuccessful in achieving re-election.
8. There was a general sentiment that the contributions of each of these Members should be recognised in some way, with the inference being that a repeat of the very brief references made in 2013 would be unsatisfactory. However, concern was also expressed as to the possibility of a full resolution being made for each, given the time that this would take.
9. Some 13 Members not seeking re-election were mentioned at the March meeting, with a further 11 who were not re-elected mentioned at the April meeting. A formal resolution usually takes around two to three minutes to read, with several further minutes added on by the formal process of calling on the mover – who often adds a personal introduction – and then calling on the seconder, and putting it to the vote. It is clear then that moving formal resolutions would have equated to around an hour of additional time at each of the two Court meetings.
10. Consequently, a fuller, more personalised note was prepared for both meetings, to be delivered by the Chief Commoner. This consisted of a short

paragraph for each Member, noting their principal achievements and contributions. Whilst longer and more personal, these still did not constitute formal resolutions and the length was subsequently curtailed.

Issue

11. The discussions of the Sub-Committee at its June meeting would suggest that Members are still minded that the position is unsatisfactory, with further thought needed to striking the balance between recognising departing Members' contributions sufficiently whilst also not taking up too much of the Court's time.
12. Members are therefore invited to consider the various options set out below or suggest alternative improvements to the current process.

Options

13. *Cease formal resolutions and replace with an informal arrangement:* one way of removing any discrepancy would be to cease the practice of delivering formal resolutions on retirement, instead switching to a system similar to that currently in place around the election period – i.e. the Chief Commoner to say a few short words, but nothing overly lengthy or formal. This would achieve parity and ensure the Court's thanks were briefly recorded in the minutes, whilst also minimising the length of time allocated to such formalities at Court meetings.
14. *Introduce formal resolutions for all Members:* if Members would not wish to cease the practice of moving formal resolutions in the traditional fashion, they may wish to consider the introduction of individual resolutions for each departing Member. This would have the disadvantage of adding significant length to Court meetings, as well as requiring additional resource to produce.
15. *Introduce written resolutions for those Members not seeking re-election/unsuccessful in achieving re-election:* a potential half-way house could be to introduce written resolutions immediately preceding and after City-wide elections. These could be circulated as part of the Summons and the Motion simply be to agree with the several resolutions as set out. This would ensure that affected Members have a fuller and more formal thank you from the Court, whilst also minimising the amount of time taken at Court meetings. The terms of the resolutions would be agreed by the Ward Deputy as is current practice (or, in certain circumstances, the Alderman of the Ward). This option would, however, preclude the individual Member moving the Resolution from adding their own personal words of introduction.
16. *Continue with the current practice:* one option would be to continue with the current practice, whereby the Chief Commoner reads a short personalised paragraph about each of the Members either not standing for re-election or who have not been returned by the electorate.
17. *Cease Resolutions altogether:* this would mean that no recognition, whether formal or informal, would be given to Members leaving office. In lieu of this, an alternative option could be a letter of thanks from the Chief Commoner; however, this would mean that there would be no recognition at the Court of the Member's service.

18. *Limit formal Resolutions to Members with a minimum period of service:* this option would see formal Resolutions at Court reserved for those Members with a significant length of service on the Court – say, 5 years. For those with a shorter period of service, an informal thanks would be delivered by the Chief Commoner instead (as is currently the case around the City-wide elections). This would ensure that those who had served for some time (and were therefore more likely to have contributed to the City Corporation's work) would be recognised formally. Whilst avoiding excessive time being added to Court meetings, it would potentially still mean a period of the Court's time being spent on these matters.

Conclusion

19. This report sets out the background to the Sub-Committee's concerns at its last meeting concerning retiring Members and sets out a number of alternative options for Members' consideration.

Appendices

- Appendix A: Example of a formal Resolution

Contact

Greg Moore

Town Clerk's Department

Tel: 0207 332 1399

Email: gregory.moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Appendix A – Example Resolution on Retirement (Billy Dove, January 2017)

“My Lord Mayor,

I move that the Members of the Court of Common Council express to

WILLIAM HARRY DOVE, OBE, JP

their sincere gratitude for his dedication to the work of the City Corporation over the past 23 years, during which time he served on more than 25 committees, many of which he also chaired.

A teacher by trade, it is no surprise that Billy’s time and activities on this Court reflected his enthusiasm for improving the lives of young people, as well as his charitable nature and his passion for serving residents. Under his Chairmanship the City Bridge Trust considered over 1,300 applications and awarded over £53.2m in grants, supporting organisations large and small and the diverse communities they serve across London. His time as Chairman of the Community and Children Services Committee was marked by his ability to understand the needs of the vulnerable or less able, which ensured that the Committee was always reminded of the people they serve. And as Chairman of the Benefices Sub-Committee, he built up a strong and lasting friendship with the incumbents and their churches, and has been a committed champion for their work.

His civic career culminated in his becoming Chief Commoner in 2015 and, during his year, he used the opportunities presented to him to further those causes close to his heart such as his work with young people and with those less fortunate.

We warmly thank him for his exceptional service to this Court. His passion, his dedication and his jovial spirit will be sorely missed. We all wish Billy a long and happy retirement and send our best wishes to him and Joe in their future adventures.

My Lord Mayor.”

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s)	Dated:
Members Privileges Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee	21/09/2017
Subject: Members' Briefing and past Members	Public
Report of: Bob Roberts – Director of Communications	For Decision
Report author: Yassar Abbas – Communications Office, Town Clerk's Department	

Summary

Following a recommendation made by the Members Privileges Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee, the Policy & Resources Committee requested the Director of Communications investigate making the Members' Briefing available to past Members of the Court of Common Council and report back to the Sub-Committee on the proposal.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked:

- Not to make the Members' Briefing available to past Members on the grounds it would erode current Members' privileges, risk sensitive information being shared outside the City of London Corporation and lead to Members' Briefing being seen as public documents which ought therefore to be displayed on the website.
- If Members wish to make Members' Briefing available to past Members they agree to the approach set out in this report for making the Briefing available.

Main Report

Background

1. At the Members Privileges Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee meeting on 22 June 2017, the past Chief Commoner was heard on the issue of the Members' Briefings following the election of the new Court of Common Council in March. He noted that many past Members were interested in keeping up to date with news from the City of London Corporation and asked whether the Members' Briefing could be circulated to them.
2. The Sub Committee felt that there was no reason for the Members' Briefing to be non-public, and upon its recommendation the Policy and Resources Committee

requested the Director of Communications to investigate and report back to the Sub Committee on the proposal.

Current Position

3. The Members' Briefing is used to communicate with all Members of the Court of Common Council on news from across the organisation including the work of the Lord Mayor, Chairman of Policy and Resources and Chief Commoner, and could include information which is not publicly available.
4. The Members' Briefing is distributed by email once a month and can also be downloaded from the City of London intranet.
5. Feedback received from Members, following a review of the Members' Briefing a number of years ago, requested its distribution be restricted to Members only.

Proposals

6. Taking into account the feedback received from Members previously and given that the Members Briefing is designed specifically as a tool for communicating with Members, your officers advise it is not made available to past Members for three reasons:-
 - i. Sensitive material can be included in the Briefing which should not be shared outside the organisation.
 - ii. Receipt of the Members' Briefing can be seen as a privilege afforded to Members only so its availability should cease with Membership.
 - iii. If the Members' Briefing is to be considered a public document and made available to past Members, a case could be put forward for it to be made available more widely to the Livery and indeed the general public including future potential election candidates.
7. Should Members decide to make the Briefing available to past Members, it is proposed that this be done by email as this will involve no additional costs and is the same method by which it is distributed to current Members. The Communications Office will then, with support from the Committee and Member Services Team, compile a list of past Members for whom a contact email address is currently held on record. The Office will contact these past Members asking them to confirm whether or not they would like to receive the Briefing and add their details to its email distribution list accordingly. Any past Members whose details are not available can be added to the distribution list by requesting this through a Member or fellow past Member.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

8. This proposal aligns with Key Policy Priority 2 of the Corporate Plan by improving the value for money of our services within the constraints of reduced services.

Implications

9. This proposal requires no additional funding. The key risk associated with this proposal is the potential publication of sensitive information. This can be mitigated by making officers aware that the Members' Briefing is now available to past Members and therefore is to be considered a public document.

Conclusion

Officers are of the view that the Members' Briefing should not be made available to past Members on the grounds it would erode current Members' privileges, risk sensitive information being shared outside the City of London Corporation and lead to the Members' Briefing being seen as public document which ought to be displayed on the website.

If Members wish to make Members' Briefing available to past Members then the approach set out in this report for making the Briefing available should be agreed.

Appendices

None

Background Papers

None

Bob Roberts

Director of Communications

T: 020 7332 3389

E: Bob.Roberts@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee: Members Privileges Sub-Committee	Date: 21 September 2017
Subject: Decisions taken under delegated authority or urgency powers	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Information
Report Author: Angela Roach, Principal Committee and Members Services Manager	

Summary

1. This report advises Members of action taken by the Town Clerk in consultation with the Sub-Committee, in accordance with Standing Order Nos. 41(a) and 41(b).

Recommendation

To note the action taken since the last meeting of the Committee

Main Report

2. Since the last meeting of the Committee approval was given under the urgency procedures, Standing Order No. 41(a), as follows:-

Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen's IT Room

3. Following a recommendation from the Members Privileges Sub-Committee approval was given to reconfigure the current Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen's IT Room to form two separate rooms i.e. a small meeting room and a four station IT room at an estimated cost of £17,500 to be met from the City Surveyor's local risk budget.
4. The Chairman and a number of other Members were of the view that the room was underutilised and that reconfiguring the space to form two separate rooms might encourage better usage of the space. The Members Privileges Sub-Committee were subsequently consulted and supported the suggestion unanimously. The proposal was also approved by the Grand Committee under the urgency procedures also. Urgent action was taken to approve this as, at that time, it was felt it would be less disruptive for the work to be carried out during the summer recess.

Contact: Angela Roach
Angela.roach@cityoflondon.gov.uk
T: 020 7332 3685

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