



Policy and Resources Committee

Date: THURSDAY, 19 NOVEMBER 2020

Time: 1.45 pm

Venue: MICROSOFT TEAMS (<https://youtu.be/K-Ml6YJsRgc>)

Members:

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

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

Accessing the virtual public meeting

Members of the public can observe this virtual public meeting at the below link:

<https://youtu.be/K-Ml6YJsRgc>

This meeting will be a virtual meeting and therefore will not take place in a physical location following regulations made under Section 78 of the Coronavirus Act 2020. A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one municipal year. Please note: Online meeting recordings do not constitute the formal minutes of the meeting; minutes are written and are available on the City of London Corporation's website. Recordings may be edited, at the discretion of the proper officer, to remove any inappropriate material.

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 Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 22 October 2020.

For Decision
(Pages 1 - 10)

- b) To note the public minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 21 October 2020.

For Information
(Pages 11 - 24)

- c) To note the public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 22 October 2020.

For Information
(Pages 25 - 28)

- d) To note the public summary of the Tackling Racism Taskforce meeting held on 16 October 2020.

For Information
(Pages 29 - 30)

- e) To note the public summary of the Tackling Racism Taskforce meeting held on 30 October 2020.

For Information
(Pages 31 - 32)

- f) To note the public summary of the Tackling Racism Taskforce meeting held on 6 November 2020.

For Decision
(Pages 33 - 34)

4. ELECTORAL REGISTRATION UPDATE

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Decision
(Pages 35 - 44)

5. **CENSUS UPDATE**
Report of the Town Clerk.
For Information
(Pages 45 - 48)
6. **BARBICAN CENTRE BOARD: COMPOSITION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE**
Report of the Town Clerk, on behalf of the Barbican Centre Board.
For Decision
(Pages 49 - 56)
7. **PLANNING PROTOCOL**
Joint report of the Comptroller & City Solicitor, Director of the Built Environment, and Town Clerk.
For Decision
(Pages 57 - 84)
8. **RECOVERY TASK FORCE: PLACEMAKING FOR A WORLD-LEADING SQUARE MILE**
Report of the Director of Innovation & Growth.
For Decision
(Pages 85 - 88)
9. **HOLIDAY MEAL SUPPORT TO CITY OF LONDON SPONSORED ACADEMIES**
Report of the Director of Community & Children's Services.
For Decision
(Pages 89 - 96)
10. **REVIEW OF PILOT AND FUTURE BRIDGE HOUSE ESTATES FUNDING FOR ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY AGAINST ILLEGAL STREET TRADING ON AND BY THE BRIDGES**
Report of the Director of Markets & Consumer Protection.
For Decision
(Pages 97 - 108)
11. **BRIDGE HOUSE ESTATES: POLICING THE BRIDGES**
Report of the Chamberlain.
For Decision
(Pages 109 - 114)
12. **DELEGATION OF WRITE-OFF LIMITS AND DISCRETIONARY BUSINESS RATE RELIEF**
Report of the Chamberlain.
For Decision
(Pages 115 - 118)
13. **POLICY INITIATIVES FUND AND COMMITTEE CONTINGENCY**
Report of the Chamberlain.
For Information
(Pages 119 - 132)

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

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

16. **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.

Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda

17. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

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

- a) To agree the non-public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 22 October 2020.

For Decision
(Pages 133 - 138)

- b) To note the non-public minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 21 October 2020.

For Information
(Pages 139 - 146)

18. **REPURPOSING OF FUNDING FOR LONDON & PARTNERS: DOMESTIC TOURISM CONSORTIUM**

Report of the Director of Major Projects.

For Decision
(Pages 147 - 154)

19. **SECURE CITY PROGRAMME: CCTV & TELECOMMUNICATIONS WORKSTREAM**

Joint report of the Director of the Built Environment and the Commissioner of Police.

For Decision
(Pages 155 - 174)

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

21. **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

22. **CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES**

To agree the confidential minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 2020.

For Decision

23. **TARGET OPERATING MODEL**

Report of the Town Clerk (TO FOLLOW).

For Decision

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Thursday, 22 October 2020

Minutes of the meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee held over Microsoft Teams (and streamed at <https://youtu.be/JA0mRYpERsM>) on Thursday, 22 October 2020 at 1.45 pm

Members:

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

In Attendance

Mark Bostock	Ann Holmes
John Chapman	Barbara Newman
Alderman Alison Gowman	Graham Packham
Alderman Sir Roger Gifford	Oliver Sells
Alderman Prem Goyal	Jeremy Simons
Graeme Harrower	James Tumbridge

Officers:

John Barradell	- Town Clerk and Chief Executive
Peter Kane	- Chamberlain
Michael Cogher	- Comptroller and City Solicitor
Paul Double	- Remembrancer
Paul Wilkinson	- City Surveyor
Carolyn Dwyer	- Director of Built Environment
Vic Annells	- Executive Director, Mansion House
Jon Avern	- Director, Markets & Consumer Protection
Sir Nicholas Kenyon	- Director of the Barbican Centre
Chrissie Morgan	- Director of Human Resources
Damian Nussbaum	- Director of Innovation & Growth
Caroline Al-Beyerty	- Deputy Chamberlain
Paul Wright	- Deputy Remembrancer

Peter Lisley	- Assistant Town Clerk
Angela Roach	- Assistant Town Clerk
Emma Cunningham	- Town Clerk's Department
Simon Latham	- Town Clerk's Department
Gregory Moore	- Town Clerk's Department
Ben Cackett	- Innovation & Growth
Giles French	- Innovation & Growth
Amanda Mays	- Human Resources
Sanjay Odedra	- Communications Team
Anna Dunne	- City Surveyor's Department
Ola Obadara	- City Surveyor's Department
Peter Young	- City Surveyor's Department
Nigel Lefton	- Remembrancer's Department

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Rehana Ameer, Wendy Mead, and the Rt Hon The Lord Mayor Alderman William Russell.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

- a) The public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 24 September 2020 were approved

Matters Arising

City Airport – it was advised that a meeting had been arranged with representatives of City Airport to explore further an appropriate course of action.

Tomorrow's City Commission / COVID Recovery Commission – the Chair informed Members that she was working with the Chair of the Planning & Transportation Committee to establish a body or group to look at the competitiveness of the City beyond COVID. Thought would also be given to an appropriate name.

- b) The public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 18 September 2020 were received.
- c) The public summary of the Tackling Racism Task Force meeting held on 2 October 2020 were received.

Matters Arising

Charter for Black Talent in Finance – it was asked that a copy of this document be circulated to Members of the Committee.

4. **RESOLUTION FROM THE COMMUNITY & CHILDREN'S SERVICES COMMITTEE**

The Committee received a resolution from the Community and Children's Services Committee which asked for a virtual City-wide residents' meeting to be organised.

The Chair advised that an event had been arranged provisionally for 2 December 2020. The precise details and format were being drawn up and Members' suggestions were welcomed.

5. **PROCEDURES AT COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL**

The Chair was heard in respect of procedures at the Court of Common Council, noting the increasing challenges associated with the Court's processes in a virtual setting, particularly in relation to voting. She advised that officers were exploring a number of options to introduce electronic voting, with it intended that a trial demonstration be undertaken at the November informal Court meeting to help identify the preferred solution. She took the opportunity to thank Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark and the Chief Commoner for their help in supporting officers in this area.

Beyond electronic voting, she agreed that there were a number of amendments that might be explored in respect of Standing Orders and their application in a virtual setting; however, any consideration would need to be mindful of the wider implications of the Governance Review and changes that might emerge through that.

6. **CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION PARTNERSHIPS STRATEGY**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Innovation and Growth in respect of a refreshed Partnerships Strategy for 2020-2023.

Several Members spoke to express their welcome and support for this report, as well as the report at Item 7, which set out key considerations for the Committee and the City Corporation in a clear and helpful fashion.

During debate, the following points were made:-

- It was observed that the City Police, with its National Lead Force responsibilities, had an established national and international footprint and that there would be scope for joint working in relation to this partnership work. The Director of Innovation & Growth thanked Members for this helpful suggestion and undertook to liaise with City Police colleagues to how this additional element might be incorporated.
- It was clarified that no additional resource was being sought for this work and that it was to be achieved through existing departmental budget.
- Following questions as to ongoing review and measurement, it was advised that there would be a regular review process with partners, as well as internal mechanisms for review. Targets and Key Performance Indicators, together with a performance framework, would be established through the business plan. Individual partnership plans would also identify success measures for each area.

- It was suggested that the Public Relations and Economic Development Sub-Committee would be a useful forum for allowing space for greater review and scrutiny of this important area of work, drawing on Member expertise to assess the principles behind specific areas of activity and review ongoing performance.
- Members observed that this item, together with Item 7, were the sorts of reports that would sit well with a new Competitiveness Committee or similar, as proposed through the Lisvane Review.
- In response to a query around future changes, the Director advised that the intention would be to agree the plans and amendments in conjunction with partners.

RESOLVED: That:-

1. The strategy refresh and Partnership Plan approach set out in the report and accompanying appendix be approved.
2. Individual Partnership Plans be reviewed in Summer 2021, alongside continuous progress monitoring.

7. INTERNATIONAL PRIORITISATION: TURNING PRIORITIES INTO ACTIONS AND OUTCOMES

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Innovation and Growth proposing actions to enable the City of London Corporation to plan, invest and allocate resources for long-term impact and outcomes in relation to international markets.

The following points arose during discussion:-

- With reference to engagement with markets in the continent of Africa, a Member urged that a more diverse range be considered rather than focusing solely on those established ones with whom strong relationships were already in place. Officers confirmed that flexibility was built into the plans and other markets were constantly being kept under review; judgements would always be made with a view to maximising impact in both the shorter and longer term.
- It was also urged that the Members' connections be utilised in respect of market engagement and consideration, particularly the Commonwealth links available through Baroness Scotland.
- A wider observation was also made around the need to leverage Members' collective skills much more effectively, utilising greater teamwork and partnership between Members and Officers, consistent with recommendations made by Lord Lisvane, although it was noted that the primary focus must be to reflect the views and needs of the Financial and Professional Services sector.
- In response to a query as to how the political situation within markets was taken into account, together with any relevant mitigation activities, the Director advised that the City Corporation worked very closely with Her Majesty's Government and relevant stakeholders to seek advice and clarity

on approaches, stressing the importance of being aligned and working in a complementary fashion.

RESOLVED: That:-

1. The international priorities set out in the report be endorsed.
2. The integrated plans and operating model to govern day-to-day ways of working set out in the report be endorsed.
3. This framework for the coming three years be approved as set out in the report, with light touch reviews in 12 and 24 months and with a full review in 2023.

8. **GUILDHALL WEST WING - PROVISION OF UPGRADED LAVATORIES AND CLOAKROOM FACILITIES FOR MEMBERS AND GUILDHALL GUESTS – GATEWAY 6 – OUTCOME REPORT**

The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor which sought to provide additional cloakroom and guest facilities to maximise the number of simultaneous events across the Guildhall complex and provide fit for purpose modernised Members facilities (lockers, showers, changing rooms, lavatories).

RESOLVED: That the project be closed, noting a final outturn cost of £1,716,298; a £102,532 (6%) cost increase since Gateway 5.

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

The Committee received a report of the Chamberlain which provided an update on those projects and activities which have received funding from the Policy Initiatives Fund, the Policy and Resources Committee's Contingency Fund, Committee's Project Reserve, COVID19 Contingency Fund, and Brexit Contingency Fund.

In response to a question concerning the level of funds allocated to each contingency pot, the Chairman of the Finance Committee advised that the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee would review this as part of its annual process.

RESOLVED: That the report be received and its content noted.

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

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

RESOLVED: That the report be received and its content noted.

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

There were two questions:

Electoral Registration

In view of the deferral of Common Council elections until 2022, it was asked what steps were being put in place to improve electoral registration and engagement across both residential and business voters. In particular, updates on digital registration and contact, as well as engagement with CEOs, was sought.

In response, the Town Clerk advised that a report was due to be submitted to the November meeting of the Committee addressing these topics, including promotional activities and associated funding requirements.

Several Members spoke to echo the importance of this issue, noting that there had been a long-standing deficit in this area and that new and innovative approaches would be needed to make a tangible difference, with an intelligent engagement strategy. It was also suggested that clear timelines and KPIs for activity would be beneficial.

In response to a supplementary question relating to steps to increase the diversity of candidates, the Assistant Town Clerk made reference to a number of planned activities as part of this work and confirmed that she was very mindful of this need in taking proposals forward.

With reference to further questions around voter registration, it was advised that there had been a delay in registration forms being circulated due to an issue with a new bespoke software system but that this had now been addressed. She also noted the importance of reminding businesses of the need to nominate voters from across the full spectrum of their workforce.

Free School Meal Vouchers

Following the recent decision by the Co-operative Group to fund free school meal vouchers for its pupils through to Spring 2021, it was asked whether the potential for the City Corporation to act similarly could be explored as a matter of urgency.

The Chair agreed to ask officers to explore this issue, although she could not guarantee this would necessarily include the October half-term, given the imminent proximity of that particular break. She also noted the importance of a holistic approach, considering whole family support rather than necessarily individual pupils.

A Member took the opportunity to suggest a correlation between the curtailing of free school meals and increased levels of childhood obesity and other health issues over recent decades, stressing the importance of good nutrition at a young age to prevent future long-term health issues. The Member urged that the case should be made to Government to reintroduce free school meals regardless of background across the nation on this basis.

The Chair undertook to raise the issue at the next London Councils Leaders' meeting, noting the importance of a coherent approach.

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

It was noted that the two late reports of the Chamberlain, Items 18 and 19, were public items and would be considered at this point in the agenda:

18. **CAPITAL FUNDING - PRIORITISATION OF 2021/22 ANNUAL CAPITAL BIDS - INITIAL REVIEW**

The Committee considered a report of the Chamberlain concerning the prioritisation of 2021/22 Annual Capital Bids. It was noted that this report had been considered by the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee earlier that day and was now recommended to the Policy and Resources Committee for approval.

RESOLVED: That:-

1. It be noted that the total value of bids amounting to £146m of which £27.5m were to be funded from existing local resources and £13.5m which did not meet the capital criteria and would need to be funded from revenue resources.
2. It be agreed that the remaining £105m of capital bids was currently unsustainable and therefore Chief Officers, in consultation with Service Committee Chairs, be requested to further consider ranking of schemes to identify the most critical bids, with innovation and reputational impact uppermost.
3. Subject to the outcome of Chief Officer rankings, it be agreed 'in principle' that bids with a final RAG rating of amber and red be deferred.
4. It be noted that the Climate Action Strategy bids would be subject to further review to confirm the priority of proposals.
5. It be noted that options for revenue funding of the Climate Action revenue bids that do not meet the capital criteria (currently £13.5m) will be brought forward in December.

19. **CAPITAL FUNDING UPDATE**

The Committee considered a paper of the Chamberlain proposing the release of £5.42m for five schemes which had previously received 'in principle' approval for progression. It was noted that this report had been considered by the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee earlier that day and was now recommended to the Policy and Resources Committee for approval.

RESOLVED: That:-

1. The five schemes listed in Table 1 of the report be reviewed in the context of the current crisis and confirmed that they should receive continued essential priority for release of funding at this time.
2. An increase of £250k in the central funding be agreed and allocated to the Frobisher Crescent fire safety works to be offset by a compensating reduction in the car park fire safety funding allocation.
3. The release of up to £5.42m be agreed for the five schemes from the reserves of City Fund and City's Cash as set out in Table 1, subject to the approval of the relevant gateway reports.

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 items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

14. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

- a) The non-public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 24 September 2020 were approved.
- b) The non-public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 18 September 2020 were noted.
- c) The non-public minutes of the Hospitality Working Party meeting held on 22 September 2020 were noted.

15. **MARKETS CO-LOCATION PROGRAMME PROGRESS REPORT**

The Committee considered and approved a joint report of the City Surveyor, Town Clerk, and the Director of Markets & Consumer Protection in relation to the Markets Co-location Programme, noting a confidential appendix at item 24.

16. **CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION AND LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS - BILLINGSGATE COOPERATION ARRANGEMENT**

The Committee considered and approved a report of the City Surveyor concerning an agreement with the London Borough of Tower Hamlets, noting a confidential appendix at item 25.

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

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

18. **CAPITAL FUNDING - PRIORITISATION OF 2021/22 ANNUAL CAPITAL BIDS - INITIAL REVIEW**

This Item had been considered in public session (see Item 12).

19. **PROJECT FUNDING UPDATE**

This Item had been considered in public session (see Item 12).

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

There was one question, relating to transportation options for City workers and an associated policy position.

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

There were no urgent items.

At 3.45pm Members agreed to extend the business of the agenda beyond two hours, in accordance with Standing Order 40, in order to conclude the business on the agenda.

22. **CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES**

The confidential minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee held on 24 September 2020 were approved.

23. **TARGET OPERATING MODEL UPDATE**

The Committee Considered and approved a report of the Town Clerk.

24. **MARKETS CO-LOCATION PROGRAMME PROGRESS REPORT: CONFIDENTIAL APPENDICES**

The Committee received an appendix in respect of agenda item 15.

25. **BILLINGSGATE COOPERATION ARRANGEMENT: CONFIDENTIAL APPENDIX**

The Committee received an appendix in respect of agenda item 16.

The meeting ended at 3.57pm

Chairman

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

This page is intentionally left blank

PROJECTS SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 21 October 2020

Minutes of the meeting of the Projects Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee held at on Microsoft Teams at 11.00 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Keith Bottomley (Chairman)	James de Sausmarez
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark (Deputy Chairman)	Deputy Philip Woodhouse
Randall Anderson	Deputy Edward Lord
Andrew McMurtrie	John Petrie
Susan Pearson	

Officers:

Alistair MacLellan	- Town Clerk's Department
Rohit Paul	- Town Clerk's Department
Sarah Baker	- Town Clerk's Department
Antoinette Duhaney	- Town Clerk's Department
Dianne Merrifield	- Chamberlain's Department
Matt Mott	- Chamberlain's Department
Nicholas Richmond-Smith	- Chamberlain's Department
Aqib Hussein	- Chamberlain's Department
Amy Poole	- Remembrancer's Department
Sarah Phillips	- Remembrancer's Department
Ola Obadara	- City Surveyor's Department
Jonathan Cooper	- City Surveyor's Department
Pete Ochser	- City Surveyor's Department
Leah Coburn	- Department of the Built Environment
Melanie Charalambous	- Department of the Built Environment
Maria Curro	- Department of the Built Environment
Gillian Howard	- Department of the Built Environment
Ian Hughes	- Department of the Built Environment
Andrea Moravicova	- Department of the Built Environment
Tom Noble	- Department of the Built Environment
Emmanuel Ojugo	- Department of the Built Environment
Clarisse Tavin	- Department of the Built Environment
Kristian Turner	- Department of the Built Environment
George Wright	- Department of the Built Environment
Paul Murtagh	- Department of Community and Children's Services
Jason Hayes	- Department of Community and Children's Services
Wayne Garrigan	- The Mansion House and The Central Criminal Court
Pauline Weaver	- City of London Police

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Rehana Ameer (subject to confirmation of co-option) and Deputy Catherine McGuinness.

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

Susan Pearson declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 17 (Concrete Testing and Repair to Golden Lane and Middlesex Street Estates) as, whilst she owned a flat within Golden Lane Estate, the report concerned the closure of the project and moreover she had no comments to make regarding the report in question.

3. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Chairman took the opportunity to welcome Susan Pearson and, subject to ratification of his co-option, John Petrie to the Sub-Committee. The Chairman thanked outgoing Members Karina Dostalova and Ben Murphy for their contributions and also thanked Members who continued to serve, given continuity was an important factor in the effective scrutiny of City projects.

Members then considered the terms of reference of the Sub-Committee as set by the Policy and Resources Committee at its meeting on 15 September 2020 and the following points were made.

- The Chairman reminded Members that the core purpose of the Sub-Committee was to focus on effective project management – Members should focus on ‘who and how’ when scrutinising projects, not ‘what and why’, the latter approach being within the remit of service committees.
- Members agreed that when the Sub-Committee’s terms of reference were next considered by the Policy and Resources Committee in April 2021 a minimum frequency of meetings of monthly should be made explicit.

RESOLVED, that the terms of reference be received.

4. APPOINTMENT OF CO-OPTED MEMBERS

Members considered the co-option of four Members to the Sub-Committee as per its terms of reference and the following points were made.

- The Town Clerk noted that an indicative ballot had been conducted via Microsoft Forms outside of the meeting and the results were as follows:

Candidate	Votes
Peter Bennett	3
Rehana Ameer	5 – CO-OPTED
Karina Dostalova	1
Sheriff Chris Hayward	8 – CO-OPTED
Deputy Edward Lord OBE	6 – CO-OPTED
John Petrie	7 – CO-OPTED

- The Chairman invited both the identified co-opted Members and other new Members on the Sub-Committee to contact the Project Management Office for introductory briefing regarding the City's project procedure and the work of the Sub-Committee.

RESOLVED, that Rehana Ameer, Sheriff Chris Hayward, Deputy Edward Lord and John Petrie be co-opted on to the Projects Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee for 2020/21.

5. **GATEWAY APPROVAL PROCESS**

RESOLVED, that the Gateway Approval Process be received.

6. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED, that the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 15 September 2020 be approved.

7. **PUBLIC ACTIONS**

Members considered a report of the Town Clerk regarding public actions and the following points were made.

17/2020/P – Gateline Data at City Stations

- The Director of the Built Environment noted that the City had access to O2 data that suggested there was 75% less footfall within the City. Since refreshed working from home guidance had been issued by the government, working numbers had fallen by 7%. City attendance was higher on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays. TfL gateline data correlated O2 data with a 67% reduction in entrance/exit figures on London underground stations within the City. An update on the impact of Tier 2 restrictions on the City daytime population could be provided in due course.

18/2020/P – TfL Traffic Management of London Bridge

- A Member noted that he had been in touch with TfL who had confirmed intelligent signals were deployed to better manage traffic flow across Southwark Bridge on to Lower Thames Street, given the restrictions on London Bridge meant that cars were effectively redirected via Southwark Bridge into the City.

RESOLVED, that the report be received.

8. **RESOLUTION - PERFORMANCE BONDS**

RESOLVED, that the resolution of the Procurement Sub (Finance) Committee dated 9 September 2020 regarding Performance Bonds be received.

9. **GATEWAY 4 - BANK JUNCTION IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT: ALL CHANGE AT BANK**

Members considered a Gateway 4 report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding the Bank Junction Improvements Project: All Change at Bank and the following points were made.

- The Chairman noted that the report's recommendations had been approved by the Streets and Walkways Sub (Planning and Transportation) Committee.
- The Director of the Built Environment noted that the report outlined changes to the project that were necessary due to the impact of temporary public realm interventions that were in response to COVID, which had increased project risk ahead of Gateway 5. The impact of these changes would become clearer in the coming months. Overall officers believed that the recommended option provided a robust design that did not undermine the work done on the project to date.
- The Chairman noted the project had a clear interdependency with TfL as their strategic routes through Bank Junction had to be taken into account in project planning. He noted that Members would see this project again at Gateway 5, and in his view the request for costed risk provision was sensible.
- In response to a number of queries raised by a Member, the Director of the Built Environment noted that no further funding was scheduled to be received from TfL, and that officers had secured £4m of funding from the City's capital bid process. Secondly, Princes Street could not be closed to buses without impacting journey times. Therefore it was proposed to narrow Princes Street to a single lane in both directions at one section, controlled by traffic lights. This would allow the route to be used by buses whilst creating more space of public access at Bank Station. Lastly, the Director of the Built Environment was unaware of a letter to the Town Clerk and Lord Mayor from external parties expressing dissatisfaction with the scheme and therefore was unable to comment.
- The Chamberlain confirmed that the City has provided £4m for the project as part of the capital bid process rather than the full £18m that had been requested. A request for draw down on the £4m would be considered at the Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee on 22 October 2020.
- In response to a question from a Member, the Director of the Built Environment noted that officers were seeking to complete the project in alignment with the London Underground Lines upgrade of Bank Station that was due for completion by the end of 2022. Temporary COVID interventions into the street scene were being monitored with a view to determining which were likely to be made permanent and which would be removed. Some of the interventions would affect the project's underlying traffic modelling and so this risk would need to be factored into the project.

- In response to a question the Director of the Built Environment confirmed that both Grocers' Hall and the NED would have access for deliveries. The Director of the Built Environment acknowledged that officers had not undertaken as much public consultation as they would have liked, due to COVID. A wider stakeholder engagement plan was being prepared between now and early 2021. Major premises such as Grocers' Hall and the NED would have the same access as they did at present.
- The Chairman concluded discussion by requesting that the Gateway 5 report include a section on risk arising from the impact of temporary COVID interventions into the street scene, and a section of what non-statutory engagement had been and would be undertaken.

RESOLVED, that Members,

- Agree that the project continues at the outlined pace to submit a Gateway 5 in September/October 2021 as per paragraphs 5-6 of the report.
- Approve that Design **Option 1** is taken forward to detailed design (the closure of Threadneedle Street and further restriction of Queen Victoria Street and Princes Street).
- Agree that further investigation into permitting general traffic on the 'open arms' during the current restricted hours is not carried forward for further investigation.
- Approve a budget of **£541,935** to reach the next gateway, giving a cumulative budget of **£1,923,410** after allowing for the underspend to date of **£201,983**.
- Approve that funding for this budget be partially met from unspent S106 deposits arising from the underspend to date, with the balance of **£339,953** to be drawn down from the central funding agreed in principle via the 2020/21 annual capital bid process, subject to the approval of the Resource Allocation Sub Committee.
- Note the total estimated cost of the project at **£5-5.6 million** (excluding risk)
- Approve a Costed Risk Provision of **£95,000** (to be drawn down via delegation to Chief Officer) subject to the Resource Allocation Sub Committee approval to draw this down from the capital funds if necessary.
- Agree that Gateway 4c Detailed Design is approved via Streets and Walkways Sub Committee and the Projects Sub Committee.

10. **GATEWAY 5 ISSUE - BEECH STREET TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC REALM PROJECT**

Members considered a Gateway 5 issue report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding the Beech Street Transportation and Public Realm Project and the following points were made.

- The Director of the Built Environment noted that the report had been approved by the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee. The request for

an increased budget was due to an increase in staff costs for an unanticipated scale of engagement, the extension of the programme by six months due to COVID, and a legal challenge.

RESOLVED, that Members,

- Approve an increase in the project budget of £200,000 to cover the estimated additional staff costs (£160k) and the estimated additional fees (£40k).
- Approve the purchase of a spare enforcement camera (from the existing budget)
- Approve a revised Costed Risk Provision (CRP) up to a total of £260,000 (Appendix 2) to account for the currently identified risks
- Delegate authority to the Director of the Built Environment, in consultation with the Chamberlain to draw down the costed risk provision if risks become issues and make any adjustments between elements of the approved budget, provided the total approved budget is not exceeded.
- Subject to the final two bullet points set out below, approve £50k to create two gaps in Beech Street central reservation to allow vehicles accessing Lauderdale Place forecourt and Shakespeare House / Defoe House car park to travel eastbound and perform a right hand turn.
- Subject to the final two bullet points set out below, note the request for residents who have car parking spaces around Beech Street to be exempted from the ETO so that they may drive through Beech Street in any vehicle, and note Streets and Walkways' approval to request officers to undertake a feasibility study to explore the legal, statutory, operational framework and cost implications of such a permitting scheme, approving £20k for the purpose.
- Note that any decision to make the proposed modification/s is subject to a road safety audit, consultation with the Chief Officer of City Police and the applicable statutory notice arrangement.
- Delegate authority to the Director of the Built Environment to consider the safety audit/s; response of the Police and responses to the publication of the proposals, and subject to such consideration, to make the modification/s if deemed appropriate.

11. GATEWAY 5 - CURSITOR STREET / BREAMS BUILDINGS PUBLIC REALM IMPROVEMENTS

Members considered a Gateway 5 report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding Cursitor Street / Breams Buildings Public Realm Improvements and the following points were made.

- The Director of the Built Environment noted that since the previous Gateway it had become clear that Breams Buildings required less intervention than anticipated, and Cursitor Street required more intervention than anticipated. Therefore it was proposed to move funds between the two projects within the same overall financial envelope.
- The Chairman noted that the Chancery Lane Association was engaged with the projects.

RESOLVED, that Members,

- Approve the proposed reconfiguration of current funding allocation for Cursitor Street (£240,934) and Breams Buildings (£239,832) a total of £480,766. (Section 106 agreements require that the interest be used for the same purpose as the principal sum).
- Approve that the existing funding allocation for Cursitor Street and Breams Buildings be reconfigured as follows: Cursitor Street (£371,647) and Breams Buildings (£109,119), a total allocation of £480,766. (Section 106 agreements require that the interest be used for the same purpose as the principal sum).
- Agree authorisation to increase the current approved budget of £10,000 for Cursitor Street by £6,048 to cover the overspend as per Appendix 4, Table 1.
- Agree authorisation to adjust the current approved budget of £40,000 for Breams Buildings to reflect the spend as per Appendix 4, Table 2.
- Approve Authority to start work on Cursitor Street (Phase 1) at a total of £355,599, as detailed the funding strategy in Appendix 4.
- Approve Authority to start work on Breams Buildings (Phase 2) at a total of £80,262, as detailed the funding strategy in Appendix 4.

12. GATEWAY 5 - ST BARTHOLOMEW'S HOSPITAL ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENTS

Members considered a Gateway 5 report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding St Bartholomew's Hospital Environmental Enhancements.

RESOLVED, that Members,

- Agree authorisation to increase the current approved budget of £30,000 by £3,235 to complete the design evaluation and cover the overspend as per Appendix 3, Table 1.
- Agree authorisation to initiate the delivery of public realm works in the area in 2 phases, funded through St Barts and the London NHS Trust

s106 agreement at a total cost of £532,161 (inclusive of indexation and interest accrued).

- Approve the revised total project budget increase from £400K-£550K to £565,396 and updated budget as per Appendix 3, Table 2.

13. **GATEWAY 4 ISSUE - GLOBE VIEW WALKWAY - OPENING UP AND ENHANCING THE RIVERSIDE WALK**

Members considered a Gateway 4 Issue report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding Globe View Walkway – Opening up and enhancing the Riverside Walk and the following points were made.

- The Director of the Built Environment confirmed that TfL had withdrawn its funding for the project in May 2020 in order to focus on its COVID response across Greater London. Officers had therefore identified alternative funding sources, primarily s106 monies.

RESOLVED, that Members,

- Approve option one (continue with design development and utilise additional s106 funds) for the allocation of £94,000 funds from the Bath House S106 obligation (public transport improvements) to reach the next Gateway.

14. **GATEWAY 2 - 1-2 BROADGATE SECTION 278 HIGHWAY WORKS**

Members considered a Gateway 2 report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding 1-2 Broadgate s278 highway works, noting that the project was entirely developer funded.

RESOLVED, that Members,

- Approve a budget of £50,000 for design and evaluation to reach the next Gateway;
- Note the total cost of the project is estimated to be between £750,000-£900,000 (excluding risk).

15. **GATEWAY 3/4 - CREED COURT S278**

Members considered a Gateway 3/4 report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding Creed Court s278 and the following points were made.

- The Director of the Built Environment noted that a number of options had been explored with the developer, but the recommended option was considered to be the only viable one to put forward to Members.

RESOLVED, that Members,

- Authorise officers to utilise £100,000 invoiced to the developer to progress the project to Gateway 5 (see section 3 table 1 below), in

advance of the full S.278 payment. The amount will be deducted from the full S.278 payment.

- Authorise officers, subject to receipt of the requested funds, to progress with detailed designs of the recommended option outlined below and fully funded by Section 278 agreement with the developer of Creed Court and undertake public consultation.
- Note, that as per the Projects Procedure and subject to scope and costs remaining within the parameters agreed in this report, the approval of Gateway 5 report will be delegated to Chief Officer.
- Note the total estimated cost of the project at £667,546 - £800,000 (excluding risk).

16. GATEWAY 6 - WEST SMITHFIELD PEDESTRIAN ACCESSIBILITY IMPROVEMENTS

Members considered a Gateway 6 report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding West Smithfield Pedestrian Accessibility Improvements and the following points were made.

- The Chairman noted that stakeholder engagement during the project had been positive, and that one lesson learned was that ground radar surveys should have been undertaken earlier. Costed risk provision should be utilised to mitigate risks such as this in future.

RESOLVED, that Members,

- Approve the content of the outcome report and agree the project be closed.
- Approve that any unspent Section 106 funding is returned to be reallocated following usual processes.

17. GATEWAY 6 - CONCRETE TESTING & REPAIRS TO GOLDEN LANE AND MIDDLESEX STREET ESTATES

Members considered a Gateway 6 report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding concrete testing and repairs to Golden Lane and Middlesex Street Estates.

RESOLVED, that Members,

- Note the contents of the report, note the lessons learned, and authorise the closure of the project.

18. GATEWAY 6 - DECENT HOMES AT DRON HOUSE, GOLDEN LANE, SOUTHWARK, SYDENHAM, WINDSOR AND YORK WAY ESTATES

Members considered a Gateway 6 report of the Director of Community and Children's Services regarding Decent Homes at Dron House, Golden Lane, Southwark, Sydenham, Windsor and York Way Estates.

RESOLVED, that Members,

- Note the contents of the report, note the lessons learned, and authorise the closure of the project.

19. GATEWAY 6 - CONCRETE REPAIRS AT CULLUM WELCH HOUSE

Members considered a Gateway 6 report of the Director of Community and Children's Services regarding concrete repairs to Cullum Welch House and the following points were made.

- The Director of Community and Children's Services noted that for this project and similar projects considered at Items 17 and 18 on the agenda that day, the projects had been delivered under budget but secondary procurement exercises and increased contractor engagement had been necessary. A number of measures had been implemented on the Decent Homes project (Item 18) to ensure better contract management and prevent cost variations.
- The Chamberlain noted that deep dives were conducted on a number of projects such as this, with some of the lessons learned captured within this report. These included the fact that transferring design and build on to the contractor made them very cautious when seeking to deliver the project. Key learning points included the provision of as much documentation as possible when assigning risk to the contractor, and ensuring the City was clear on underlying assumptions when receiving bids. Moreover there had been a tendency for procurement to be squeezed due to time pressures. Lastly, it was clear that contractor performance should be managed as far as was possible by the service and via the agreed contract.
- The Chairman requested that these lessons learned be incorporated into the Project Management Academy.

RESOLVED, that Members note the contents of the report, note the lessons learned, and approve the closure of the project.

20. GATEWAY 3 ISSUE - TOWER BRIDGE HV SYSTEM REPLACEMENT AND INCREASING RESILIENCE

Members considered a Gateway 3 Issue report of the City Surveyor regarding Tower Bridge HV System Replacement and Increasing Resilience. The Chairman highlighted this report as an example of best practice and noted he had thanked the report author accordingly. Members noted the non-public appendix detailing financial information at Item 26.

RESOLVED, that Members,

- Approve that the project proceed straight to Detailed Design stage (G4c), noting the G4c will be approved by the Planning & Transportation Committee and Project Sub Committee.
- Approve an additional budget of **£431,095** for professional fees required between Gateway 4 and Gateway 4c and for the first payment to UKPN for the installation of the new HV intake.
- Note the revised approved budget will be **£760,155** (excluding risk).
- Approve a Costed Risk Provision of **£355,000** for Gateway 4 to Gateway 4c.

21. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE

Timeline for Gateway 6 Reporting

In response to a question, it was confirmed that Gateway 6 reports should be completed within six months of work being completed on site. The City Surveyor acknowledged that this target had been missed on the City of London Freemen's School Enabling Works project but noted this was largely due to COVID and the temporary suspension of Gateway 6 reports to Committee. The Gateway 6 report for the Freemen's School Enabling Works was scheduled for November 2020.

22. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT
Request for Delegated Authority – Vehicle Procurement for Animal Reception Centre

The Town Clerk noted that officers at the Animal Reception Centre at Heathrow wished to procure a vehicle which triggered the threshold for the project procedure. Given it was a start and finish procurement exercise rather than a project Members were content to provide delegated authority to the Town Clerk to deal with the matter, noting that the procurement would be scrutinised by a relevant officer-level procurement group.

RESOLVED, that delegated authority be given to the Town Clerk to approve the procurement of a vehicle for the Animal Reception Centre, Heathrow.

23. 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.

24. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

RESOLVED, that the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2020 be approved.

25. NON-PUBLIC ACTIONS

Members considered a report of the Town Clerk regarding non-public actions.

26. **NON-PUBLIC APPENDIX 3 TO ITEM 20 - TOWER BRIDGE HV SYSTEM REPLACEMENT AND INCREASING RESILIENCE**
RESOLVED, that the non-public appendix to Item 20 – Gateway 3 Issue Tower Bridge HV System Replacement and Increasing Resilience be received.
27. **REPORT ON ACTION TAKEN**
Members considered a report of the Town Clerk regarding action taken.
28. **PROPERTY PROJECTS GROUP - COVID-19 UPDATE**
The City Surveyor provided an COVID-19 update regarding the Property Projects Group.
29. **GATEWAY 3 - PHASE 2, 3 & 4 - CITY OF LONDON SCHOOL MASTERPLAN**
Members considered a Gateway 3 report of the City Surveyors regarding – Phase 2,3 and 4 of the City of London School Masterplan.
30. **GATEWAY 3/4/5 - GUILDHALL ART GALLERY - CLOAKROOM & LAVATORIES REFURBISHMENT**
Members considered a Gateway 3/4/5/ report of the City Surveyor regarding the Guildhall Art Gallery – Cloakroom and Lavatories Refurbishment.
31. **GATEWAY 1/2/3/4 - PENSION ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM PROCUREMENT**
Members considered a Gateway 1/2/3/4 report of the Chamberlain regarding Pension Administration System Procurement.
32. **GATEWAY 1/2/3/4 - RENEWAL OF FLAT ROOF COVERINGS (VARIOUS HOUSING BLOCKS OF FLATS)**
Members considered a Gateway 1/2/3/4 report of the Director of Community and Children's Services regarding Renewal of Flat Roof Coverings (Various Housing Blocks of Flats).
33. **GATEWAY 6 (EARLY CLOSURE) - FINSBURY CIRCUS GARDEN REINSTATEMENT - PREVIOUS SCHEME**
Members considered a Gateway 6 (Early Closure) report of the City Surveyor regarding Finsbury Circus Garden Reinstatement – Previous Scheme.
34. **CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT WORKS & PROJECTS**
Members considered a report of the Executive Director, Mansion House and Central Criminal Court regarding Central Criminal Court Works and Projects.
35. **PORTFOLIO OVERVIEW**
Members considered a Portfolio Overview report of the Town Clerk.
- 35.1 **Project Status Report - Video Management System (iMS-DRS)**

Members considered a project status report of the Commissioner regarding the Video Management System (iMS-DRS).

35.2 Project Status Report - HR Integrated Time Management and e-Expenses Project

Members considered a project status report of the Commissioner regarding the HR Integrated Time Management and e-Expenses Project.

36. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE

There were no non-public questions.

37. 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 other business in non-public session.

The meeting closed at 12.45 pm

Chairman

**Contact Officer: Alistair MacLellan / 020 7332 1416 /
alistair.maclellan@cityoflondon.gov.uk**

This page is intentionally left blank

RESOURCE ALLOCATION SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Thursday, 22 October 2020

Minutes of the meeting of the Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources)
Committee held at Virtual Meeting on Thursday, 22 October 2020 at 12.00 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chair)
Jeremy Mayhew (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Keith Bottomley
Tijs Broeke
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Anne Fairweather
Sheriff Christopher Hayward
Shravan Joshi

Alderman Vincent Keaveny
Deputy Edward Lord
Alderman Ian Luder
Deputy Tom Sleigh
Sir Michael Snyder
Deputy James Thomson
Alderman Sir David Wootton

In Attendance

Helen Fentimen
Marianne Fredericks
Graeme Harrower
Barbara Newman

Officers:

Caroline Al-Beyerty	- Deputy Chamberlain
John Barradell	- Town Clerk & Chief Executive
Michael Cogher	- Comptroller & City Solicitor
Peter Kane	- Chamberlain
Dianne Merrifield	- Chamberlains
Greg Moore	- Town Clerks
Chrissie Morgan	- HR
Sanjay Odedra	- Communications
Angela Roach	- Assistant Town Clerk
Paul Wilkinson	- City Surveyor
Aqib Hussain	- IT
Joseph Anstee	- Town Clerks
Emma Cunningham	- Town Clerks

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Karina Dostalova.

The Policy Chair took the opportunity to ask the Sub-Committee whether they would be content to reduce the frequency of these meetings, whilst making

sure they were still in line with the governance review timetable. Members were in agreement of this approach.

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

There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee meeting held on 19 September 2020 were agreed as a correct record.

4. CAPITAL FUNDING UPDATE

The Sub-Committee considered a paper of the Chamberlain proposing the release of £5.42m for five schemes, which had previously received 'in principle' approval via the 2020/21 annual capital bids or was agreed for progression outside of the fundamental review.

RESOLVED, that:-

- The five schemes listed in Table 1 of the report be reviewed in the context of the current crisis and confirmed that they should receive continued essential priority for release of funding at this time.
- An increase of £250k in the central funding be agreed and allocated to the Frobisher Crescent fire safety works to be offset by a compensating reduction in the car park fire safety funding allocation.
- The release of up to £5.42m be agreed for the five schemes from the reserves of City Fund and City's Cash as set out in Table 1, subject to the approval of the relevant gateway reports.

5. CAPITAL FUNDING - PRIORITISATION OF 2021/22 ANNUAL CAPITAL BIDS - INITIAL REVIEW

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Chamberlain concerning the prioritisation of 2021/22 Annual Capital Bids.

The Deputy Chamberlain outlined the extent of the submissions in the report, which totalled £105m, which was an increase since last year. Members heard how affordability, in the present context, was more challenging and how there had been some concerns about how the ranking of schemes had been undertaken at officer level.

A Member observed that, despite the recent approval of the Climate Action Strategy, there were some environmentally friendly bids which did not have a green RAG rating. The Deputy Chamberlain explained that these projects would be assessed by the Climate Action Strategy team.

The Policy Chair then conveyed the concerns that the Chair of Audit and Risk Committee had emailed about concerning the health and safety risks of the glass canopy at Smithfield Market and to request emergency provision of funding to support this work. Members felt strongly that this needed to be progressed urgently. The City Surveyor explained the extent of the works required included removing the concrete canopies and gutters (funded through

existing budgets) and the need to install new glass panels at a cost in the region of £150k + VAT. Members then discussed the interim health and safety measures while waiting for the glass panels to be replaced and whether that section of the market should be closed to prevent any further threat of injury or death to the general public. The Chair and Deputy Chairman indicated they would be very willing to consider a request under urgency provisions if emergency funding was required.

RESOLVED, that:-

- It be noted that the total value of bids amounting to £146m of which £27.5m were to be funded from existing local resources and £13.5m which did not meet the capital criteria and would need to be funded from revenue resources.
- It be agreed that the remaining £105m of capital bids was currently unsustainable and therefore Chief Officers, in consultation with Service Committee Chairs, be requested to further consider ranking of schemes to identify the most critical bids, with innovation and reputational impact uppermost.
- Subject to the outcome of Chief Officer rankings, it be agreed 'in principle' that bids with a final RAG rating of amber and red be deferred.
- It be noted that the Climate Action Strategy bids would be subject to further review to confirm the priority of proposals.
- It be noted that options for revenue funding of the Climate Action revenue bids that do not meet the capital criteria (currently £13.5m) will be brought forward in December.

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

A question was asked as follows:-

2021/22 budget process

A question was raised requesting confirmation that, as part of the 2020/21 budget process, the City Corporation would look at the level and value for money of all the grants the City Corporation provided, including those which might not directly or nominally fall under departmental budgets. In particular there was reference to the grants given within the educational model. The Policy Chair confirmed that this was being looked into.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There was no other urgent business.

8. 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 the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Item No.

9, 10, 12
15

Paragraph No.

3
3, 4

9. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The non-public minutes of the meeting held on 18 September 2020 were approved as a correct record.

10. **NOTE OF THE INFORMAL MEETING**

The note of the informal meeting on 7 October 2020 was received.

11. **DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES
COMMERCIAL TENANTS AND COVID 19 - PROPOSAL FOR ADDITIONAL
SUPPORT IN THE SEPTEMBER QUARTER**

This item was withdrawn.

12. **REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN**

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

RESOLVED, that:-

- The actions taken since the last meeting of the Sub-Committee be noted.

13. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

14. **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 other urgent business.

15. **CONFIDENTIAL NOTE OF THE INFORMAL MEETING**

The confidential note of the informal meeting held on 7 October 2020 be received.

The meeting ended at 1.00 pm

Chair

Contact Officer: Emma Cunnington
tel. no.: 020 7332 1413
emma.cunnington@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Tackling Racism Taskforce

A public summary of the Tackling Racism Taskforce's meeting held on 16 October 2020.

The Tackling Racism Taskforce held its sixth meeting on 16 October 2020 with a focus on **education**.

The City Corporation's Strategic Education & Skills Director gave an overview of the areas for action that the Taskforce could focus on, such as:

- a) Lobbying for more inclusive forms of evaluation and assessment
- b) Continued research on wellbeing and adaptive practices for equalities groups
- c) Proactively diversify school governing bodies through recruitment practices
- d) Lobbying for inclusive curriculum design and addressing some recent national curriculum changes, which may have resulted in some negative changes.
- e) Providing greater access to pupil wellbeing, counselling and family support.

The Taskforce then had a detailed discussion where the following points were made:-

- Overall, the schools were doing a really good job in this area but there was no room for complacency.
- It would be useful to have the demographic statistics of pupils in the City Corporation's selective schools.
- It was important to consider the language used when advertising for school governors to attract diverse candidates with the right skills. The alumni community could be an important source of candidates for school governor roles. Age diversity for school governors was also important.
- Black writers needed to be embedded across the curriculum – this was something the City Corporation could lobby for. One Member suggested that the curriculum be devolved to reflect the diversity of London. The CEO of the City of London Academies Trust (CoLAT) explained that, despite the constraints of the National Curriculum, the academies had been teaching about the role of BAME individuals in English Literature, Science and History.
- There was a disparity in funding from the City of London Corporation to the independent schools in comparison to the academies, as highlighted in the Tomlinson Review. This should be looked at.
- Generally, across the country, there seemed to be disproportionate impact on black Caribbean boys and white, working-class boys in terms of exclusions. Following a further discussion on exclusions, it was noted that any exclusion was always a last resort and also had to be taken when considering other pupils' ability to learn without distraction.
- There should be better partnership working in this area between the independent schools and the academies.
- High stakes examinations induced anxiety for pupils and this may affect their wellbeing.
- Raising standards and aspirations was the only real way to increase outcomes.
- Whilst some Members felt it was important that schools be left to concentrate on getting through the fallout of the pandemic, others felt that it was important

to keep shining a spotlight on this area to ensure that all pupils, whatever their ethnicity, recover from the pandemic, equally.

- It was important to look at what other initiatives were in place, such as the Financial Services Skills Commission, and see where the City of London Corporation could add value.
- The role of bursaries, philanthropy and endowments should not be underestimated in helping educational outcomes. The City Corporation may be able to do more to financially support the academies, such as a City Giving Day.

Members of the Taskforce requested that the most recent exclusion data report be sent to the Taskforce for information.

The Taskforce also acknowledged that there were other governing bodies, such as the Education Board and the Board of Governors for the independent schools, in this space and so the Taskforce should not overstep its boundaries.

The Taskforce concluded that it would focus on:

- Bringing together initiatives on tackling racism across the family of schools
- Drawing together some common themes, including clear outcomes and timelines, such as:
 - Data on exclusions and diversity within schools
 - Governor diversity and linking schools with alumni
 - Curriculum – can the Taskforce support something specific
 - Funding – can the City Corporation support particular initiatives financially
 - Improve diversity and unconscious bias training for governors and staff

The Taskforce agreed to have two additional sessions on education: one to focus on independent schools and state schools, and the other to focus on cultural and creative learning and skills and adult learning.

For any enquiries to the Tackling Racism Taskforce, please contact emma.cunnington@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Tackling Racism Taskforce

A public summary of the Tackling Racism Taskforce's meeting held on 30 October 2020.

The Tackling Racism Taskforce held its eighth meeting on 30 October 2020 with a focus on **adult skills and cultural and creative learning (education)**.

Firstly, the City Corporation's Strategic Education & Skills Director directed the Taskforce with the paper's section on adult skills, which suggested that consideration be given to the following areas:

- a) Providing accessible work experience opportunities in the City and beyond
- b) Increase efforts to encourage apprenticeship applications from BAME learners and ensure these convert in proportion to appointments.
- c) Continued 'reach-out' offers for community learning, using community engagement and family learning to support children and their families.
- d) Continued development around fusion skills for all across lifelong learning.

The Taskforce heard about some of the work (both accredited and non-accredited) that the City Corporation had provided, such as food hygiene courses for Bangladeshi women. There was also some discussion on the Family Learning Festival which helped the whole family (both children and parents) with a range of learning activities.

Similarly, the City Corporation had a particular focus on apprenticeships in recent years with BAME representation in 2020/21 cohort of 41%. The Taskforce heard how the London Careers Festival, which connected individuals to a range of apprenticeship opportunities, had been very successful.

The Chief Executive Officer of the City of London Academies Trust also presented information on a new pre-Apprenticeship Academy for young people who may otherwise have been permanently excluded. He added that the Taskforce may wish to consider whether they could recommend that the City Corporation provide financial support to this initiative, as this is currently being funded by the Schools directly (and match-funded by pupil premium). On the whole, Members were enthusiastic about the scheme and, following questions, it was clear that this programme was different from a Pupil Referral Unit.

It was also suggested that the Taskforce should encourage Members and senior officers to volunteer with mentoring of these children.

Following this, the Taskforce then heard about the Cultural and Creative Learning work and watched a YouTube video giving a small idea of what initiatives were being undertaken during Black History Month, where a Black Londoner responded to one of our cultural items. It was reported that many teachers did not feel confident teaching on Black or ethnic minority curriculum and asked that the Taskforce consider what they could do to improve professional development for teachers. Similarly, it was noted that not all children were able to visit the cultural institutions and the Culture Mile Schools Visits Fund aimed to overcome this.

Members of the Taskforce then had separate conversations into breakout rooms and fed back the following points:

- Apprenticeships are extremely important, and there is sometimes still resistance as universities hold a certain status. Working and learning, however, is important for children that have outgrown school.
- There is a need to increase mentoring for students.
- The dots need to be connected between the work that the Barbican are doing and Culture Mile learning
- Continual Professional Development (CPD) is an important aspect for teachers alongside peer mentoring groups.
- The Fusion Skills work, encouraging parents and parental engagement in education is vital.

The Co-Chair concluded the discussion to underline how the Taskforce will build on a fantastic foundation of work in this area. In particular, the Taskforce could look at what financial support could be offered to the pre-Apprenticeship Academy and to offer and promote mentoring by Members and officers to young people. The Taskforce also highlighted the important work of the Culture Mile Learning team to help children access and be exposed to cultural institutions.

Separately, the Taskforce also briefly discussed the use of the term BAME and concluded that it should be used in the final report as it is the term used and recognised nationwide. The report should, however, address that the term is not cohesive and must be broken down into the separate groups when necessary.

Finally, the Taskforce considered a report listing the external experts that the Co-Chairs and Members of the Taskforce had liaised with, and noted that due to the amount of sessions remaining, the final report would be submitted to the January 2021 meetings of the Policy and Resources Committee and Establishment Committee, rather than December 2020.

For any enquiries to the Tackling Racism Taskforce, please contact emma.cunnington@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Tackling Racism Taskforce

A public summary of the Tackling Racism Taskforce's meeting held on 6 November 2020.

The Tackling Racism Taskforce held its ninth meeting on 6 November 2020 with a focus on **independent and state schools (education)**.

The Taskforce considered a report of the Strategic Education & Skills Director and heard from representatives from the City of London School, the City of London School for Boys and the City of London Freeman's School on the work they were doing to tackle racism and where there were still issues that required the help of the Taskforce.

Members of the Taskforce then discussed how important it was for everyone to understand the mental health burden on students on tackling racism. The Co-Chairs also asked for more detail on data and particularly on what success would look like for the schools. A Member of the Taskforce also suggested that each governing body had a lead Member responsible for diversity and inclusion.

The Taskforce and external guests then discussed this topic further in breakout rooms and fed back the following points:-

- The key area that the Taskforce should focus on is recruitment and retention of a diverse range of staff and governors, as well as career progression. Consideration should be given to the introduction of teacher apprenticeships.
- It was important that the curriculum did not portray black and minority ethnic people as 'victims' but tell a positive story.
- The Taskforce could encourage more joined up partnership working, e.g. between the City of London Police and the family of schools
- One group felt that bursaries at the independent schools could be advertised to academies and change the conversation, so it was less about 'class' or 'race' and more about education itself.
- It was also felt important to ensure that equality and inclusion training, as well as difficult conversations training, was rolled out to all staff.
- There should be a focus on work experience placements and consider not always giving the most 'capable' student a placement, but those where there would be most impact.

In the final wrap up discussions, it was underlined again how important it was to recognise that coming from a BAME background did not automatically mean you would be disadvantaged in the education world, and it was important that social mobility work was not ignored as part of this work.

There was also a brief conversation about the importance of having these sorts of conversations about race, even though they can sometimes feel uncomfortable.

For any enquiries to the Tackling Racism Taskforce, please contact emma.cunnington@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee:	Date:
Policy and Resources	19 November 2020
Subject: Electoral Registration Update	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	3, 4, and 10
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	Y
If so, how much?	To be determined
What is the source of Funding?	Committee Contingency
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	Y
Report of: Town Clerk and Chief Executive	For Decision
Report author: Charlotte Gordon, Elections and City Occupiers Database Manager	

Summary

Due in part to the adverse impact the COVID-19 pandemic was having on the City Corporation's ability to compile the Ward Lists, undertake the canvassing activities associated with it as well as the schedule of promotional activities planned to encourage businesses and residents to register to vote ahead of the 2021 elections, the Policy and Resources Committee agreed in July that the all-out Ward elections should be postponed from March 2021 to March 2022. This was subsequently supported by the Court of Common Council and an Act of Common Council was made to formally effect the change.

The Committee has acknowledged that the change of date presents the City Corporation with an opportunity to improve the registration process and encourage greater participation in the City elections. This was reinforced at the last meeting where Members were keen for the digitisation of the registration process and more innovative communication with businesses and residents to be explored. In July it was also suggested that the City should also consider taking the lead in modernising the current voting process and investigate the possibility introducing electronic voting.

This report therefore:-

- Updates Members on voter registration, including the proposals for widening electronic registration;
- Addresses the issue of electronic voting;
- Reminds Members of the promotional activities previously agreed to encourage businesses and residents to register. It also includes a couple of other areas of activity you might wish to consider;
- Reminds the Committee of the promotional campaign to encourage a diverse range of candidates to stand in the 2022 City elections;
- welcomes any further suggestions which you feel might assist in the lead up to the all-out elections.

- asks the Committee to agree that the previously agreed allocation of £127,000 from the Committee's contingency to meet the cost of the promotional activities be transferred from 2020/21 to 2021/22.

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

1. Note the report.
2. agree that the previously agreed allocation of £127,000 from the Committee's contingency to meet the cost of the promotional activities be transferred from 2020/21 contingency to 2021/22.
3. Consider the additional activities referred to in paragraphs 25 to 30 of this report. Should any be supported, note that a more detailed report on some of the activities including the cost will need to be considered.
4. Consider whether there are any further activities which could be considered.

Main Report

Background

1. At its meeting in July the Committee agreed to the postponement of the all-out Ward elections from March 2021 to March 2022. This was in part due to the adverse impact the COVID-19 pandemic was having on the City Corporation's ability to compile the Ward Lists, complete the database of businesses with the relevant degree of accuracy, undertake canvassing activities and the planned schedule of promotional activities planned to encourage businesses and residents to register to vote ahead of the 2021 elections. An Act of Common Council was subsequently made by the Court to effect the change.
2. As part of its deliberations in the summer, the Committee acknowledged that the change of date would present an opportunity to improve the registration process and encourage greater participation in City elections. This was reiterated at the last meeting where Members were keen for the digitisation of the registration process and more innovative communication with businesses and residents to be explored. In July it was also suggested that the City should also consider taking the lead in modernising the current voting process and investigate the possibility of introducing electronic voting.
3. A programme of promotional activities was agreed earlier this year to raise awareness of voter registration in readiness for the then 2021 Ward Elections and, as part of the City Corporation's efforts to enhance the diversity of the Court of Common Council, this included activities to encourage people from a diverse range of backgrounds to consider standing for election. As a result of the pandemic this work will now be pursued next year in the lead up to the elections in 2022.

Current Position

4. The timetable for the preparation and publication of the Ward Lists is fixed as set out in section 7 of the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1957. The qualification date for inclusion on the Ward List is 1 September each year.

5. The Town Clerk is required to make house to house or other sufficient inquiries as to persons entitled to vote in Ward elections. This involves sending voter registration forms to every eligible business in the City of London and every residential address. This activity has been interrupted by the COVID-19 pandemic and since April the City Occupiers Database team has been working remotely to compile an accurate, up to date Ward list by emailing existing business contacts. In addition, the team have made use of the Companies House website and data held by the City Corporation's Business Rates department.
6. Provisional Ward Lists must nevertheless be prepared and published by 30 November each year to enable any claims or objections to be considered. The final Ward Lists must then be published by 15 February and these are the definitive lists of persons entitled to vote in Ward elections held between 16 February and 15 February in the following year.
7. The postponed all-out Ward elections in March 2022 will therefore use the Ward Lists compiled in Autumn 2021 to identify the eligible voters.
8. The current number of voters is 19,200. This is made up of 6,484 residential voters and 12,716 business voters. The Ward Lists have grown steadily over the past two years. In 2018/19 there were 18,631 voters and in 2019/20 there were 18,829 voters. At the all-out elections in March 2017, there were 18,983 voters. It is important to ensure that as many voters remain on the Ward Lists for the March 2022 elections, as well as identifying other eligible voters and encouraging them to register.
9. The number of businesses appointing voters was 3,120 (out of a possible 7,615). This compares with 3,304 businesses appointing voters (out of a possible 7,441) for the 2019/20 Ward List.
10. With regard to potential candidates, the Elections Office maintains a list of people who have expressed interest in standing for election in future who are notified of all forthcoming elections including the all-out elections. 119 people are currently on the list.
11. In terms of encouraging greater diversity, the Committee has acknowledged that more needs to be done to improve the current situation and a more high-profile campaign to encourage as diverse a range of candidates as possible to stand for the 2022 City elections has been approved. Further details are referred to below.
16. Ahead of the all-out Common Councillor elections in March 2021 a series of activities to promote voter registration, the work of the City Corporation and to raise awareness of the elections were agreed earlier this year at a cost of £127,000 to be met from the Committee's contingency. As a result of the pandemic and the subsequent change of date of the election to 2022, these activities will now take place next year and it is proposed that the funds are now transferred from the 2020/21 contingency to 2021/22.

Impact of Remote Working on Registration

17. Due to the pandemic most office-based employees are now working remotely. This is likely to have an impact on qualification and voting numbers in the long term. In the summer, the Committee was advised that virtual offices do not have any voting rights. This is because qualifying bodies must ordinarily occupy as owner or tenant the whole or part of any premises in that ward. 'Occupying' means occupying premises by personal physical presence there (which can be through a director, officer, employee, agent or office holder) for the purpose of carrying on any trade, business, profession or other occupation or calling. The right to appoint voters then depends on the size of the workforce. 'Workforce' means all those persons whose principal or only place of work on the qualifying date is ordinarily those premises occupied by the qualifying body. Additionally, one of the categories of person who may be appointed as a voter by a qualifying body is employees whose principal or only place of work is within the City and has been for the whole of the twelve months preceding that qualifying date.
18. At that time the Committee was advised that a temporary total absence from the office would not lead to disenfranchisement, so long as it was intended that workers would return to the premises in question as their principal or only place of work following the relaxation of the pandemic restrictions, and that workers temporarily working from home could be included in the workforce size and the calculation for the number of voters that each business can appoint. This is in the same way that a period of absence due to illness or holiday or temporary work commitments elsewhere, even if this includes the qualifying date, does not affect eligibility to vote, as long as the overall requirements are still satisfied.
19. However, it is becoming increasingly clear that even in the longer term it is unlikely that all businesses will return to their previous numbers of employees working in their buildings at the same time. One business has already indicated its plans to continue remote working in future and is expecting that the maximum number of staff in its building at any one time will be about 50% of its previous workforce. As a result, it will be looking to sublet any excess space.
20. It was possible prior to the pandemic to count employees who worked from home for a proportion of the time and this is still the case. So long as employees have a particular City office as their principal or only place of work on 1 September 2021 then they will still count towards the workforce there – it is not necessary that they attend the office every working day. Obviously, however, employees who work from home in future without an office base would not be included in the canvass.
21. Further advice has been sought from the Comptroller and City Solicitor and the City Remembrancer and they have advised that, for the time being, legislation must be applied as it stands. Local legislation specifically requires a personal physical presence on the premises which are ordinarily the place of work and does not explicitly provide for working from home or multiple locations. The Town Clerk and Chief Executive as the arbiter on Ward List registration (subject to any appeal) has fairly wide discretion or 'margin of appreciation' to take into account the facts of each case and the reason for any absence from the premises in determining whether each of the above tests are met.

Promotional Activities Previously Agreed in the Lead up to March 2022

22. In February, the Committee agreed a number of activities which were scheduled to take place throughout 2020 to increase awareness and promote voter registration and participation. These will now take place in 2021 and are as follows:-

Digital Communications

- The creation of a series of webpages around the theme “CityVote22” which will contain all information relating to the elections including key deadlines, lists of candidates and polling stations and other relevant information;
- Production of a series of YouTube videos promoting the City Corporation, explaining what their vote can influence, voter registration and the elections;
- Creation of an electronic campaign logo for use on email signatures by officers and Members;
- A social media campaign, which can be used to disseminate the YouTube video and other key messages;
- Email communications to business contacts before and during the registration period;
- Send link to YouTube videos to contacts within firms or the footage to imbed in their intranets
- Emails to residential voters to say “Look out for your registration form” during the canvass
- Ask departments across the City Corporation to include the electronic campaign logo or a news item in their regular email newsletters to their contacts in the City
- Promotion at the Guildhall reception areas

Paper Communications

- Production of leaflets, posters, flyers and business cards with the “CityVote22” messaging for use in business and residential voter registration forms, business surveys from the City Occupiers Database team and distribution outside key train stations. It should be noted that this involves physical distribution and will be dependent on the situation at the time.
- Production of posters, leaflets, email templates that contacts within businesses can use to promote the City and voter registration within their business. These will also include a statement encouraging businesses to nominate voters that reflect the make-up of their organisation – from the Chief Executive to regular contractors - as we currently do.
- An advertising campaign in CityAM and City Matters and Corporation publications (City Resident, CityView, ward newsletters and Livery Briefing) – this will involve at least three campaigns in each of these fora throughout 2020. Again, this will now depend on the situation at the time.
- It was agreed previously that a pocket card with fixtures for the Euro 2020 football tournament should be created and given out in key City locations with “CityVote21” branding. Depending on sporting arrangements, we will continue to look to capitalise on any major sporting event with multiple fixtures occurring next year to

promote the City Corporation, its work and elections to be given out at key areas of footfall.

- A letter from the Town Clerk and Chief Executive to business contacts prior to the voter registration process to raise awareness of the registration period
- A letter from the Town Clerk to new voters (both business and residential voters) appointed during the registration period to inform them that they will be a voter in February and will be able to vote at the elections in March, and to encourage them to look out for further information as the elections approach
- A letter from the Lord Mayor to companies that have not responded towards the end of the canvass explaining the importance of appointing voters and participating in the City's democratic process

Informative Events

- Two briefing meetings to be held in the autumn for potential candidates. The aim of this will be to provide candidates with details of the election process, give them the opportunity to ask questions and to hear more about the City Corporation and its work.

Promotional Events

- An early evening reception to be held during Inclusion Week (usually September/October). The purpose of the reception would be to brief and engage a diverse range of networks operating in businesses across the City as well as raise awareness through established contacts in organisations such as the 100% Club and those involved in International Women's Day, Business in the Community Race at Work Charter, the Women in Finance Charter or the Pride flag raising event to promote the City Corporation's work and the benefits of undertaking civic duties.
- As part of efforts to encourage as diverse a range of candidates as possible, a more high-profile campaign across appropriate print channels and in London Underground sites within the City will also take place. For example, this would include large format display adverts in City AM and City Matters newspapers (once a month for four months) and advertising on London Underground escalator panels in stations across the City.

Additional Temporary Staffing

- The employment of two additional temporary members of staff over the canvass and election period (August 2021 to March 2022) to enable extra follow-up work to be undertaken, help to ensure the accuracy of the Ward Lists and ensure there are sufficient resources to administer the elections effectively and efficiently.

Additional measures which could be considered

23. Members are keen for more to be done to improve the registration process and encourage greater participation in the City elections. A number of possible activities have therefore been explored in addition to the programme of promotional events the Committee agreed at the beginning of this year. These are considered in turn below.

Electoral Registration

24. Residents and businesses must return a form each year to remain on the Ward List for the next year. Businesses and residents are sent one initial form and two subsequent reminders throughout the Autumn. Businesses are also able to complete their registration form online through a system operated by the Corporation's IT department. Members have asked the Electoral Services Team to explore ways of increasing the digitisation of the electoral process for both residential and business voters.
25. The City Corporation moved to a new Electoral Management Software system from Democracy Counts in February this year. This new software enables digitisation of the registration process and increased integration of emails that can be used around elections. The new system has an integrated online canvass response system called *Register Securely*. Due to the unique electoral system in the City of London and the requirement to develop the Ward List element of the new software system, it has not been possible to use this for residential properties in the City of London this year. Notwithstanding this, the groundwork has been done in preparation for its use for the canvass in 2021. This will also enable emails to be sent to residents who can then respond online to both the electoral register and ward list canvasses. This should make responding to the canvass a much easier process for residents.

Additional Communication

26. In the absence of a physical canvass for this year, arrangements are being made to contact residents by telephone where those details are held. Prior to this canvass we have only requested the email addresses of the business contacts. All voters have been asked to provide email addresses for the first time in the 2020 canvass. It is not compulsory for voters to provide an email address and, due to the Data Protection Regulations, they could withdraw consent for the Electoral Services Team to contact them by email at any time. The aim will be to include email communication and telephone calls as part of canvass process next year.
27. As mentioned, the Democracy Counts software system provides more integrated digital communication methods. It is therefore also proposed that emails are used in conjunction with postal communications for the 2022 City elections. An email poll card with attached postal vote and proxy vote application forms can be sent to those voters we hold email addresses for and returned digitally.
28. An election newsletter aimed at firms and workers could be created under the banner of a "CityView special edition" which brings together different strands of the campaign: what the City Corporation is and does; why registering is important and how votes can shape the City; why all levels within firms should be represented; encouraging interest in standing for election. It is anticipated that an additional budget in the region of £12,000 -15,000 would be required if Members were minded to support this.
29. Consideration could also be given to an event delivered during either Local Democracy Week or National Democracy Week both of which usually take place in the autumn each year. This could, for example, take the form of an interactive Panel discussion with a cross section of our Members (ensuring we tick all the right boxes) or a webinar encouraging participation in democracy, the importance of electoral registration and

voting. Depending on Members views, precise details would need to be explored further including the cost and submitted for approval.

Online streaming of Wardmotes

30. Wardmotes are held the day before the day of poll in each Ward and must be held in the Ward itself. Turnout at Wardmotes can be low, and yet this is also a key method of finding out where candidates stand on issues and can assist voters in deciding which candidate(s) they would like to cast their vote for. It is proposed that consideration be given to the statements made by candidates at the Wardmotes being recorded and made available on the website or on the Corporation's YouTube channel, so that those voters who are unable to attend the Wardmote are able to access the statements given by candidates and the answers to any questions they respond to. The intention is not to record members of the public and to solely focus on candidates. If Members were supportive of this direction of travel the detailed particulars of the proposal, including the cost, would need to be worked through to ensure that it was viable.

Online Voting

31. At the Committee meeting in July, Members were keen for the City Corporation to consider taking the lead in modernising the voting process. Consequently, officers were asked to investigate possible mechanisms for electronic voting.
32. Electoral online voting would require a change in primary legislation, with the grant of the necessary powers for operating one. The case for granting those powers would therefore need to be made to Parliament's satisfaction. The Cabinet Office was approached to ascertain whether there might be scope to introduce online voting for the City of London. We have been advised that the evidence surrounding the robustness of electronic voting systems is insufficient. Cybersecurity is a critical challenge for internet voting, and current technology was not able to address the range of cybersecurity threats that could undermine online voting. Therefore, the Cabinet Office was not currently looking at online voting as a possible voting solution.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

33. The opportunities presented in this report will assist the City Corporation's vision in terms of its Corporate Plan. It will help the organisation's contribution to a flourishing society by ensuring that when it comes to democracy, people have equal opportunities to enrich their lives in that area. The promotional opportunities and areas of further engagement will help encourage residents and businesses to become more invested in engaging with democracy at a local level.

Climate implications

34. The proposals included in this paper do not carry any significant implications for the Climate Action programme. However, the increasing digitisation of the electoral process will contribute to decreasing the City Corporation's footprint. Production of paper materials will still be required for access to some voters as well as for candidates, but this will be reduced.

Equality Impact Assessment and Public Sector Equality Duty

35. Under the Equality Act 2010, all public bodies have a duty to ensure that when exercising their functions due regard is given to the need to:-

- *eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the 2010 Act;*
- *advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not; and*
- *foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.*

36. In advancing equality of opportunity public bodies also need to have due regard to the need to:-

- *remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics;*
- *take steps to meet the needs of people with certain protected characteristics where these are different from the needs of other people; and*
- *encourage people with certain protected characteristics to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is disproportionately low.*

37. An equality analysis has been undertaken to ensure that any potential negative impact on a particular group of people based on their protected characteristics would be mitigated where possible. Modernising and simplifying the electoral process digitally is a practical step which might encourage more City constituents to participate in the democratic process, including those with protected characteristics, for example, those with mobility issues.

Conclusion

38. Moving the City elections to 2022 presents the City Corporation with an opportunity to improve the registration process by digitising elements of the process and encourage far greater participation in City elections. The approved programme of publicity and events to be held in the period preceding the elections will also assist with this. It is anticipated that activities set out in this report will also enhance communication and encourage a diverse range of candidates to consider standing for election. The Committee's views are sought on the additional areas of activity set out in the report and whether there are other areas the City Corporation ought to consider. It should be noted that it will be necessary to report back on the extra resources which might be required should any of the additional activities be supported.

Appendices

None.

Background Papers

Reports to the Policy and Resources Committee:-

- 20 February 2020 – Common Council Elections in March 2021
- 7 May and 9 July 2020– COVID-19 Implications – possible postponement of the City-Wide elections in March 2021
- 10 September and 8 October 2020 - Common Council Elections Change of Date from March 2021 to March 2022 – Bill for an Act of Common Council

Charlotte Gordon

Electoral Services and City Occupiers Database Manager

T: 020 7332 1430

E: charlotte.gordon@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committee(s): Policy and Resources Committee – For information	Date(s): 19 November 2020
Subject: Census 2021	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	1, 3, 4, 7
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	Yes
If so, how much?	£18,000
What is the source of this funding?	Policy & Resources Contingency Fund
Has this Funding Source been agreed with by the Chamberlain's Department?	Yes
Report of: Town Clerk & Chief Executive	For Decision
Report author: Emma Cunnington, Town Clerk's Stuart O'Callaghan, Built Environment	

Summary

This report provides an update on the census taking place on 21 March 2021 and the City of London Corporation's involvement in supporting and promoting the decennial enumeration.

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- Note the report.
- Approve the cost of £18,000 in the financial year 2021/22 for payment to the GLA regarding the proposals for the 2021 Census Information Scheme to be met from the 2021/22 Policy and Resources Contingency Fund.

Main Report

Background

1. The Office for National Statistics (ONS) is overseeing the census (or decennial enumeration) in March 2021. This census provides the most accurate estimate of all the people and households in England and Wales.
2. The census takes place every ten years. The first census was in 1801 and the latest took place in 2011.

3. The Census (England and Wales) Order, which sets the date of the census, was made (became law) at the May Privy Council on 20 May 2020 meeting following debates and votes in both Houses of Parliament in May.
4. The Census Regulations came into force on 23 June 2020 in England. The Regulations include many of the operational details of the census, as well as exact copies of the paper questionnaires and descriptions of the online questionnaires. They are available to view online: [Census \(England\) Regulations 2020](#).

Current Position

5. The census provides an invaluable set of information for the City of London Corporation to inform policy issues relating to the resident population, workforce, and the profile of travel to work.
6. To aid effective enumeration and engagement of local communities, the ONS will appoint a Census Engagement Manager (CEM) to liaise with the London Borough of Hackney and the City Corporation. The CEM will work with the City Corporation and engage with community leaders to promote the benefit of the census and gain their support for it. They will develop a partnership working plan with the City Corporation that will contain details of agreed activities and support for the census operation.
7. Local authorities designate a Census Liaison Manager (in this case, Angela Roach – Assistant Town Clerk and Director of Member Services) and Assistant Census Liaison Manager (in this case, Stuart O’Callaghan, Built Environment) to lead on assisting in the enumeration through the partnership working plan.
8. Effective enumeration includes contribution from a range of City Corporation services, for identifying residential properties, promoting the census in the City, support for local communities, identifying hard-to-reach groups and providing support to complete the census through the online form.
9. For the Census 2021 unlike previous censuses, when each household was posted a printed census questionnaire, the 2021 Census will be predominantly online - householders will be contacted by letter that will contain a unique internet access code to an on-line form. People can use a variety of devices such as a PC, tablet or mobile phone. However, some households will continue to receive a paper questionnaire, but these too will include a unique access code to be able to make an internet response. Anyone that prefers to fill in a paper questionnaire will still be able to request one and be able to do so.
10. Detailed work for the City of London Corporation is likely to start in November 2020. At this point, an Officer Working Group will be established to include officers from Community and Children’s Services, Built Environment, Electoral Services, Planning, Chamberlain’s (Council Tax), Communications and Town Clerk’s.
11. A national address register for Census enumeration is being compiled for all residential properties. For the City of London all residential property data has now been entered into the Local Land and Property Gazetteer (LLPG) which is cross-

referenced to relevant residential records in the Electoral Register and Council Tax data. This listing of all residential addresses in the City of London is fundamental to a successful Census. However, the use of further existing local knowledge on the likely occupiers will also help achieve a good response.

12. The data and associated analysis provide a corporate benefit for the City Corporation, as data is used by a range of services, including Community and Children's Services, Built Environment, Innovation and Growth and Chamberlains to inform policy and delivery plans. For previous Censuses, the City Corporation has analysed and published a range of Census profile reports for the whole of the City of London area and specific areas within the City, for example population areas based on residential estates such as the Barbican and Golden Lane, and for the workforce areas such as the Eastern Cluster.
13. Data from the Census of Population 2021 is expected to be published from the latter part of 2021/22.
14. To both access and analyse the data effectively, the Greater London Authority (GLA) has brought together the London Local Authorities and the GLA functional bodies in a consortium to acquire, analyse and disseminate information for the 2021 Census. This consortium builds upon the effective consortia that operated for the previous 2001 and 2011 Census. Key benefits for the City Corporation are the training, advocacy for London (e.g. response to government proposals for the Census), briefings on topics themes and data, ability to compare 2021 and 2011 data, historical data series, access to data user group, and ongoing technical and analytical support and advice.
15. The cost for each London Borough and other consortia members is £18,000 per member. This is set out in the proposals for the 2021 Census Information Scheme.
16. As the Census will provide data and analysis to inform service delivery across the City Corporation, it is recommended the cost of £18,000 in the financial year 2021/22 for payment to the GLA regarding the proposals for the 2021 Census Information Scheme is met from central Corporation funds, rather than departmental budgets.

Financial Implications

17. It is proposed that the required funding of £18,000 is to be drawn from the Committee's 2021/22 Contingency Fund categorised and charged to City's Cash. The current uncommitted balance in the 2021/22 Contingency is £300,000 prior to any allowances being made for any other proposals on today's agenda

Conclusion

18. This report summarises an update on the census in 2021 and provides information on how the City Corporation will be supporting the decennial enumeration, which is overseen by the Office of National Statistics.

Emma Cunningham

Head of Chairmen's Support Services, Town Clerk's

E: emma.cunnington@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committee:	Date:
Policy and Resources Committee Court of Common Council	19 November 2020 3 December 2020
Subject: Barbican Centre Board: Review of Composition and Terms of Reference	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Decision

Summary

In 2015, the Barbican Centre Board undertook a review of its general composition and effectiveness, in keeping with governance best practice and in view of the need to ensure a dynamic and diverse Board which could not only provide strategic leadership and challenge for the Centre and its Directors, but was also comprised of key individuals with specific skill sets who could provide more comprehensive guidance and support in important strategic areas. With over five years having elapsed since the last review and, in the wake of recent consideration of various governance issues, in September 2020 the Board considered that it was timely to consider once more the Board's arrangements and determine whether or not they remain fit for purpose, or where improvements might be achieved. This is of particular salience for the Barbican given the challenging circumstances arising from the COVID-19 outbreak, together with other emerging challenges affecting the cultural sector more generally.

Following its deliberations, the Board now wishes to progress changes to:

- its composition and, in particular, its ability to increase the external expertise available to it (by two additional individuals);
- its own rules in relation to term limits, where a lack of clarity had become apparent (applying a consistent nine-year limit on membership); and,
- a minor amendment to the Board's Terms of Reference, to reflect better the Barbican's creative learning activities and the Board's oversight thereof.

Separately, the Board has also determined to pursue the introduction of "Board placements", a scheme by which two young people will be invited to attend meetings as observers. This will increase the diversity of voices at Board meetings whilst also providing experience of non-executive roles to the next generation.

It is noted that the outcomes of Lord Lisvane's comprehensive Governance Review will also reflect on the Barbican Board's governance. The Board's proposals at this stage are intended to be complementary to any Barbican-specific recommendations that emerge from Members' wider consideration of that Review over the longer-term, facilitating the effective implementation of proposals within the context of the Barbican's current needs, whilst also taking into account best practice across the arts sector and comparator institutions.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to approve:

- An alteration to the composition of the Barbican Centre Board, to allow for two additional external Members (see paragraphs 5-11).
- The consistent application of a nine-year term limit across the Barbican Centre Board's membership, applying to all Members (see paragraphs 12-23).
- A clarification in respect of the Board's Terms of Reference in relation to the Barbican's creative learning activities (see paragraphs 24-30).

Main Report

Background

1. In 2015, the Barbican Centre Board reviewed its composition and considered the range of skills and expertise required to make it as effective as possible, resulting in a skills audit and various proposals being adopted, including the introduction of a role description and an increase in the number of external Members on the Board.
2. Given the time that had now elapsed and in the context of an evolving and challenging climate, it was considered timely to review again whether further amendments or improvements might be beneficial.
3. The Board was mindful of the context of the Lisvane Review and that the recommendations therein may take some time to be considered and implemented. Accordingly, the Board wishes to propose amendments that will increase the efficacy of the current arrangements whilst not precluding or cutting across anything that will emerge from that Review.
4. The proposed amendments concern the Board's composition, Terms of Reference, and terms of service.

Proposals

Composition

5. The composition of the Board allows for 20 Members, as follows:
 - 8 Common Councillors directly elected by the Court of Common Council
 - 2 Common Councillors appointed by other City of London Corporation Committees (Policy & Resources and Finance)
 - 2 ex-officio Common Councillors (the Chairs of the Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama and the Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee)
 - 1 ex-officio external Member (the Chair of the Barbican Centre Trust)
 - 7 external Members appointed by the Board in light of the specialist skills and knowledge they possess.
6. The value of the external Members and the particular expertise that they bring, not just to a world-class arts centre but to any commercial enterprise, is much

valued and appreciated by the Board and the Centre. In particular, they have assisted the Barbican greatly in improving its digital offering, approach to diversity, commercial operations, and focus on Creative Learning and the youth offering across London over recent years.

7. The Board has identified that further substantive challenges have now arisen for the Barbican and the cultural sector generally, through both the COVID-19 outbreak and the UK's departure from the European Union. Both present significant operating and financial challenges and it will be vital, in the coming months and years, for the Barbican to enjoy the best strategic leadership and advice possible, to help it navigate these troubled waters. Consequently, it was felt that increasing the pool of external Members at this time would be a prudent step.
8. Whilst the Board's current size is larger than might normally be considered best practice, Members were mindful of its unusual funding and governance arrangements. As an institution of the City Corporation, rather than a distinct entity, it was felt that the Barbican benefits from having a higher than average number of Board Members, due to the requirement to ensure that the interests of the City Corporation are served whilst, at the same time, overseeing the Centre's effective operation and the provision of multi-platform pioneering artistic programmes.
9. Members were also conscious of the importance of retaining an overall majority of Common Council Members, to ensure that a controlling interest in decision-making is retained. The quorum of the Board also requires that Common Councillors be in the majority.
10. It is, therefore, proposed that the number of external Members the Board may appoint be increased from 7 to 9.
11. The current balance of the Board is 12 Common Councillors to 8 External Members (when counting the ex-officio Chair of the Barbican Centre Trust). This change would, therefore, result in a balance of 12 to 10.

Term Limits

12. During 2008/09, the Barbican Board voluntarily introduced term limits for Board Members, consistent with general governance best practice. Board Members may currently serve for a maximum of three terms of three years; however, it has become apparent that there is a lack of clarity associated with the specifics of that requirement, both in relation to breaks in service and to ex-officio or other appointees.
13. At present, the wording of the Board's constitution is such that, once a Member has completed nine years' service, they would technically be eligible to serve again after a short break (even one day, for instance). Providing for such a loophole would seem to run contrary to the spirit of the application of term limits generally, where there is either a defined period of time before one can serve again, or the possibility of future service is precluded as a rule.

14. A direct comparator is the Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama, where a similar nine-year limit on service exists. There, the wording of that Board's constitution prevents the possibility of repeat service, in keeping with the requirements of the Higher Education Code of Governance (where there is an express limitation on aggregate service). Clauses in relation to the use of term limits also exist within the UK Code of Corporate Governance, and consistent term limits is also accepted best practice across within the arts sector itself.
15. For instance, those arts bodies to whom Government makes public appointments (such as the Tate Gallery, British Museum, or National Gallery) comply with the Commissioner for Public Appointments' guidance on Public Appointments, which advises that "no individual should serve more than two terms or serve in any one post for more than ten years". Within this, many often apply a "two terms of four years" (i.e. 8 years' maximum) approach. Other comparator institutions are registered as charities and so comply with the Charity Commission's Charity Governance Code, which recommends a nine-year limit.
16. Related inconsistencies are apparent in relation to the three ex-officio posts and the appointments made by the Finance and Policy & Resources Committees, where the wording of the constitution is silent in respect of the application of term limits, which can lead to some confusion as to eligibility.
17. For instance, there is ambiguity as to whether the Policy & Resources Committees could appoint the same individual for multiple years, well in excess of nine, should they so wish. The Board was agreed that such opacity was not in anybody's interest.
18. In considering the matter, the Board concluded that a nine-year term limit should be strictly applied to all Members, including representatives nominated by other committees (such that, in a case where a prospective candidate for appointment by the nominating committee has already served nine years on the Barbican Centre Board, they would be ineligible for further service and another representative should be sought by the relevant committee).
19. However, in considering the uniform application of the nine-year limit, a number of Members observed that the practice of having ex-officio representation from the Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama and the Culture Heritage & Libraries Committee provided an important strategic link, with the preference being that such representation should be undertaken by the relevant Chair. It was noted that the likelihood of the relevant Chairs having already served 9 years on the Board was small and that, in the unlikely event of the new Chair of one of these committees being someone who had already served nine years on the Barbican Centre Board, then agreement to make an exception to the nine-year rule should be sought from the Court. This approach was consistent with a provision within the Board's existing constitution, which provides for such specific exceptions to be permitted with the Court's concurrence.
20. The Board recommends, therefore, that the nine-year service limit be applied consistently across its membership.

Terms of Reference

21. The terms of reference of the Board (set out at appendix 1) are relatively straightforward and, of themselves, appear to present no immediate cause for concern – the role of the Board is clear in terms of the provision of strategic direction, the appointment of the Managing Director, and enterprise and income-generating support.
22. However, it is notable that the importance of creative learning and education has never been greater to the Barbican. It is apparent that the Barbican will only enjoy success if it is able to appeal to a wide and diverse range of audiences: it has, therefore, a key role to play in seeding and fostering an engagement with cultural pursuits through its education and creative learning portfolio.
23. The current wording of the terms of reference specifies responsibility for *“the provision of world-class arts and learning by the Centre for the education, enlightenment and entertainment of all who visit it... [and] the provision of access to arts and learning beyond the Centre”*.
24. This is, perhaps, insufficiently explicit and there is a risk of confusion of responsibilities in relation to the role of the Education Board, whose Terms of Reference refer to oversight and monitoring of educational matters including creative learning (in consultation with relevant Boards and Committees with roles defined by their own Terms of Reference).
25. Amending the Barbican Board’s Terms of Reference to make clear that it oversees the creative and cultural learning programmes of the Barbican would, therefore, seem to be a pragmatic way of addressing any potential for conflict.
26. Whilst the Education Board undoubtedly has a role to play in monitoring and being aware of the Barbican’s creative / cultural learning activities, as part of its wider piece in relation to the Corporation’s overall educational endeavours, the Board was minded that it is clearly the Barbican Centre (and, indeed, the Guildhall School of Music & Drama, with whom the Barbican acts through a Creative Alliance) which delivers in this area: the Board considers the Creative Learning Strategy and delivery against it on an annual basis, providing strategic guidance and input to assist.
27. Inserting the words “particularly through the delivery of its creative and cultural learning programmes” to subsection 4(c) of the Terms of Reference (appendix 1) is, therefore, recommended as being beneficial in this regard.

Board Placements

28. Whilst not requiring approval to implement, the Board also wishes to bring to the Policy & Resources Committee and Court of Common Council’s attention its intentions in respect of Board Placements.
29. It is accepted that there is a lack of diversity at Board level across most sectors, and this is also true within the cultural sector. Most Boards will, perhaps understandably, wish to recruit Members with extensive experience or skills in particular fields and on other Boards, which tends to result in an inherent bias towards appointing people from particular age demographics.

30. One initiative intended to try and address this shortfall, utilised to good effect by Sadler's Wells, is the creation of Young Trustee Placements. This sees the appointment of younger people, who might not perhaps be considered for Board places in the normal way, to effectively act as non-voting observers.
31. Not only does this have the benefit of bringing a younger and more diverse voice to the Board, but it also afford the individuals invaluable experience of serving on a high-profile Board: understanding the executive and non-executive dynamic, input into strategic decision-making, and similar skills and experience at a level that it would be difficult to come by through exposure elsewhere. This will equip them to apply with confidence to other similar roles, thus assisting in the diversification of the sector at the Board-level and beyond.
32. Your Barbican Centre Board, therefore, has determined to identify and extend an invitation to two individuals to act in a Board Placement role, to increase the diversity of those who contribute at Board level. The key objective is to attract younger people, say 30 years old and under, who might bring a different perspective to discussions; use the opportunity to learn from experiences for their own career development; and go on to contribute to other organisations in the cultural sector at a senior level.
33. Candidates would undergo a selection procedure, and if successful, will be 'buddied' with a Board Member who is willing to take a mentorship role and work with the young person to get the most out of the experience and build confidence. The positions, as with Board Member roles, would be unpaid, and the Barbican would seek to use existing networks, especially those operated by Barbican/Guildhall Creative Learning, to draw up a shortlist of interested candidates.
34. In particular, the intention would be seek to identify suitable candidates from the City's Family of Academies and Schools in the first instance, as well as from the wider community of Schools with which the Barbican Centre works across London (particularly through its creative learning activities). This will have the additional benefit of helping to build and strengthen links with these bodies and other City institutions.

Conclusion

35. This report presents several potential proposals or consideration which are intended to enhance the effectiveness of the Board, by allowing for additional expertise and strategic leadership at what is a time of significant change, both for the arts world and the Centre itself. Members are asked to consider the proposals set out.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Terms of Reference

BARBICAN CENTRE BOARD

1. Constitution

A Non-Ward Committee consisting of,

- eight Members elected by the Court of Common Council for three-year terms, at least one of whom shall have fewer than five years' service on the Court at the time of their appointment.
- Up to seven non-Common Council representatives appointed by the Committee, of which at least two should be drawn from the arts world
- a representative of the Policy & Resources Committee
- a representative of the Finance Committee
- the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama (ex-officio)
- the Chairman of the Barbican Centre Trust (ex-officio)
- the Chairman of the Culture, Heritage & Libraries Committee (ex-officio)

The Chairman of the Board shall be elected from the City Corporation Members.

There is a maximum ~~continuous~~ service limit of ~~three terms of three~~ **nine** years, **which shall apply to all Members (including ex-officio).**¹

2. Quorum

The quorum consists of any five Members, provided Common Councilmen are in the majority.

3. Membership 2020/21

- | | | |
|----|-----|--|
| 3 | (3) | David Andrew Graves, Alderman |
| 6 | (3) | Wendy Mead, O.B.E. |
| 10 | (1) | Dr Giles Robert Evelyn Shilson, Deputy, <i>for one year</i> |
| 6 | (3) | Tom Sleight, Deputy |
| 5 | (2) | Vivienne Littlechild, M.B.E., J.P. |
| 2 | (2) | William Anthony Bowater Russell, Alderman, the Rt Hon The Lord Mayor |
| 1 | (1) | Munsur Ali |
| 1 | (1) | Randall Keith Anderson |

Together with the Members and ex-officio Members referred to in paragraph 1 above, and:-

Stephen Bediako)	
Russ Carr)	
Zulum Elumogo)	Up to seven nine non-Common Council Members
Gerard Grech)	appointed by the Board
Lucy Musgrave)	
Jenny Waldman)	
Vacancy)	

4. Terms of Reference

To be responsible for:-

- (a) the strategic direction, management, operation and maintenance of the Barbican Centre, having determined the general principles and financial targets within which the Centre will operate;
- (b) the appointment of the Managing Director of the Barbican Centre;
- (c) the Centre's contribution to the City of London Corporation's key policy priority, 'Increasing the impact of the City's cultural and heritage offer on the life of London and the nation', viz:-
 - i) the provision of world-class arts and learning by the Centre for the education, enlightenment and entertainment of all who visit it, **particularly through the delivery of its creative and cultural learning programmes;** and
 - ii) the provision of access to arts and learning beyond the Centre;
- (d) the creation of enterprise and income-generating support for the Centre.

¹ *other than in specific cases approved by the Court of Common Council.*

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s):	Date(s):
Planning & Transportation Committee	17 November 2020
Policy & Resources Committee	19 November 2020
Subject: Planning Protocol Update	Public
Report of: Town Clerk, Director of the Built Environment and Comptroller and City Solicitor	For Decision
Report Author: Deborah Cluett, Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department	

Summary

This report recommends that the Planning Protocol be amended to reflect current case law and procedural updates, and particularly to address the recent judgment in the Holocaust Memorial case¹ in respect of local authorities' own developments.

Recommendations

That the Planning and Transportation Committee :-

- (i) recommends to Policy and Resources Committee that the amendments to the Planning Protocol shown tracked at Annexure 1 to this report be approved
- (ii) Authorise the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director to prepare any necessary Regulation 64(2) Handling Note in respect of any development proposals promoted by the City.

That the Policy and Resources Committee agree the recommendation of Planning and Transportation Committee at (i) above.

Main Report

Background

1. The current Planning Protocol was updated in 2014 and is at Annexure 1 (with proposed updates shown tracked).

Proposed Updates regarding Planning Applications submitted by the City Corporation.

2. In early October judgment was handed down in the Holocaust Memorial case. This considered the acceptability of Handling Arrangements adopted by the Ministry of

¹ London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust v Secretary of State for Housing Communities and Local Government [2020] EWHC 2580 (Admin)

Homes, Communities and Local Government (“MHCLG”) to deal with the consideration of a planning application “called in” by MHCLG where the application was also promoted by MHCLG. The case examined whether the Handling Arrangements complied with the requirement in Regulation 64(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 to ensure a separation of functions where the same body is both bringing forward the proposal and deciding on it.

3. Until the judgment, it was established practise (based on case law) that where a local authority is both making a planning application and deciding it, including in EIA cases, the necessary separation of functions is achieved through separate committees.
4. However, the judgment found that in the MHCLG Holocaust Memorial case, separation of persons (between those responsible for bringing forward the proposals and those responsible for deciding the planning application for the proposals) is also required in EIA cases. In addition, a binding Handling Note setting out certain principles and practises to give effect to the separation of functions should be published in respect of each EIA application made by an authority to itself
5. It is therefore recommended that the existing Planning Protocol be updated at **paragraph 8(e)** to ensure that it reflects the interpretation of the requirements which have emerged from the judgment in respect of EIA proposals. The proposed amendment includes a prohibition against any officer or member responsible for promoting a proposal also exercising any planning functions in respect of the proposal, and a requirement for a Handling Note identifying the persons exercising the respective functions.
6. Although the judgment was concerned with a planning application for EIA development and with the application of regulation 64(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 it is the view of your officers that it could be argued that similar principles should apply when determining applications for non EIA development. In the circumstances officers recommend that the proposed handling arrangements should be applied to all planning applications which the City Corporation make to themselves as planning authority. This approach has been endorsed by Leading Counsel.

Other Proposed Updates

7. While updating the Planning Protocol in respect of the City’s own applications, the opportunity to refresh it has been taken in regards to updated cross references to the Code of Conduct, and in regard to Member meetings.
8. **Code of Conduct:** **Paragraph 1.c** of the Planning Protocol refers to the Code of Conduct. Since the Planning Protocol was last updated the Code of Conduct has been revised (including following consideration of the recommendations of the Committee on Standards In Public Life (“CSPL”) report on Local Government Ethical Standards.)² It is proposed to slightly amend **paragraph 1.c** to reference the current Code of Conduct

² CPSL is a non-departmental advisory body of the government established to advise the Prime Minister on ethical standards across public life in England.

and to provide a link to the Code of Conduct and guidance (rather than Appendices) so that any further Code of Conduct and guidance updates will be incorporated without need to amend the Planning Protocol.

9. **Member Meetings:** The Planning Protocol currently advises at **paragraph 4** that officers can be asked to attend meetings between members and applicants/objectors, and a follow up letter recording the meeting provided. It is proposed that **paragraph 4** of the Planning Protocol be updated to provide that officers should attend meetings with members and meeting notes should be taken. Reference is also included to meeting records being disclosable under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or Environmental Information Regulations 2004. This update makes the meeting guidance in the Planning Protocol consistent with arrangements adopted by officers, as set out in the Pre-Application meeting information which has been more clearly set out since the Planning Protocol was last revised.

Proposals and conclusion

10. The amendments to the Planning Protocol shown tracked in Annexure 1. are recommended. These include restrictions on members and officers with responsibility for promoting proposals from participating in any Local Planning Authority functions in respect of the proposal. The amendments also require the preparation of a binding Handling Note in each case of the authority's own applications and include a Template Handling Note. Authority is sought for the Chief Planning Officer and Director of Development to prepare a Handling Note in each case where required
11. Amendments are also recommended to reference the most recent Code of Conduct and in respect of member meetings.

Appendices

Annexure 1 – Planning Protocol

Background Documents

City of London Pre-Application Meeting Request Form June 2020

Deborah Cluett

Assistant City Solicitor

T: 02073321677

E: deborah.cluett@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Protocol Update November 2020

Table of Contents

Planning Protocol.....	<u>11</u>
Part 1 – Introduction	<u>12</u>
1. Introduction.....	<u>12</u>
Part 2 – Planning & Transportation Committee	<u>22</u>
2. The Committee	<u>22</u>
3. General Principle.....	<u>32</u>
Part 3 – Pre-Committee Consideration	<u>33</u>
4. Contact with Applications and/or Objectors	<u>33</u>
5. Members of other Committees	<u>44</u>
6. Site Visits and Questions	<u>44</u>
7. Briefings.....	<u>55</u>
Part 4 – Committee Meetings	<u>55</u>
8. Interests	<u>55</u>
9. Members' Presence throughout Consideration of an Item	<u>76</u>
10. Reports to the Planning & Transportation Committee.....	<u>76</u>
11. Decisions Contrary to Officer Advice	<u>86</u>
12. Public Participation	<u>87</u>
Appendix A - Guidelines	<u>98</u>
1. Deferral	<u>98</u>
2. Refusing a Planning Application contrary to a recommendation to approve.....	<u>98</u>
3. Approving a Planning Application contrary to a recommendation to Refuse	<u>98</u>
Appendix B - Rules Governing Public Speaking at Meetings of the Planning & Transportation Committee	<u>111</u>
Appendix C – Code of Conduct for Members.....	<u>131</u>
Registering and declaring pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests	<u>141</u>
Appendix D – Department for Communities and Local Government.....	<u>171</u>
Appendix E – Standards Committee Guidance.....	<u>181</u>
Voluntary Registration of Gifts and Hospitality.....	<u>181</u>
Registering your gifts and hospitality.....	<u>181</u>
Gifts and hospitality that do not need to be disclosed.....	<u>191</u>
Gifts and hospitality that are likely to require disclosure.....	<u>191</u>
Appendix FC – <u>Handling Note</u> Seven Principles of Public Life.....	<u>212</u>

Part 1 – Introduction

1. Introduction

- a. This Protocol relates to the way in which the Planning & Transportation Committee exercises its functions on behalf of the City of London Corporation as Planning Authority for the City. The Protocol has been

prepared to guide Members and Officers and to inform the public generally of the high standards of ethical conduct adopted by the City in the discharge of its statutory planning functions.

- b. The Protocol aims to ensure that the Committee acts reasonably and openly in dealing with planning matters; to protect the Court of Common Council and individual Members from allegations of unfairness, findings of maladministration and legal challenge; and to preserve public trust in the integrity and fairness of the planning system.

- c. The ~~new~~ Code of Conduct for Members ([link below](#)) (~~Appendix C to this Protocol~~) sets out the general provisions which must be complied with in all decision making, and must be applied in relation to planning decisions.

<https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/assets/About-us/members-code-of-conduct.pdf>

[The Code of Conduct is supplemented by Guidance to Members on the Code of Conduct \(link below\)](#)

<https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/assets/About-us/guidance-to-members-2018.pdf>

This Protocol is intended to supplement the Code of Conduct and DCLG Guidance on Openness and Transparency on Personal Interests (~~Appendix D to this Protocol~~)([link below](#)) specifically in the context of planning decisions, and must also be read in conjunction with Standing Orders.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/openness-and-transparency-on-personal-interests-guidance-for-councillors>

- e.d. In this Protocol the word “must” is used to mean it is a specific legal or regulatory requirement which must be complied with, and the word “should” is used for advice or recommendations which are regarded as good practise.

Part 2 – Planning & Transportation Committee

2. The Committee

- a. The Planning & Transportation Committee is a Ward Committee comprising Common Councilmen for each Ward of the City together with four Aldermen.

- b. The Committee on Standards in Public Life recommended that members of planning committees should receive appropriate training. Appointment to the Planning and Transportation Committee effectively creates a requirement for Members to undertake such training, both on appointment and periodically thereafter. The form of the training is to be agreed by the Committee and Members are advised not to accept nomination for appointment on the Committee unless they are prepared to accept this responsibility. Members should also familiarise themselves with this Protocol and the Code of Conduct.

3. General Principle

Members of the Planning and Transportation Committee must consider all planning applications objectively on the basis of evidence of relevant planning issues presented to them, the first consideration being compliance with planning policy. Non-planning considerations such as property values are not relevant and must be disregarded.

Part 3 – Pre-Committee Consideration

4. Contact with Applications and/or Objectors

- a. Approaches from applicants, potential applicants or objectors is a normal and proper aspect of the political process. However, unless the parties concerned exercise care and common sense, this can lead to the impartiality and integrity of Members being called into question. A planning committee decision may be susceptible to judicial review where there is a real danger of bias.
- b. To avoid such problems, discussions should take place within the following guidelines:-
 - Members and Members of the Planning and Transportation Committee in particular, must take care not to indicate they have made up their mind on an issue before they have heard and/or read all the evidence, and should make clear that any views expressed are personal and provisional.
 - Members should make it clear that they will not be in a position to make a decision until they have heard and/or read all the relevant evidence and arguments at the Committee meeting. The Committee report may contain issues previously unknown to Members and other aspects, not previously evident, may arise during the Committee's deliberations.
 - Where a meeting is arranged between a Member and an applicant or objector ~~can be foreseen~~, the Member ~~should~~can, at their discretion, ask for an Officer also to attend and make a record of the meeting. (Meeting records are disclosable under Freedom of Information Act/Environmental Information Regulations requirements unless statutory exemptions apply)~~and for a follow-up letter of the meeting to be sent to record the~~

~~matter.~~.) Also, if there is a contentious telephone discussion, it is recommended that the Member should make a note afterwards of what was said.

- Officers may give an indication of the recommendation that is likely to be made to the Committee, particularly in the light of the provisions of the relevant planning policy, but it must be made clear that this will not bind the Committee to make a particular decision.
- c. *Pre-determination* - A distinction can be drawn between pre-disposition and pre-determination. A Member can quite properly be pre-disposed towards or against an application for a variety of good planning reasons. This is perfectly acceptable as long as the Member remains open to persuasion based on the evidence and arguments presented at the meeting. The Localism Act 2011 makes it clear that a decision maker is not to be taken to have had a closed mind merely because he did or said something which indicated the view he took, or might take, on the issue. It is recognised that decision makers may have views on certain matters. If, however, the Member approaches the meeting with a closed mind, and has already reached a fixed view, then he could be deemed to have pre-determined the matter and should not vote.
- d. Notwithstanding the above, it should be possible for a Member of the Committee to assist members of the public in dealing with the planning process and explaining how they are able to make their views known.
- e. *Gifts and Hospitality* - Members should be very cautious about accepting gifts and hospitality from planning applicants, or objectors or other interested parties, and must notify any acceptance in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct and guidance issued by the Standards Committee (Appendix E to this Protocol). Unless there are special reasons, the presumption should be that hospitality (other than routine refreshments offered in the ordinary course of business) and gifts are refused.

5. Members of other Committees

The City of London Corporation's Standing Orders permit Members who are not Members of the Committee to attend meetings of the Planning & Transportation Committee and, with the permission of the Chairman, to speak (from the floor) but not vote. However, any Member who has a disclosable pecuniary interest in the matter being considered is prohibited from participating in discussion at the meeting and must not speak unless they have first been granted a dispensation by the Standards Committee.

6. Site Visits and Questions

- a. In terms of site visits, the presumption is that Members have a general knowledge of the City that can be supplemented, as necessary, by the site

descriptions set out in the reports submitted to the Committee. Therefore, site visits are not generally considered necessary.

- b. Site visits will be undertaken if Members or the City Planning Officer consider there are reasons for doing so. The decision to hold a Members' site visit will be recorded in the minutes of the Committee meeting.
- c. Occasionally, Members may wish to hold site visits before the planning application is submitted to them for consideration. A decision to hold such a visit may be agreed in advance of the Committee meeting by the Chairman. Non-attendance would not preclude a Member voting on the matter.
- d. Site visits will consist of an inspection by Members in company with the appropriate officers. Other than for reasons of access, visits should normally not be accompanied by applicants or objectors. If, however, the applicant, objector or agent is present, Members should avoid making any statements that could prejudice consideration of the application.
- e. A site visit is not a formally convened meeting of the Committee and, therefore, decisions cannot be taken. The following meeting of the Committee should be advised that the site visit has occurred.
- f. Where possible Members should give advance notice to officers of any additional information they intend to request or of any other concerns so that officers can seek to provide the information or clarification sought, and minimise the risk of deferral and delay.

7. Briefings

Occasionally, briefings on major applications are arranged by applicants for all Members of the Committee or Common Council to facilitate general "information gathering". Officers should also be in attendance and record of the meeting made. Attendance at such a briefing would not compromise the ability of a Member of the Planning & Transportation Committee to participate in the determination of the application.

Part 4 – Committee Meetings

8. Interests

- a. Private interests should never be allowed to influence a Member's decisions on matters the Member is asked to decide. Where a Member has an interest they should never seek to use their position to advance that interest; and should avoid both impropriety and the appearance of impropriety.
- b. In considering planning matters, in common with all City Corporation business, Members should apply the Seven Principles of Public Life

(Selflessness; Integrity; Objectivity; Accountability; Openness; Honesty; Leadership) (See [Code of Conduct at link below](#))Appendix F to this Protocol).

<https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/assets/About-us/members-code-of-conduct.pdf>

Members should ensure that they leave the room during discussion and voting on matters if they consider their continued presence would be incompatible with the Seven Principles of Public Life.

- c. A Member of the Planning and Transportation Committee who is, at the same time, a Member of a City of London Corporation committee responsible for a site or building that is the subject of an application does not, by that fact, have an interest that is disclosable under the Code of Conduct. ~~However, where the other City of London Corporation Committee is responsible for promoting a proposal paragraph e. applies. Nor does the fact that they may have participated in the consideration of non-planning matters in relation to the site or building mean they would be regarded as biased or as having pre-determined consideration of planning matters in relation to the same site. However, if the Member's participation in a meeting of the other committee means his consideration of planning issues is not impartial (for example because he has already reached a decision about the planning merits of a planning application under consideration) then he must not participate in the decision of the Planning and Transportation Committee.~~
- d. Particular care must be taken in determining planning applications for the development of land or buildings owned by the City of London Corporation so as to ensure that such an application is not subject to preferential treatment but is subject to the same rigorous evaluation as other applications.

e. In addition, regulation 64(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 requires that where a local authority is bringing forward a proposal, it must make appropriate administrative arrangements to ensure that there is functional separation between the persons within the authority responsible for bringing forward the proposal, and the persons responsible for determining that proposal. Recent case law ¹has set out that the appropriate arrangements should include a published and binding Handling Note setting out handling arrangements which give effect to the following requirements:

- (i) the planning authority functions should be undertaken by an identified internal entity within the authority including officers assisting in those functions with necessary resources and acting impartially and objectively;

¹ [London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust v Secretary of State for Housing Communities and Local Government \[2020\] EWHC 2580 \(Admin\)](#)

- (ii) persons acting or assisting in the planning authority functions (both officers and members) must be prohibited from being involved in promoting or assisting in the promotion of the application for planning permission
- (iii) persons undertaking the planning authority function must not discuss the project with persons promoting the project (other than through formal channels appropriate to the planning application process)
- (iv) persons involved in promoting the proposal must not give instructions or put pressure whether direct or indirect on persons discharging the planning authority function.

Appendix C sets out a template Regulation 64(2) Handling Note. This Note also applies to applications which are not for EIA development. A bespoke Handling Note will be prepared and published by the City as local planning authority in connection with all City Corporation planning applications whether or not they are for EIA development.

9. Members' Presence throughout Consideration of an Item

- a. Committee Members should be present for the full discussion of an item in order to be able to vote on it, as their decision should be based on all the evidence presented to them, including the City Planning Officer's introduction and any questions and discussion.
- b. A Member who arrives after an Agenda Item has commenced should seek and follow the advice of the Chairman as to whether he has arrived in sufficient time to be aware of the evidence presented.

10. Reports to the Planning & Transportation Committee

- a. All planning and related applications considered by the Planning & Transportation Committee should be the subject of reports by the City Planning Officer.
- b. Such reports will include:
 - the substance of the objections and views expressed by respondents to the consultations
 - relevant Government advice, Development Plan policies and supplementary planning guidance, site or related history, and any other considerations including technical aspects that are material planning considerations on which other City of London Corporation departments may have commented
 - a technical assessment which justifies the recommendation(s)
 - a recommendation (unless, in rare circumstances, the reason for making no recommendation to approve or reject is explained in the report)
 - reasons in the case of a recommendation for refusal, and any necessary conditions (and reasons therefor) in the case of a recommendation for approval.

11. Decisions Contrary to Officer Advice

Where a decision on a planning application is made contrary to the recommendation(s) of the City Planning Officer sufficient information will be required by the City Planning Officer to prepare the formal Decision Notice in accordance with the statutory requirements. The decision must be made on reasonable planning grounds which can be substantiated by relevant evidence, otherwise, in the event of an appeal, costs may be awarded against the authority. A statement as to how the planning authority has worked with the Applicant in a positive and pro-active manner must also be provided in the Decision Notice. In the case of approval, any necessary planning conditions must be framed in the Decision Notice. How these requirements can be most appropriately met will depend on the circumstances. Guidelines for dealing with such cases are set out in Appendix A to this Protocol.

12. Public Participation

- a. Applicants, agents and objectors have the right to address the Planning & Transportation Committee in accordance with the approved Procedure for Public Speaking set out at Appendix B.
- b. The operation of the Procedure will be reviewed regularly to ensure that it continues to operate in an effective way.
- c. The Committee will take account of the material planning matters expressed (whether in writing or orally) when reaching a decision.

Appendix A - Guidelines

Planning Application/Appeals

Determinations contrary to Recommendations of the City Planning Officer

These guidelines apply when a majority of Members do not consider that a planning application should be determined in accordance with the City Planning Officer's recommendation. The appropriate way of proceeding will depend on the circumstances but in most cases the following options and suggested actions will apply:

1. Deferral

- a. If further information is required or the Committee considers that minor change may make a scheme acceptable, the application may be deferred for decision at a later meeting. (This may need to follow further public consultation in respect of the change, depending on its impact).
- b. However, the requirement to determine planning applications within a fixed period, and the implications of delay must be borne in mind in considering whether to defer.
- c. It may also be necessary to defer a decision in the circumstances set out at 2.b.

2. Refusing a Planning Application contrary to a recommendation to approve

- a. The Committee should indicate reasons for refusal with sufficient clarity to enable clear and precise reasons (with reference to relevant policies) to be provided in the Decision Notice. The reasons indicated should be confirmed by the Chairman and minuted in full. However, it may well be that although the committee has indicated clear reasons, the precise wording (including relevant policies) cannot appropriately be framed in the forum of the committee meeting. In this case the drafting of precise reasons may be delegated to the Town Clerk (after consultation with the City Planning Officer and the Chairman and Deputy Chairman), rather than reported back to Committee for final approval.
- b. In exceptional circumstances, if the Committee is unable to indicate reasons for refusal with sufficient clarity to frame the Decision Notice (for example, due to their complexity or to the wide range of concerns expressed) it may be necessary to defer an application for a further report to enable detailed reasons to be framed and considered. In those circumstances it may be necessary for the Committee to reconvene at a special meeting as soon as possible to avoid undue delay in issuing the Decision Notice. Only those Members who attended the Committee meeting which initially considered the application will be eligible to vote at the reconvened meeting, and those Members should therefore make every effort to attend.

3. Approving a Planning Application contrary to a recommendation to Refuse

Where the Committee wishes to grant planning permission contrary to a recommendation to refuse, the reasons should be clearly stated and minuted,

and the Committee should consider whether there are any planning conditions it would wish to see imposed. The drafting of appropriate conditions, including those specified by Committee, will normally be delegated to the City Planning Officer (unless Committee resolve otherwise), and reported to the Committee at its next meeting.

Appendix B - Rules Governing Public Speaking at Meetings of the Planning & Transportation Committee

1. In order to speak the public must have submitted written representations on the relevant planning application at least 14 days before the committee meeting.
2. There will be a maximum of 20 minutes" public speaking time allotted to each planning application. This time is divided between the following categories:
 - a. Objectors – 10 minutes in total
 - b. Applicants, agents or supporters – 10 minutes in total
3. No person may speak for more than 5 minutes each. If there are more than two persons wishing to speak from category (a) or (b) they will need to organise themselves by appointing up to two spokespersons or agreeing to share the allotted 10 minutes in shorter slots between more people to enable more speakers to participate from that category within the allotted 10 minutes. In rare circumstances where there is considered to be an exceptionally wide range of different issues, the Chairman may, in his discretion, allow limited additional time.
4. Anyone wishing to speak at Committee must register a request to do so with the City Planning Officer at least five working days before the meeting. This is to allow time for the City Planning Officer to alert those wishing to speak if it is necessary to organise themselves as set out in paragraph 3, and to allow time for such organisation.
5. All parties on registering a request to address the Committee must submit a written statement of their case in order that any factual or new points can be investigated prior to the meeting and to facilitate the organisation of speakers in accordance with paragraph 4 above. This should include any material to which they wish to refer in order to ensure that it can be appropriately displayed.
6. Persons will address the Committee after the City Planning Officer has presented the application to the Committee and Members have obtained any necessary information in respect of that presentation and the relevant Committee report.
7. Persons addressing the Committee will not be given the opportunity to question Members or officers of the Committee.
8. Persons addressing the Committee are expected to be available to answer questions in order to clarify points which they have made to Committee.
9. Committee cases will be taken in the order in which they are set out in the agenda unless it is felt expedient by the Chairman to do otherwise (eg. if there were a high level of public interest in a particular case).

10. The Committee will not accept additional written representations in lieu of a person addressing the Committee unless they convey new points that had not been included in the original representation, which will already have been taken into account.
11. If there is any dispute as to whether it is appropriate for someone to address the Committee, the final decision rests with the Chairman or Deputy Chairman.
12. Representation on matters other than planning applications will be at the discretion of the Chairman

LINKS TO BE USED INSTEAD OF APPENDICES C – F

Appendix C – Code of Conduct for Members

~~(in Respect of the City of London Corporation's Local Authority, Policy Authority and NonLocal Authority Functions).~~

~~As a Member your conduct shall in particular address the Seven Principles of Public Life by:~~

- ~~a. Championing the public interest, taking into account the needs of your constituents, including those that did not vote for you, and the community as a whole.~~
- ~~b. Dealing with representations or enquiries from residents, City voters, members of our communities and visitors fairly, appropriately and impartially.~~
- ~~c. Not allowing other pressures, including the financial interests of yourself or others connected to you, to deter you from pursuing constituents' casework, the interests of the Corporation or the good governance of the Corporation in a proper manner.~~
- ~~d. Exercising independent judgement and not compromising your position by allowing individuals or organisations to improperly influence you in the performance of your official duties by means of any financial or other obligations.~~
- ~~e. Listening to the interests of all parties, including relevant advice from statutory and other professional officers, taking all relevant information into consideration, remaining objective and making decisions on merit.~~
- ~~f. Being accountable for your decisions and co-operating when scrutinised internally and externally, including by constituents.~~
- ~~g. Contributing to making the Corporation's decision-making processes as open and transparent as possible to enable constituents to understand the reasoning behind those decisions and to be informed when holding you and other Members to account but restricting access to information when the wider public interest or the law requires it.~~
- ~~h. Behaving in accordance with all of the Corporation's legal obligations, alongside any requirements contained within the Corporation's policies, protocols or procedures, including on the use of the Corporation's resources.~~
- ~~i. Ensuring that, when using or authorising the use by others of the resources of the Corporation, such resources are not used improperly for political purposes (including party political purposes) and having regard to any applicable Local Authority Code of Publicity made under the Local Government Act 1986.~~

- ~~j. Valuing your colleagues and officers of the Corporation and engaging with them in an appropriate manner and one that underpins the mutual respect that is essential to good local governance.~~
- ~~k. Always treating people with respect, including the organisations and constituents that you engage with and those that you work alongside.~~
- ~~l. Registering and declaring any private interests, both pecuniary and nonpecuniary, that relate to your public duties in a manner conforming with the procedures set out below.~~
- ~~m. Providing leadership through behaving in accordance with these principles when championing the interests of constituents with other organisations as well as within the Corporation.~~

~~Registering and declaring pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests~~

- ~~1. You must, within 28 days of taking office as a Member, notify the Town Clerk (on behalf of the Corporation's Monitoring Officer) of any disclosable pecuniary interest as defined by regulations made by the Secretary of State, where the pecuniary interest is yours, your spouse's or civil partner's, or is the pecuniary interest of somebody with whom you are living with as a husband or wife, or as if you were civil partners, together with any non-pecuniary interests of yours described in paragraph 7 below and thereafter maintain an up to date register of any such interests.~~
- ~~2. The Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012 (Appendix 1) currently define disclosable pecuniary interests under the following categories:-~~
 - ~~a. Employment, office, trade, profession or vocation~~
 - ~~b. Sponsorship~~
 - ~~c. Contracts~~
 - ~~d. Land~~
 - ~~e. Licences~~
 - ~~f. Corporate tenancies~~
 - ~~g. Securities~~
- ~~3. Where you believe you have a sensitive interest (A 'sensitive interest' is described in the Localism Act 2011 as a member or co-opted member of an authority having an interest, and the nature of the interest being such that the member or co-opted member, and the authority's monitoring officer, consider that disclosure of the details of the interest could lead to the member or co-opted member, or a person connected with the member or co-opted member, being subject to violence or intimidation), you should apply to the Monitoring Officer (via the Town Clerk) for exemption from the requirement that details of the interest be published and made available for inspection.~~

~~4. In addition, you must, within 28 days of taking office as a Member, and thereafter on an ongoing basis, notify the Corporation's Monitoring Officer (via the Town Clerk) of any other pecuniary or non-pecuniary interest which you consider should be included on your Members' Declaration form if you are to fulfil your duty to act in conformity with the Seven Principles of Public Life.~~

~~5. In any event you are required to disclose your membership of any:~~

- ~~a. Management board or similar organ of any charity or body directed to a charitable purpose (e.g. a trustee or director) but excluding any charity or other such body administered by the Corporation~~
- ~~b. Club or Society active in the City of London or which relates to any functions of the Corporation~~
- ~~c. Fraternal or Sororal Societies~~
- ~~d. Livery Company, City Company without Livery, Guild or Company seeking Livery~~
- ~~e. Political Party~~
- ~~f. Organisation, one of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy, and which is likely to seek to affect the policy of the Corporation or which may have an impact on its services or stakeholders~~
- ~~g. Professional Association~~
- ~~h. Trade Association~~
- ~~i. Trade Union~~
- ~~j. Management board or similar organ of any organisation not falling within paragraph 1 or sub-paragraphs (a)-(i) above.~~

~~6. You must also notify the Corporation's Monitoring Officer (via the Town Clerk) of any gift or hospitality received by you as a Member with a value of £100 or more, or multiple gifts and/or instances of hospitality with a cumulative value of £200 or more when received from a single donor within a rolling twelve month period. Such notification must be made within 28 days of receipt, or within 28 days of reaching the cumulative threshold, as appropriate.~~

~~7. Special provision shall be made for the Lord Mayor and other holders of special offices in relation to the registration of gifts and hospitality to be set out in Guidance to be issued by the Standards Committee.~~

~~8. Entries shall be retained in the register of gifts and hospitality for three years—older entries will be removed.~~

~~9. If an interest has not been entered onto the Corporation's register, then the Member must disclose the interest to any meeting of the Corporation at which they are present, where they have a disclosable interest in any matter being considered and where the matter is not a „sensitive interest“ (A 'sensitive interest' is described in the Localism Act 2011 as a member or co-opted member of an authority having an interest, and the nature of the interest being such that the member or co-opted member, and the authority's monitoring~~

~~officer, consider that disclosure of the details of the interest could lead to the member or co-opted member, or a person connected with the member or co-opted member, being subject to violence or intimidation).~~

~~10. Following any disclosure of an interest not on the Corporation's register or the subject of pending notification (This is where an interest has been notified to the Monitoring Officer but has not yet been entered on the register), you must notify the Monitoring Officer (via the Town Clerk) of the interest within 28 days beginning with the date of disclosure.~~

~~11. Unless dispensation has been granted, you may not participate in any discussion of, vote on, or discharge any function related to any matter in which you have a pecuniary interest as defined by regulations made by the Secretary of State.~~

~~12. Your participation in any item of business:~~

- ~~a. in which you have any other interest; or~~
- ~~b. that affects a donor from whom you have received any gift or hospitality;~~

~~that is registered, or ought to be registered as set out above, will need to be considered by you on a case by case basis. You will only be expected to exclude yourself from speaking or voting in exceptional circumstances, for example where there is a real danger of bias.~~

~~13. If in doubt about any of the above matters you are encouraged to seek advice from the Town Clerk or the Corporation's Monitoring Officer.~~

—

Appendix D – Department for Communities and Local Government

“Openness and transparency on personal interest — a guide for councillors”

—

Appendix E – Standards Committee Guidance

Voluntary Registration of Gifts and Hospitality

Only those interests defined as disclosable pecuniary interests in the regulations are required to be registered and/or disclosed in every case. However, in accordance with the Nolan Principles and the general duties set out in the Code of Conduct, Members are required to disclose any other interest at a meeting where it is felt, in relation to a specific item of business, that the interest warrants disclosure.

The Standards Committee considers that such a disclosure is likely to be necessary in relation to one-off gifts and hospitality to the value of £250 or more, and cumulative gifts and hospitality to the value of £500 or more from a single donor in a financial year i.e. ending on 31st March.

If an item of business arises at a meeting that relates to such a donor, the Standards Committee would normally expect this interest to be disclosed. If a complaint were to be received in relation to non-disclosure by a Member, then (subject to hearing all of the facts) the Standards Committee may be minded to find that there had been a breach of the Code.

Therefore, the Standards Committee is introducing a local voluntary arrangement whereby Members are encouraged to register the receipt of all gifts and hospitality equalling or exceeding the above values. In the same way as for disclosable pecuniary interests, prior registration will constitute disclosure of the interest, meaning that a further disclosure at the meeting is not required. This will assist Members in complying with the Code. It will also provide transparency of Members' actions to the public. The new arrangement will come into effect as of 1st April 2013.

A member's participation in relation to an item in which they have such an interest will need to be considered by the member on a case by case basis. In the spirit of the Localism Act the Standards Committee would expect that a member would only be precluded from participation in exceptional circumstances e.g. where there is a real danger of bias. Members are encouraged to seek advice from the City Solicitor on such matters.

Registering your gifts and hospitality

Your up-to-date register of interests, including any disclosed gifts and hospitality, is published via your Members' page on the Corporation's webpages. Where you wish to register any received gifts and hospitality, please contact the Committee and Member Services Team via email or on telephone: 020 7332 1427 or 020 7332 1434 specifying the following details:

- description of the gift or hospitality (i.e. tickets to a theatre performance);
- the date it was received;
- from whom the gift or hospitality was received; and
- an approximate value (and cumulative value, if appropriate).

~~Please note that such declarations should be made within 28 days of receipt of the gift or hospitality.~~

~~Gifts and hospitality that do not need to be disclosed~~

~~Gifts and hospitality provided by the City Corporation, or received by a Member whilst acting as an official representative of the City Corporation, do not need to be disclosed — this will include:~~

- ~~• committee dinners~~
- ~~• lunches associated with committee visits~~
- ~~• any gifts or hospitality provided to the office of Lord Mayor or Sheriff (but not including gifts retained by the individual, as opposed to the City Corporation)~~
- ~~• hospitality offered as part of City Corporation related events such as MIPIM (events approved by the Policy & Resources Committee)~~
- ~~• local government dinners~~
- ~~• garden parties at Buckingham Palace (if tickets via City Corporation)~~
- ~~• tickets to sporting and cultural events (where the Member is the appointed representative of the City Corporation e.g. Olympics tickets in summer 2012)~~
- ~~• tickets to events at the Barbican Centre, or Guildhall School of Music and Drama (if tickets via City Corporation).~~

~~In addition, a Member only has to disclose gifts or hospitality received by virtue of being a Member — this will not normally include gifts or hospitality received from friends or family. Members should apply honesty and common sense when they consider how receipt of a gift or hospitality might be interpreted. For example, if the Member is the Chairman of the Planning Committee, and a birthday present arrives from an applicant just before a planning application is due to be considered, then the Member should think about how this would be interpreted by a reasonable member of the public. If in doubt, the Member should disclose the interest.~~

~~As set out above, Members do not need to disclose gifts and hospitality that do not reach the £250 one-off threshold or £500 cumulative threshold. Some examples of gifts and hospitality that are unlikely to reach the £250 threshold are as follows:~~

- ~~• livery company dinners~~
- ~~• drinks receptions (where only drinks and canapés are served)~~
- ~~• standard commemorative gifts including pin badges, published materials, ties, paper weights, plaques.~~

~~Gifts and hospitality that are likely to require disclosure~~

~~Some examples of gifts and hospitality that are likely to reach the £250 threshold are as follows:~~

- ~~• overseas trips~~
- ~~• exceptional evening dinner events (i.e. pre-dinner drinks, three course, silver service meals, all drinks)~~

- ~~bespoke gifts that have been sourced/ made specifically for the Member (e.g. an engraved crystal vase, or a gold picture frame with a signed limited edition print)~~
- ~~hospitality packages including lunch or dinner and tickets to a sporting or cultural event.~~

~~Caution should be exercised where the offer of any gift or hospitality is over and above what could reasonably be viewed as ancillary to the business being conducted, or is wholly unrelated to the business being conducted.~~

~~Particular caution should also be exercised by Members involved in determining regulatory matters (licensing, planning) and making decisions that affect the financial position of others.~~

~~**Further information regarding Members' declarations can be obtained from the Comptroller & City Solicitor or the Committee and Member Services Team.**~~

~~—~~

Appendix CF – Template Handling Note~~Seven Principles of Public Life~~

~~You are a member of the City of London Corporation (“the Corporation”) or a member of a committee of the Corporation (in this Code collectively referred to as a “Member”) and hence you shall have regard to the Seven Principles of Public Life—~~

~~**SELFLESSNESS:** Holders of public office should act solely in the public interest and should never improperly confer an advantage or disadvantage on any person or act to gain financial or other material benefits for themselves, their family, a friend or close associate.~~

~~a. **INTEGRITY:** Holders of public office should not place themselves under a financial or other obligation to outside individuals or organisations that might seek to influence them in the performance of their official duties. NB— This Principle applies only to conduct by a Member in their capacity as a Member which may foreseeably lead to the Member being subjected to inappropriate influence in the performance of their duties. It does not apply to contracts of employment, service or other formal and informal business relationships entered into by Members in their private capacities and which are dealt with by the rules on disclosable pecuniary and nonpecuniary interests.~~

~~b. **OBJECTIVITY:** When carrying out public duties, such as making public appointments, awarding contracts or recommending individuals for rewards or benefits, holders of public office should make all choices on merit.~~

~~c. **ACCOUNTABILITY:** Holders of public office are accountable for their decisions to the public and should co-operate fully with whatever scrutiny is appropriate to their office.~~

~~d. **OPENNESS:** Holders of public office should be as open as possible about their decisions and actions and the decisions and actions of their authority and should be prepared to give reasons for those decisions and actions.~~

~~e. **HONESTY:** Holders of public office have a duty to declare any private interests that relate to their public duties and to take steps to resolve any conflicts arising in a way that protects the public interest.~~

~~a. **LEADERSHIP:** Holders of public office should promote and support high standards of conduct when serving in their public post, in particular as characterised by the above requirements, by leadership and example.~~

[DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL] (“the Proposal”

CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION

TEMPLATE FOR REGULATION 64(2) HANDLING NOTE

1. Background

1.1 Regulation 64(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (“the EIA Regulations”) requires that where a proposal for EIA development is brought forward by the City of London Corporation and the City of London Corporation will also be responsible for determining that application for planning permission, they must make appropriate administrative arrangements to ensure that there is a functional separation, when performing any duty under the EIA Regulations, between the persons bringing forward the proposal for development and the persons responsible for determining that proposal.

1.2 This note sets out the arrangements which must be adopted to ensure compliance with the EIA Regulations

1.3 This note also applies to applications for planning permission for development which is not EIA development made by the City of London Corporation as applicant to the City of London Corporation as local planning authority.

2. Overarching Principles to be observed in handling the Proposal

2.1 The Local Planning Authority must assess the Proposal in the same way as if it was submitted by any other applicant. It will be assessed and determined solely on the material planning considerations, disregarding any financial or other benefits to the City of London Corporation as applicant. If more information is required it will be sought from the applicant notwithstanding potential delay or cost consequences for the applicant.

2.2 The Local Planning Authority function will be undertaken wholly independently of the applicant/promoter functions, acting impartially and objectively

2.3 There will be no discussion or communication about the Proposal between the officers and members carrying out the Local Planning Authority function in respect of the Proposal and the officers and members carrying out the Applicant/Promoter functions in respect of the Proposal, other than formal communications appropriate to the application process such as would occur with any other Applicant.

2.4 No officer or member carrying out the Applicant/Promoter function in relation to the Proposal may give any instructions to or put any pressure whether direct or indirect upon any person acting or assisting in the discharge of the Local Planning Authority function.

3. Arrangements for handling the Proposal

3.1 Local Planning Authority Functions

Gwyn Richards (Interim Development Director and Chief Planning Officer) is the lead officer responsible for undertaking the local planning authority functions [under the EIA Regulations] arising in respect of the determination of the planning application including pre-application advice

He is (or has been) assisted by the following officer team:

Planning

Transportation

Highways

Legal

Communications

The Local Planning Authority officer team will report to the Planning and Transportation Committee [or any Sub-committee appointed by it for the purpose], which will be responsible for making the decision on the planning application. No member of a committee with responsibility for promoting the Proposal should sit on Planning and Transportation Committee [nor be a member of any sub-committee] when it is considering the planning application for the Proposal. The members of the Planning and Transportation Committee who are to sit on that committee or any sub-committee when determining the planning application shall be identified as soon as is practicable following receipt of the planning application.

3.2 Applicant/Promoter (non-Local Planning Authority) Functions

The officers, consultants and Committees who are (or have been) involved in the promotion of the Proposal are as follows:

[Specify team]

The following officer/s is/are identified as the agent for the planning application:

3.3 Implementation of Arrangements

3.3.1 The persons identified at 3.1 and 3.2 will be reviewed regularly and updated to reflect any changes in responsibilities or roles, and any such changes shall be noted on an updated Handling Note

3.3.2 The officers identified at paragraph 3.1 and any members of the Planning and Transportation Committee identified as those who will sit on the committee or any sub-committee to determine the planning application shall not engage in any discussion or communication in relation to the planning application with other officers or members save that the officers identified in paragraph 3.1 shall be entitled to communicate with the officer/s identified in paragraph 3.2 as the agent for the planning application and only in the same way as those officers identified in paragraph 3.1 would communicate with any person acting as an agent in relation to planning applications in general, and save when officers identified in paragraph 3.1 are conducting formal consultation on the planning application.

3.3.3 Persons identified at 3.2 must not engage in any discussion or communication in relation to the planning application with the persons identified in paragraph 3.1, save that person/s identified as the agent in paragraph 3.2 may communicate with the officers identified in paragraph 3.1 in the same way and on the same basis as the agent in relation to planning applications in general.

3.3.4 The Handling Arrangements will be published and will be included within the publicly available planning application documents both in hard copy and electronically

3.3.5 The Handling Arrangements will be circulated to all persons identified at 3.1 and 3.2, and recirculated to them following any amendments

3.3.6 Any communications, documents or other information generated by those exercising the Local Planning Authority function which would not normally be shared with an Applicant should be marked “CONFIDENTIAL: LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY ONLY”, and should not be stored on file space accessible to any person other than those exercising the Local Planning Authority function (unless this is authorised by the Interim Development Director and Chief Planner and he has satisfied himself that, where applicable, such disclosure would be compliant with the EIA Regulations)

Committees:	Dates:
Planning and Transportation Committee	17 November 2020
Policy and Resources Committee	19 November 2020
Subject: Recovery Task Force: Placemaking for a world-leading Square Mile	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	2, 5-12
Does this proposal require extra revenue spending?	Y
If so, how much?	£100k
What is the source of Funding?	Policy Initiatives Fund
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	Being finalised
Report of: Damian Nussbaum, Director of Innovation & Growth	For decision
Report author: Damian Nussbaum, Director of Innovation & Growth	

Summary

The following report provides Members with an overview of the proposed Recovery Task Force.

The prosperity of cities across the world is under threat. Those able to adapt to the new environment, and help shape it, will thrive. This Task Force will provide a blueprint for how the Square Mile can remain competitive. It will speed the City's evolution towards a world-leading hub that is innovative, inclusive and sustainable. It will continue to enhance the Square Mile as a great place to work, visit and live, creating growth and jobs.

We will do this by developing a five-year placemaking blueprint for the Square Mile. This will identify the key interventions needed to respond to changing expectations from businesses and workers in the wake of Covid-19.

The project will be overseen by the Policy & Resources Committee and the Planning & Transportation Committee, steered by their Chairs and relevant Chief Officers, with wider Member engagement. The final report will be brought to Committee for approval. Given the urgency, this project will aim to complete over the next six-months.

Recommendation

P&R and P&T Members are asked to:

- Agree to the project start up and next steps.

P&R Members are asked to:

- Agree the funding of £100k for the Recovery Task Force to be met from the 2020/21 Policy Initiative Fund (PIF) categorised as 'Promoting the City' and charged to City's Cash.

Main Report

Background

1. The Recovery Task Force will provide a blueprint for how the Square Mile can remain internationally competitive. It will provide a compelling vision for the future success of the City and demonstrate the Corporation's leadership in the recovery. It will focus on medium-term changes to the design and management of the Square Mile's built environment as it interacts with changing business needs and ways of working. Over the next 3-5 years:
 - What kind of dynamic environment do businesses and workers want? How should the built environment intersect with innovative businesses and people to create a dynamic hub?
 - How does the design and use of the City's buildings, streets and spaces need to change?
2. The project will focus on what will be people's experience in the City. It will explore the interaction between transport, public spaces (including streets and City gardens) and businesses. It will consider how to strengthen the innovative ecosystem, and further underpin it with leading edge infrastructure. It will also look at the wider ecosystem and offer, including culture and education/ academia. The work of the Culture and Commerce task force will inform and shape the cultural content of the Recovery Task Force's work.
3. This complements the City Corporation's immediate response to the Covid-19 pandemic. Work on short-term measures and activity to support the Square Mile's initial recovery will continue to be led by the Recovery Silver Group. The Recovery Task Force will build on the Corporation's crisis measures for the City.

Approach

4. The project will be led by a small core team from Innovation and Growth (IG) and Department of the Built Environment (DBE) supported by departmental working groups and external consultants. The project will be overseen by the Chairs of Policy & Resources and Planning & Transportation Committees, supported by their deputies, officers, and with Mayoral input.
5. The Task Force will draw on existing material from the Climate Action Strategy, the draft CityPlan 2036, Transport Strategy, London Recharged and other relevant sources.
6. Given the urgency, this project will aim to complete within six-months, with regular updates for the duration of the project. It is important to note a lot of work has already been done or is underway in response to the crisis. This needs to be built upon.
7. The major milestones are:
 - End of year – complete desktop review of existing ideas and data, with targeted engagement to fill gaps.
 - Early 2021 – Initial findings and first iteration of blueprint, engagement with Members.
 - First quarter 2021: Stakeholder engagement to test and refine blueprint and identify potential delivery partners.
 - Spring 2021: Committee approvals and publication.

Governance

8. Members will be engaged informally while the blueprint is being drafted. The final report will be brought to the Policy & Resources and Planning & Transportation Committee for approval.
9. Given the time constraints, it is intended to engage stakeholders informally to test and refine the proposals rather than to undertake a formal consultation.

Corporate & Strategic Implication

10. Strategic implications – This goes to the heart of the Corporate Plan in underpinning the aim of having a vibrant and thriving City. The outputs are also likely to inform the review of the Transport Strategy that will be undertaken in 2021/22.
11. Resource and financial implications – Funding will be required for a variety of purposes during the project. During the recent impactful reports on Climate Action and London Recharged, key costs included external expertise, public engagement, and design/publication of a report. We are in mobilisation phase, so we do not yet know exactly how the project will shape up, but it is likely that we will again need this kind of support, and a rough estimate would be £100k, divided between: :
 - a. External expertise to fill gaps in Corporation knowledge e.g. plans in competing hubs, new approaches on data etc.
 - b. Design/publication of a public report which can put across the findings in a way that is visually appealing and impactful.
 - c. Engagement publicly, which needs to be managed effectively to ensure we can analyse, incorporate and feedback on external ideas.

Staff in IG and DBE will also be assigned to the project by reallocating resources, and reprioritising projects.

It is proposed that the required funding of £100,000 is met from Policy and Resources 2020/21 Policy Initiative Fund categorised as 'Promoting the City' and charged to City's Cash. The current uncommitted balance in the 2020/21 PIF is £597,082, prior to any allowances being made for any other proposals on today's agenda.

12. Legal implications – No legal implications have been identified at this stage. This will be kept under review.
13. Risk implications – At this stage in the project, no significant risks have been identified. This will be kept under review.
14. Equalities implications – At this stage in the project, no negative equalities implications have been identified. This will be kept under review and equalities analysis will be carried out if necessary, to ensure negative impacts can be mitigated and opportunities for positive impacts exploited.
15. Climate implications – This will be fully in line with the Climate Action Strategy and will look to drive the implementation of the actions that Members have agreed.
16. Security implications – There are no security implications which have been identified at this stage in the project. This will be kept under review.

Conclusion

17. At a crucial moment for the future of London and the UK, the Task Force will provide Members with a blueprint for the actions to take to ensure the City of London remains the best place to do business in the world.

Committee(s):	Date(s):
Education Board [For Information] Policy & Resources Committee [For Decision] Community & Children's Services Committee [For Information]	19/11/2020 19/11/2020 11/12/2020
Subject: Holiday Meal Support to City of London Sponsored Academies	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	2, 3 & 4
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N
If so, how much?	N/A
What is the source of Funding?	N/A
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	Y
Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services	For Decision
Report author(s): Anne Bamford, Strategic Director of Education and Skills Daniel McGrady, Lead Policy Officer (Education, Culture and Skills)	

Summary

This report asks Members to consider the provision of food vouchers to the families of pupils attending City of London sponsored academies, pupils attending The Aldgate School and City resident children attending other schools who are eligible for free school meals (FSM) over school holiday periods.

On 8 November 2020, the Department for Work and Pensions released a Press Statement which included a commitment to a "COVID Winter Grant Scheme" up until March 2021 and a "Holiday Activities and Food Programme" covering Easter, Summer and Christmas in 2021. Under the COVID Winter Grant Scheme, Local Authorities will receive funding directly to help the hardest-hit families and individuals, as well as provide food for children who need it over the holidays up until the end of March 2021. From April 2021, the Holiday Activities and Food Programme will continue with the same provision. Whilst it is currently unclear how and what will be distributed to families, the announcement is clear that Local Authorities will receive the funding which would include the City of London Corporation (for City resident children) as well the Local Authorities in which City Sponsored academies reside: Islington, Hackney and Southwark. As a Local Authority, the City Corporation will review the allocation and distribution requirements to implement this new programme which is likely to require additional administrative resource to support the approximately 60 children who will benefit.

Members are asked to endorse the recommendation that the City Corporation should await further Government announcements on the COVID Winter Grant and Holiday Activities and Food Programme before clarifying its position and long-term role in supporting the families of pupils in its community school, residents in the City, and in its sponsored academies over holiday periods. Members are asked to note that

officers conducted financial modelling for the scenario that the City Corporation provides support to pupils in its sponsored academies as an indication of what a package of support from the City Corporation would cost. This modelling is provided for information and to frame future discussions on the role of the City Corporation in regard to its academies following further details on the Government announcements.

Recommendation(s)

Members of the Education Board and Policy & Resources Committee are asked to:

1. Approve the decision to await further Government announcements on the COVID Winter Grant and Holiday Activities and Food Programme before clarifying the City Corporation's role in providing food vouchers to pupils in City sponsored academies over holiday periods;
2. Note that the City Corporation will review the allocation and distribution requirements to implement the Government Schemes as a Local Authority which is likely to require additional administrative resource to support the children who will benefit;
3. Note that financial modelling has been conducted on support to families of pupils in City sponsored academies for information.

Main Report

Background

1. Over the 2020 summer holidays and in response to the unprecedented circumstances brought about by COVID-19, the Government provided the COVID Summer Food Fund which gave food vouchers for families with children eligible for FSM over the summer holidays. The Government then announced that it would not continue this provision into school holidays during the 2020/21 Academic Year. Some Local Authorities subsequently ran schemes for resident children in their local catchment areas to fill this gap. Of the boroughs where the City of London schools reside, the following delivered food voucher schemes over the October half term:
 - London Borough of Islington: Established a voucher scheme to help parents whose children are eligible for statutory free school meals during the October half-term holiday¹. The vouchers were for the value of £15 and distributed to parents and carers by the school when they return in November as reimbursement for the additional food costs incurred during the half term.
 - London Borough of Southwark: Provided FSM vouchers for eligible pupils over the October half term.²
 - London Borough of Hackney: Provided a service for families whose children are eligible for FSM and need emergency support to be able to contact the Council helpline to access vouchers³.

¹ <https://www.islington.gov.uk/children-and-families/benefits-and-financial-support/free-school-meals-and-uniform-grant>

² <https://www.southwark.gov.uk/schools-and-education/information-for-parents/financial-support/free-school-meals-during-covid-19>

³ <https://education.hackney.gov.uk/content/apply-free-school-meals>

- City of London Corporation: In total, 59 vouchers were given out to City resident children over the week beginning 26th October 2020, which was Autumn half term. Feedback from families was very positive, as from the school/social workers/early help workers who worked with them. Children's services are due review the list and eligibility for vouchers during school holidays before schools break up for the Christmas holiday.
2. On 8 November 2020, the Department for Work and Pensions released a Press Statement which included a commitment to a "COVID Winter Grant Scheme" up until March 2021 and a "Holiday Activities and Food Programme" covering Easter, Summer and Christmas in 2021⁴. The statement includes the following details:
- £170m will be distributed to Local Authorities in December 2020, with 80% earmarked to support with food and bills to cover the period to the end of March 2021.
 - It will allow Local Authorities to directly help the hardest-hit families and individuals, as well as provide food for children who need it over the holidays.
 - Schools will not be provided the funding as their role will continue to be to provide meals during term-time.
 - A £220m Holiday Activities and Food programme will also be expanded to cover Easter, Summer and Christmas in 2021 which will be available to children in every Local Authority in England, building on previous programmes.

At this stage, it is unknown in what form the COVID Winter Grant will be distributed through Local Authorities to families (e.g. through food vouchers or another means) and also what the value of food support will be per child. However, it seems likely that it will follow the same format as the COVID Summer Food Fund and take the form of £3 per day food vouchers distributed through Local Authorities to resident children eligible for FSM.

3. The role of the City Corporation in relation to its academies is not that of the Local Education Authority. The City Corporation is an academy sponsor which is a role defined by the Department for Education (DfE). The City Corporation supports its sponsored academies in several ways, including through the provision of grants. Over 2020/21 Financial Year, the City Corporation has provided the following in grant payments to its sponsored academies:
- £1,644,123 provided as City Premium Grant funding from the Education Board's budget for 2020/21 Academic Year, plus £85,000 to be distributed in January 2021.
 - £330,000 provided as one-off supplementary City Premium Grant funding from the Policy Initiative Fund distributed to academies to address educational gaps exacerbated by school closures during COVID-19.
 - £50,000 from the Education Board's budget provided to City of London Academies Trust (CoLAT) to support central services costs.

⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-winter-package-to-provide-further-support-for-children-and-families>

- £70,000 from the COVID-19 Contingency Fund to City of London Academies Trust to deliver a Summer School over August 2020 to address educational gaps as a result of school closures during COVID-19.

Current Position

4. The City Corporation is awaiting further details on the COVID Winter Grant Scheme (Dec 2020 to Mar 2021) and Holiday Activities and Food Programme (Apr 2021 to Aug 2021). It is expected that the details will include the means by which Local Authorities will support vulnerable families with food over holiday periods as well as the financial value per family and eligibility criteria.
5. There are 18 pupils in The Aldgate School eligible for FSM and 32 City-resident children attending other schools (excluding The Aldgate School and City sponsored academies).
6. Officers have conducted financial modelling on what a City Corporation package of support to low-income families of pupils attending its sponsored academies would look like. This will provide contextual information for the City's long-term view of food support over the holiday periods once the Government's programme has been clarified.
7. Based on the latest available census data for schools, there are 1,847⁵ pupils in City of London sponsored academies (excluding post-16) eligible for FSM. There is a total of 27 weekdays in the 2020/21 Academic Year school holidays:
 - a. Christmas holidays (Monday 21 December 2020 – Friday 1 January 2021) – 10 days
 - b. Spring half term (Monday 15 February 2021 – Friday 19 February 2021) – 5 days
 - c. Easter holidays (Thursday 1 April 2021 – Friday 16 April 2021) – 12 days

The benchmark for food voucher provision is £3 per day, set by the Government's COVID Summer Food Fund which provided food vouchers over the summer holidays.

Proposals

8. It would cost an estimated £149,607 to provide food vouchers for all eligible pupils in City sponsored academies for each day of the remaining school holidays until the end of the Easter holidays at a rate of £3 per pupil per day. This has been rounded to £150,000 to allow for variances in the 2021/22 Academic Year data on pupils eligible for FSM and actual pupils in schools.
9. It will cost an estimated £20K to implement the scheme to City-resident children as a Local Authority which will include children eligible for FSM and wider vulnerability criteria such as whether the child is in social care and if the family are using the childcare affordability scheme.
10. It is proposed that Members await further Government announcements on the COVID Winter Grant and Holiday Activities and Food Programme before clarifying the City Corporation's role in providing food vouchers to pupils in City

⁵ Based on latest available school census data (2019).

sponsored academies over holiday periods and approving the implementation of funding as a Local Authority.

11. Should Members endorse a role for the City Corporation in providing food vouchers for pupils in City sponsored academies, Members should consider the funding options outlined in Paragraph 12.

Options

12. Members should consider the following options for the role of the City Corporation in providing food vouchers for pupils in City sponsored academies:
- i. To leave the provision of food support to the discretion of the Local Authorities where the academies are based (Southwark, Hackney and Islington) in light of funding due to be distributed to Local Authorities from the Department for Work and Pensions' COVID Winter Grant and Holiday Activities and Food Programme;
 - ii. To provide financial support to low-income families of pupils in City sponsored academies at a value of £150,000 for food vouchers. This could be funded in one of the following two ways:
 - a) Allow academies to use their City Premium Grant funding to provide food vouchers for eligible pupils over the holiday periods at their discretion.
 - b) Recommend to Policy & Resources Committee to approve the release of £150,000 from the Policy Initiative Fund to resource the initiative.
13. The recommended course of action is to await further Government announcements on the COVID Winter Grant and Holiday Activities and Food Programme before clarifying the City Corporation's role in providing food vouchers to pupils in City sponsored academies over holiday periods.

Key Data

14. The calculations in this report for pupils in City sponsored academies are based on the latest school census data provided by the Department for Education (DfE) correct in 2019. *Table 1* below provides a summary of the number of pupils eligible for FSM in each sponsored academy, as well as the number of pupils Ever6 for reference.

Table 1

School	Number of pupils eligible for Free School Meals (FSM)	Number of pupils eligible for FSM any time in last 6 years (Ever 6)
City of London Primary Academy Islington	7	8
Galleywall Primary School	69	77
Redriff Primary School	72	140
City of London Academy Islington	348	514
The City Academy, Hackney	412	547
City of London Academy Southwark	389	751

City of London Academy Highbury Grove	315	633
City of London Academy Highgate Hill	127	266
City of London Academy Shoreditch Park	108	204
Total	1,847	3,140

Corporate & Strategic Implications

Strategic implications

15. The City Corporation has a different relationship with pupils in its sponsored academies than with resident children in the City of London. The City Corporation is an academy Sponsor in its Corporate capacity and not as a Local Authority. In this case, Members should consider the proposals in the strategic capacity as an academy Sponsor.

Financial implications

16. There are no provisions in the 2020/21 Education Board budget to fund a City package of support and therefore the initiative would require the approval of Policy & Resources Committee to release £150,000 from the Policy Initiatives Fund.

Resource implications

17. The purchase and distribution of food vouchers to families of pupils in City sponsored academies would require resource to administrate the activities. This could be quite significant if CoLAT or the academies decide to run a 'helpline' model such as that provided by the London Borough of Hackney where vouchers are distributed as they are requested.

Risk implications

18. The following risks should be considered:

- Risk of double funding if the Local Authorities in which the academies reside (Islington, Hackney and Southwark) deliver holiday meal schemes with the COVID Winter Grant and Holiday Activities and Food Programme.
- Risk that there will not be demand from families which will cause CoLAT and/or the academies to underspend on the grant from the City Corporation.
- Risk that the administration of the food voucher scheme will be costly to CoLAT and/or the academies.
- Risk that it creates a precedent and funding will be sought for holidays beyond the Easter holiday break requiring an ongoing commitment of funds.

Conclusion

This report asks Members of the Education Board and Policy & Resources Committee to consider the provision of food vouchers to families of pupils attending City of London sponsored academies who are eligible for free school meals (FSM) over school holiday periods.

Report author(s)

Professor Dr Anne Bamford

Strategic Director of Education and Skills
Department of Community and Children's Services

E: Anne.Bamford@cityoflondon.gov.uk

T: 07864948686

Daniel McGrady

Lead Policy Officer (Education, Culture and Skills)
Department of Community and Children's Services

E: Daniel.McGrady@cityoflondon.gov.uk

T: 07935208179

This page is intentionally left blank

Committees:	Date
Resource Allocation Sub Committee – for decision	20 November 2020
Policy and Resources - for decision	19 November 2020
Planning and Transportation Committee – For Decision	17 November 2020
Culture Heritage and Libraries Committee – For Information	23 November 2020
Port Health and Environmental Services Committee – For Decision	24 November 2020
Subject Review of Pilot and Future Bridge House Estates Funding for Enforcement Activity against Illegal Street Trading on and by the Bridges	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	1, 2, 12.
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	Yes
If so, how much?	£268k
What is the source of Funding?	BHE Unrestricted Income Fund
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	Yes
Report of Jon Averbs, Director of Markets and Consumer Protection	For decision
Report Author Rachel Pye, Markets and Consumer Protection Department	

Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide details of the review of the 2 year pilot of a new approach to enforcement against illegal street traders by the City Corporation as local authority on the five Thames bridges owned by Bridge House Estates (BHE) (charity registration number 1035628). These bridges (Tower, Southwark, Millennium, London, Blackfriars) link the City of London area (including Tower Bridge located in neighbouring London Borough of Tower Hamlets (LBTH)) to Southwark on the south-side of the river.

The report seeks approval -

- (a) to extend and maintain additional enforcement capability by the City Corporation as local authority to be directed against illegal street trading on and by the bridges and the public highways which cross them and to authorise the Comptroller and City Solicitor to complete any necessary agreement with Southwark in respect of enforcement by the City Corporation within Southwark's boundary; and

- (b) should it be considered to be in the best interests of Bridge House Estates and its beneficiaries, to those additional costs being met by the charity with a view to preserving and safeguarding the bridges (and those who use them) consistent with the City Corporation's duties and powers as charity trustee to expend the charity's funds on maintaining and supporting the bridges, including to meet reasonable and proportionate costs of policing them.

The enhanced funding bid seeks on-going funding for a two-year period for the existing Licensing Officer post which was funded during the pilot period, as well as for an additional temporary Licensing Officer post, both to be managed within the Markets and Consumer Protection Department alongside other local authority street-trading enforcement capability at a cost of £268k to be met by Bridge House Estates.

The posts are to be dedicated to carry out local authority enforcement activities on the bridges, particularly those bridges, parts of bridges and adjacent areas which are normally within the jurisdiction of neighbouring Local Authorities. A review of effectiveness will be carried out and reported annually; including to assess and establish any on-going justification for these costs continuing to be met by Bridge House Estates.

The neighbouring boroughs of Tower Hamlets and Southwark have now delegated authority to the City of London Corporation in its capacity as local authority for the City of London area to enforce against illegal street trading activity within their local authority boundaries, and arrangements are underway to increase the geographical area where this delegated authority might be exercised.

Recommendation(s)

Acting collectively for the City of London Corporation as trustee of Bridge House Estates (charity registration number 1035628), should it be considered to be in the best interests of the charity and the charity's beneficiaries -

A. Members of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee and the Policy and Resources Committee are asked to:

- Note the review of the effectiveness and outcomes of the two-year trial period of increased enforcement activity against illegal street trading on and around the five bridges owned, supported and maintained by Bridge House Estates.
- Agree to allocate £268k over two years from Bridge House Estates (subject to annual review) to meet the costs of enhanced local authority street trading enforcement capability on and around the bridges with a view to their support, safeguarding and preservation, and to the protection of the general public who use the bridges, subject to the approval of the Planning and Transportation Committee insofar as it has delegated responsibility for the City Corporation as trustee for "*all functions relating to the control, maintenance and repair of the five City river bridges*".

B. Members of the Planning and Transportation Committee are asked to: -

- Note the review of the effectiveness and outcomes of the two-year trial period of increased enforcement activity against illegal street trading on and around the five bridges owned, supported and maintained by Bridge House Estates.
- Agree to support enhanced local authority street trading enforcement capability on and around the bridges for a further two year period (subject to annual review) with a view to supporting, safeguarding and preserving the bridges and to the protection of the general public who use the bridges

C. The Port Health and Environmental Services Committee for the City Corporation as local authority, to agree: -

- that enhanced local authority street trading enforcement capability on and around Tower, Southwark, Millennium, London, Blackfriars Bridges should continue for a further two-year period (subject to annual review), subject to funding being agreed.
- Authorise the Comptroller and City Solicitor to complete any necessary agreement with Southwark in respect of the extended enforcement by the City Corporation in Southwark's area (the southern Millennium Bridge Approach)

Main Report

Background

1. Reports were presented to the Port Health and Environmental Services Committee (PHES) on 4 July and 21 November 2017 regarding the very long-standing issue of illegal street trading and the sale of peanuts from trollies mainly on and around the five bridges in or nearby the City of London area. The City Corporation, as well as being responsible for street trading enforcement as the local authority for the City of London, is also responsible as charity trustee of Bridge House Estates (charity registration number 1035628) (BHE) for the support and maintenance of the five bridges - Tower, Southwark, Millennium, London, Blackfriars.
2. Members and officers were concerned, both for the City Corporation as local authority and for the City Corporation as charity trustee of BHE, with the unacceptable risk that illegal traders on our bridges bring, as it is a security and safety concern to have mobile carts containing gas bottles and congestion on narrow pavements. There are also health issues as they attract pigeons and other vermin who deposit their droppings on the structure and pavement accelerating the deterioration and increasing the maintenance liability to the charity in maintaining the bridge structures, and to the City Corporation as street and highway authority (in its local authority capacity).
3. It was apparent that illegal traders are co-ordinated, opportunistic and swiftly adapt to patterns of enforcement necessitating evening and weekend operations as well as those undertaken in the normal working week.

4. City Corporation Officers until recently had no enforcement authority on the south side of Millennium and London Bridges and any part of Tower Bridge as they are outside of the City of London boundary, although the bridge structures are owned, funded and maintained by BHE. (Transport for London (TfL) is the highway authority for Tower Bridge, London Bridge and Blackfriars's Bridge. The City (north halves) and Southwark (south halves) are the highway authorities for Southwark Bridge and the Millennium Bridge. The lack of enforcement had reflected poorly on the image and reputation of the City of London.
5. PHES Committee resolved that several short- and longer-term actions should be proactively undertaken to manage and dissuade this type of activity: -
 - a. To adopt a targeted enforcement strategy for illegal traders within the City of London's boundaries.
 - b. To seek delegated authority from neighbouring Local Authorities to enforce within their boundaries on the bridges.
 - c. To seek appropriate funding to provide enhanced enforcement capability, specifically to appoint an enforcement officer to focus on the bridges and environs.
6. Illegal trading being carried out within the City of London boundaries was tackled successfully through enforcement by City Corporation local authority Licensing Team Officers and by stopping traders, seizing receptacles and by prosecutions. This all contributed towards the near elimination of illegal street trading within the City of London area.
7. To enable effective enforcement on the bridges, the Court of Common Council for the City Corporation as street trading enforcement authority resolved on 8 March 2018 to enter into delegation agreements with our neighbouring local authorities. Section 101 Agreements under the Local Government Act 1972 were negotiated and secured with the London Borough of Southwark on 23 May 2018, and the London Borough of Tower Hamlets (LBTH) on 2 April 2019, and relevant delegated powers of enforcement within those local authority areas passed to City Officers.
8. The City Corporation as trustee of BHE in meeting the charity's objects to maintain and support the five bridges, including to meet the reasonable costs of policing the bridges to this end, resolved in the best interests of the charity to help meet the costs of enhanced enforcement activity on and around the bridges. This funding was approved for the financial years 19/20 and 20/21.
9. A dedicated City Bridges Licensing Officer has been funded and in post since November 2018, commencing the pilot ahead of the BHE funding period to deal with the acute issues, and has been supported by existing resources in the Licensing Team to provide enforcement 7 days a week, including times of peak footfall (evenings and bank holidays). Where costs have not been met from BHE, they have been met from City Fund in the usual way for such enforcement activity.

10. A working group of Officers has been in place since 2017 to co-ordinate action across the three local authority areas of the City of London, Southwark and Tower Hamlets. Officers from these authorities are represented on the working group together with representatives from TfL and the City of London Police. The group shares intelligence and delivers co-ordinated operations across the bridges and environs.
11. This report therefore presents the evaluation of the outcomes of the 2-year enforcement pilot on the bridges and surrounds, and presents further options to be trialled for a further two-year period to deal with the ongoing issues of illegal trading.

Current Position

12. From November 2018 to September 2020 the five bridges and their immediate environs receive daily inspections for illegal street trading activity:. The Thames Path between Blackfriars and Tower Bridge including Peters Hill and Old Billingsgate are included, as are some City of London locations occasionally frequented by traders, such as St Pauls Cathedral and Water Lane. The inspection times are programmed to align with peak trading times and are flexible to respond to trader activities and times of peak visitor activity such as weekends, evenings, special events and Bank Holidays.
13. **Appendix 1** shows the resulting detail of illegal street trading enforcement activity for the same time period, there has also been significant interventions for other undesirable activity that although not within the scope of the initial project have been addressed.
14. In summary, 26 selling receptacles seized (19 peanut, 5 hotdog, 2 ice cream receptacles), 365 informal warnings given on occasions where Police were not available to assist with seizure, where officers were assisting security staff on private land or outside of the delegated areas. 18 offences have been prosecuted (details in **appendix 2**), a number of these prosecutions have been supported by CCTV evidence. Officers have also disrupted 325 illegal gambling operations, 235 pickpockets and 370 buskers.
15. Notably, on the day of the Fishmongers Hall terror attack, the City Corporation Bridge Licencing Officer was present near the scene as events unfolded and was the first to notify Tower Bridge Control who triggered their incident management plan for Monument and the bridge before any formal notifications were received.
16. Relationships with other partners have been strengthened with operations and intelligence flowing between the National Food Crime Agency, City of London Police, Metropolitan Police, Tower Bridge Security, Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs, Border Force, TfL Traffic Enforcement, Better Bankside, Tower of London, Potters Field Management Trust, Tate Modern, LBTH and London Borough of Southwark.
17. City Corporation officers took part in an operation on New Year's Eve run by the Metropolitan Police targeting illegal street traders in and around the event footprint which aimed to disperse crowds more quickly and reduce congestion on

one of London's busiest evenings. Officers targeted the bridges and successfully removed traders from Blackfriars Bridge and assisted with seizures and storage of receptacles from across central London.

18. As a result of the persistent enforcement activity, the areas now able to be enforced by City Corporation Officers remain relatively clear of traders with displacement now affecting the areas immediately outside of the area with which the section 101 delegations operate, i.e. Bankside, the Tower and Tower Hill tube station. Altercations have been noted between traders as they compete for the limited pitches now available. Joint operations with City and LBTH officers have been conducted over the times of peak footfall such as Bank Holiday weekends to target these new trading areas.
19. Feedback from Tower Bridge management team, DBE's cleansing team, City Police and visitors to the bridges has been extremely positive and all have been grateful that this long running issue has finally been tackled effectively.
20. The traders have however adapted to the increased enforcement by improving their own communications and organisation. For example, if a City Corporation officer is undertaking a seizure on Millennium Bridge, a trader will take the opportunity on Tower Bridge knowing they have some time to trade prior to the officer returning.
21. In addition, at peak seasonal times the area attracts other undesirable elements such as gamblers and pickpockets, intelligence gathered is reported to the Police who have also targeted operations on these individuals and gangs resulting in successful Police prosecutions.
22. Both the London Borough of Southwark and LBTH have licensed ice cream and hot dog stalls around Tower Bridge and Bankside but even with this provision in place, the illegal traders are undeterred.
23. The Covid-19 lockdown resulted in no illegal traders over the period of no footfall, but they returned in July 2020 once footfall began to gradually increase again. The options presented propose that the funding for the continuation of enhanced enforcement capability for a further two-year period will commence in April 2021, which will coincide with the recovery following the second wave of Covid-19 pandemic.
24. The spend on inspection and enforcement funded by BHE from April 2019 to the end of March 2021 is summarised as follows:

• Licensing Officer	£100k
• Additional resources for operations	£5k
• Equipment (Bodycams)	<u>£2k</u>
	£127k
25. During the initial pilot period, significant additional support has been provided from existing City Fund resources within the Department of Markets and Consumer Protection's Local Risk Budget, as the initial funding estimate for the

pilot underestimated the level of unsocial hours required, and the further support needed for conducting operations and providing 7 day and holiday cover.

26. Joint funding options have also been explored with the neighbouring Local Authorities but there is no scope for this option to be taken forward at the present time.
27. Having regard to other service demands of the City Corporation and the enforcement team, and as the enforcement area under the delegation arrangement with our neighbouring Local Authorities extends into their areas, on balance it is not considered appropriate to fund the enhanced enforcement provisions on and in the environs of the bridges from City Fund.

Options

28. There are three possible options available:

- a. Cease funding. If funding is not identified and enforcement activity by City Corporation officers reduces, evidence suggests the traders will immediately return to the bridges leading to the public safety and health risks identified above, and which will reflect poorly on the reputation of BHE as owners the bridges which are popular visitor destinations, or which otherwise provide a gateway for residents, workers and visitors into the City of London area.
- b. Extend the funding from BHE for a further 2 years from April 2021 and extend the contract of the existing enforcement officer at a cost of £134. This would not provide 7 day or holiday cover, support for operations or the ability to have 2 officers approach the bridges from each end and experience has shown that traders will simply move off and an element of illegal street trading is likely to continue on the bridges.
- c. Extend the funding from BHE for a further 2 years from April 2021, extend the contract of the existing enforcement officer and create a further temporary Licensing Officer post to maintain the current level of enforcement focused on the bridges and environs, including 7 days per week, unsocial hours and bank holidays at a cost of £268k. This level of enforcement capability, also having regard to the proposed extension of enforcement areas into our neighbouring Local Authority area in the Millennium Bridge Approach, is considered most likely to achieve the elimination of illegal street trading and other undesirable activity on and near the bridges.

Proposals

29. Having regard to the duties of the City Corporation as trustee of BHE to support and maintain the bridges - which may include meeting reasonable and proportionate costs of policing the bridges with a view to protecting, preserving and safeguarding the structures and the safety of those who use them - officers consider that it is in the best interests of the charity to meet the proposed costs as set out in Option C, at paragraph 28 above.

30. This proposal is considered to be the most proportionate in the circumstances, and there are clear benefits to the charity and the general public served by the charity to be gained through an elimination of illegal street trading from the bridges and areas within close vicinity of the bridges by enhancing the current capability through the appointment of an additional officer. This will provide an effective, single point of contact to work closely with neighbouring Local Authorities, City Corporation Departments (Open Spaces, DBE, Town Clerk's, etc), and associated agencies such as the National Food Crime Unit, Border Force, the MET Police and City of London Police to achieve longer-term control.
31. As the proposed expenditure is directly linked to policing of the bridges and their close environs funding for these costs of £268k over two years from April 2021 is therefore sought from BHE.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

32. This report incorporates the comments of both the Open Spaces Department which operates Tower Bridge, and DBE who consider and maintain the physical infrastructure of the bridges and insofar as relevant to our functions as a highway authority, the public highways and pedestrian areas which cross and adjoin the bridges.
33. This proposal will support two of the main aims of the City Corporation's Corporate Plan 2018 to 2023:
- 'contribute to a flourishing society' in ensuring people are and feel safe and,
 - 'shape outstanding environments' in that our spaces are secure, resilient and well maintained.
34. This proposal will support the key aim of the City's Visitor Strategy 2019 to 2023:
- To develop the City as a vibrant, attractive and welcoming destination for all, leveraging these attributes to showcase London as a world-leading place to visit and do business
35. A charity trustee has duties *inter alia* to meet its charitable objects for the public benefit, and to preserve charity property and take appropriate steps to safeguard those who have access to that property. A charity trustee should also have regard to the reputational implications for their charity associated with a failure to safeguard their charity, its property and its beneficiaries. In this case the proposed expenditure by BHE is in respect of enforcement on the bridges and areas within their close vicinity. It is considered by officers to be a proportionate means to safeguard the reputation of BHE and therefore to be in the charity's best interests. Prioritisation of this expenditure by BHE over other activities has been considered, with officers concluding that this does support the best interests of the charity noting that a further review period is to be built in.

Implications

36. The anticipated cost of the enhanced enforcement capability for the bridges and immediate environs is £134k per year. It is proposed that funding is provided for a further 2 years from April 2021, and reviewed annually. The short breakdown of anticipated costs is as follows: -

• Licensing Officers x 2	£67k
	£134k
Cost over 2-year extension of project	£268k

37. The anticipated costs for this activity would be funded from the unrestricted income funds of BHE. As these costs are deemed to be associated with the primary objective of the charity (maintenance and support of the bridges), these would be met prior to considering the surplus available for charitable giving. The inclusion of the immediate environs is in the interest of BHE and its primary objective. It will ensure the bridges and their immediate environs are kept clear of obstruction and illegal activity.

Conclusion

38. The 2-year pilot of a new approach to enforcing illegal street trading on the bridges and environs, extending into the Boroughs of Southwark and Tower Hamlets has proven to be immensely successful.

39. With the City of London being promoted as a visitor destination the bridges are obviously an attraction for tourists as well as being used by local communities. The presence of illegal traders detracts from the enjoyment and experience of using the bridges, particularly as the City recovers from the longer-term economic effects of the pandemic. It also adversely impacts upon the security and safety of the bridges and the general public.

40. Officers have historically been frustrated by the boundary issues preventing enforcement on the bridges which extend into neighbouring local authority areas, as well as by the lack of regular enforcement action from neighbouring Local Authorities. Therefore, the delegation of enforcement powers from those Authorities during the pilot period have been welcomed and we are seeking to extend the areas for enforcement under the section 101 Agreements with them.

41. Therefore, to effectively enforce on the bridges and environs, it is recommended that the existing capability under the 2-year pilot is extended and expanded upon for a further 2 years from April 2021.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Enforcement Activity November 2018 to September 2020

Appendix 2: Legal Proceedings outcomes

Background Papers

- Illegal Street Trading Report – PHES 4 July 2017
- Illegal Street Trading Report – PHES 21 November 2017
- Illegal Street Trading -Item 20(B) – Court of Common Council 8 March 2018
- Funding for Enforcement Officer for City Bridges May 2018
- Update on Street Trading Enforcement for the City's Bridges May 2019

Rachel Pye

Assistant Director of Environmental Health and Public Protection

Rachel.Pye@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Appendix 1 - Enforcement Activity November 2018 to September 2020

Enforcement activity November 2018 to September 2020	
Activity	Number
Informal warning	365
Seizure of peanut receptacles	19
Seizure of hotdog receptacles	5
Seizure and return of Ice Cream van	2
Informal Warning to Illegal Ice Cream seller	5
Prosecution (individual offences)	18
Number of individuals prosecuted	12
Prosecutions pending court dates	3
Illegal gambling operations disrupted	325
Number of occasions gambling matt and bowls seized	75
Number of ID of suspicious characters passed to COL Police	95
Warning given to cyclist on pavement at Tower Bridge and other bridges	65
Number of buskers asked to move or given warning	370
Pickpockets disrupted	235
Number of warning given to illegal trader on areas outside our ability to enforce	345
Number of times beggars moved on bridges	550
Number of times graffiti on Col bridges reported	16

Appendix 2 - Legal Proceedings outcomes

27 November 2019, Conditional discharge for 6 months; Contribution to prosecution costs of £85 whereas £1385 was sought. Victim surcharge of £20. Forfeiture and destruction of the peanut trolley

15 Jan 2020: £183 fine (One charge), £1,018.00 costs, £30 Victim Surcharge.

15 Jan 2020: £450 fine (Three counts at £150 on each count), £1345 costs, £30 Victim Surcharge

15 Jan 2020: £1050 fine (Three counts, £300, £350 and £400 respectively) £40 victim surcharge, £1192 prosecution costs.

10 February 2020; £220 fine (One count, Illegal Pancake selling) £32 Victim Surcharge, £436 Costs.

10 February 2020; £220 fine (One count, Illegal Ice Cream selling) £32 Victim Surcharge, £436 Costs.

29 February 2020: Defendant selling Hot dogs had his case adjourned for a further date as the summons was returned.

20 February 2020 Defendant Public Order offence case heard at Hendon Magistrate Court for opposing Licensing officer to seize the trolley.

18 March 2020, Illegal trading case (picture frames) postponed and awaiting further date.

15 May 2020, Proceedings against a minor for illegal trading dropped due to his age and protocol from Director of Public Prosecution.

1st September 2020, case of illegal trader withdrawn at Westminster Magistrate court as the defendant could not be traced.

Committees:	Date
Policy and Resources - for decision	19 November 2020
Subject Bridge House Estates: Policing the Bridges	Public
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	Yes
If so, how much?	£56,000
What is the source of Funding?	BHE Unrestricted Income Fund
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	Yes
Report of The Chamberlain	For decision
Report Author Karen Atkinson (Head of Charity & Social Investment Finance)	

Summary

This report addresses a request to the City Corporation as trustee of Bridge House Estates (BHE: registered charity no: 1035628) from the Police Authority Board (PAB) on behalf of the City of London Police (CoLP) for an increase in annual funding for CoLP from Bridge House Estates by £56,000 to £298,000 per annum. The request by the CoLP is within the criteria for funding by BHE.

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 to act in the best interest of BHE (see Appendix 1 for a summary of the principal duties and responsibilities of charity trustees).

The report advises that CoLP have satisfactorily demonstrated that the annual sum requested reflects the actual costs of policing the bridges. The report further advises that the expenditure is within the City Corporation's powers as sole trustee of BHE, and that the request be agreed subject to a review period of 5 years and the provision of a framework agreement to manage service expectations.

Recommendations

Acting for the City of London Corporation as trustee of Bridge House Estates (charity registration no: 1035628), should it be considered to be in the best interests of the charity and the charity's beneficiaries, Members of the Policy and Resources Committee are asked to:

- i. To approve an increase in funding by £56,000 to £298,000 per annum from BHE unrestricted income funds from 2020/21, subject to an annual increase in future years in line with pay awards and inflation to be confirmed in November of each year, ahead of the relevant financial year, to fund the cost of policing the City Bridges;

- ii. To agree that this sum and the services provided be subject to regular review, with a formal review after 5 years; and
- iii. To approve the production of a framework agreement between BHE and CoLP that sets out each of the services to be provided.

Main report

Background

1. At the meeting of the PAB on 3rd September 2020, it was recommended that Members approve an approach to BHE for increased funding to cover the actual cost of the service provided in policing the five City Bridges owned by the charity.
2. In 2017, RASC/P&R approved annual funding of £214,000 to cover the cost of the above policing services. Since this date, it has been recognised that previous estimates understated the actual total costs of officers. An increase in employer pension contributions had also not been factored into the costs requested. The amounts recharged to BHE exceeded the approved amount in financial years 2017/18 - 2019/20 as a result.
3. The request recommended by PAB addresses the funding gaps identified. Members should note that the request from PAB is effective for the current financial year (2020/21), with a subsequent increase in funding being requested from BHE of £56,000.

Current position

4. A recent Law Officer's Opinion 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 BHE, subject to the City Corporation as trustee being satisfied that such funding is in the best interests of the charity.
5. Following clarification within the Law Officer's Opinion, the then named Police Committee approached BHE in January 2017 for annual funding of £214,000 which was approved by P&R. Subsequent to this, the CoLP have recharged amounts in excess of the approved funding. Due to this, CoLP were requested by BHE to review the services being provided in relation to the five City Bridges and provide a revised request for funding.

Evaluation

6. 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 PAB and is satisfied that they represent reasonable expenditure. Members should note that a full review of traffic and parking enforcement across the City is currently in progress, and if there is any income due relating to this service, the recharge will be reduced accordingly.

7. 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 services appropriate to the bridges, including an adequate level of support to social services provision, can be maintained.
8. Members should note that a separate recharge is made by the CoLP to BHE for traffic and speed enforcement, currently set at £92,000 per annum. A separate review is underway by the CoLP covering all aspects of traffic and parking enforcement across the City.
9. To ensure that the services provided by the CoLP are in the best interests of the charity, it is proposed that a framework agreement is developed between BHE and CoLP that sets out the expectations for each for the services provided.

Corporate and Strategic Implications

10. Strategic implications: this proposal supports the aims and objectives of BHE's overarching strategy, Bridging London 2020 – 2045, which was approved by the Court of Common Council in October 2020. In particular, it will support the achievement of being a world-class bridge owner and responsible leader.
11. Security implications: this proposal seeks to provide funding for policing the bridges; thus aiming to mitigate any security issues on the bridges.
12. Financial implications: this proposal increases the draw upon the unrestricted income funds of BHE, so reducing the amount available for charitable funding via the City Bridge Trust. However, as confirmed in the Law Officer's Opinion, there is a BHE duty to fund the policing of three of the bridges, and the funding in respect of the other two is within BHE's primary purpose. Expenditure in meeting BHE duties and its primary purpose of maintenance and support of the bridges must take precedence over the allocation of surplus funds for the ancillary purpose for City Bridge Trust activities.
13. Resource implications: nil implications for BHE.
14. Legal implications: these are included in the report.
15. Risk implications: the City Bridges of BHE include iconic sites within London which require appropriate policing. CoLP have highlighted the risks associated with this in their report to PAB.

16. Equalities and resources implications: nil implications for BHE.

17. Climate implications: nil implications for BHE

Conclusion

18. It is open to BHE to provide annual funding of £298,000, subject to future increases to be agreed on an annual basis, to cover the costs of policing the five City Bridges. This revenue expenditure, funded from the unrestricted income fund of BHE, is recommended for approval.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Summary of the principal duties and responsibilities of charity trustees

Karen Atkinson

Head of Charity & Social Investment Finance

E: karen.atkinson@cityoflondon.gov.uk

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)

¹ In the event of the report requiring decisions of the City acting as trustee of BHE and decisions of the City acting in another capacity, each recommendation should make clear in which capacity it is being made. Non-BHE decisions should always be subject to the City as trustee of BHE first being satisfied (in recommendation 1) that the BHE decision is consistent with the proper exercise of the duties of a charity trustee.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s): Finance Committee Policy and Resources Committee Court of Common Council	Date(s): 5 November 2020 19 November 2020 Urgency
Subject: Update to the Code of Corporate Governance concerning delegation of write off limits and discretionary business rate relief.	Public
Report of: Chamberlain	For Decision
Report author: Phil Black – Head of Revenues	

Summary

As part of the response to the Covid-19 pandemic the Policy and Resources Committee agreed some amendments to the scheme of delegation to officers. These temporary measures expired on 31st October 2020.

This report requests that the revised levels of delegation for write offs and the delegation of decisions for discretionary business rate relief are continued until they can be updated within the Code of Corporate Governance.

The report also requests that the Head of Revenues is given delegated authority to determine and award the grants for the Government business rate grant schemes. These grants are being delivered to support businesses through the pandemic.

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- Approve the amendments to the following changes to the Scheme of Delegations to Officers:
- To increase the limits to write off all debts due to the City of London Corporation which are irrecoverable up to £100,000 (Head of Revenues) and up to £500,000 (Chamberlain) with any amount in excess of £500,000 to be submitted to Finance Committee for approval. Finance Committee to receive a report for information on any write-offs over £25,000.
- To authorise the granting of discretionary rate relief under section 47 and section 49 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 up to £25,000 per annum.
- To delegate authority to the Head of Revenues to determine and award all business grant payments under the government support schemes.

Main Report

Background

1. Current Standing Order no 52 delegated authority to write off debts which are irrecoverable up to £5,000 and to write off all non-domestic rates debts up to £5,000 and council tax debts up to £1,000.
2. Finance Committee agreed on 13th November 2018 to update the standing orders and delegate authority to write off all debt types to £20,000 to the Head of Revenues.
3. As part the City response to the Pandemic these limits were increased to £100,000 for the Head of Revenues and £500,000 for the Chamberlain. Debts over £500,000 still require approval by Finance Committee. These arrangements expired on 31st October 2020.
4. The limits of delegation were increased for the Head of Revenues from £5,000 to £25,000 for awards of discretionary rate relief made under section 47 and 49 of the LGFA 1988. This was also a temporary measure which expired on 31st October 2020.
5. Over the course of the pandemic the Head of Revenues has determined eligibility and awarded the business support grants of up to £25,000 per property. The request to delegate these decisions is included within this report to ensure the Head of Revenues has the correct authorisation to make these payments.

Current Position

6. The temporary write-off and discretionary relief measures expired on 31st October 2020 but the reasons for the increase continue with many businesses and individuals likely to suffer financially as a result of the pandemic.
7. It is expected that there will be an increase in both write off requests and discretionary rate relief requests. By increasing the delegation limits it will allow a more efficient and streamlined process.
8. A new grant scheme has been announced by Government which involves regular grant payments to businesses that have been forced to close by the pandemic. As these are new schemes there had been no previous requirement for delegation.

Proposals

9. It is proposed that the increase in the levels of authority to write off -debt and to award discretionary rate relief should be extended and then made permanent at the next review of the Code of Governance.
10. It is also proposed to delegate authority for the payment of business support grants to the Head of Revenues.

Conclusion

11. This report sets out a proposed extension to amendments to the Scheme of Delegation to streamline decision-making within the City of London Corporation with specific reference to Write Off levels and discretionary rate relief. It is also delegates authority to the Head of Revenues to determine eligibility and make award of the business support grants.

Appendices

- None

Background Papers

Temporary Amendments to Code of Corporate Governance in response to COVID-19/Coronavirus

Phil Black
Head of Revenues
Chamberlains Department

T: 020 7332 1348
E: phil.black@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee: Policy and Resources	Date: 19 November 2020
Subject: Policy and Resources Contingency/Discretionary Funds	Public
Report of: Chamberlain	For Information
Report author: Laura Tuckey	

Summary

This report provides the schedule of projects and activities which have received funding from the Policy Initiatives Fund (PIF), the Policy and Resources Committee's Contingency Fund, Committee's Project Reserve, COVID19 Contingency Fund and Brexit Contingency Fund for 2020/21 and future years with details of expenditure in 2020/21. The balances remaining for these Funds for 2020/21 and beyond are shown in the Table below.

Fund	2020/21 Balance Remaining after Approved Bids	2021/22 Balance Remaining after Approved Bids	2022/23 Balance Remaining after Approved Bids
	£	£	£
Policy Initiative Fund	597,082	1,043,365	1,240,000
Policy and Resources Contingency	407,719	300,000	300,000
Policy and Resources Project Reserve	405,000	0	0
COVID19 Contingency	420,000	0	0
Brexit Contingency Fund	639,860	0	0

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- Note the report and contents of the schedules.

Main Report

Background

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 current process for identifying which items should sit within the PIF are if they fall under the below criteria:

- 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.
3. To restrict the depletion of funds in future years, a two-year time limit is in place on multiyear PIF bids, with three years being an option by exception. To ensure prioritisation within the multiyear bids, the PIF from the financial year 2019/20 and onwards has £600k of its total budget put aside for multiyear bids with the rest set aside (£650k) for one off allocations, with the option to 'top up' the multiyear allocation from the balance if members agree to do so. This will ensure that there should always be enough in the PIF to fund emerging one-off opportunities as they come up.
 4. PIF bids need to include a measurable success/benefits criterion in the report so that the successful bids can then be reviewed to see what the outcomes are and if the works/activities meet the objectives of the PIF. These measures will be used to review PIF bids on a six-monthly basis. This review will aide members in evaluating the effectiveness/benefits of PIF bids supported works/activities which can be taken into consideration when approving similar works/activities in the future.
 5. When a PIF bid has been approved there should be a reasonable amount of progress/spend on the works/activities within 18 months of approval which allows for slippage and delays. If there has not been enough spend/activity within this timeframe, members will be asked to approve that the remaining allocation be returned to the Fund where it can be utilised for other works/activities. If the Department requires funding for the same works/activities again at a later date, it is suggested that they re-bid for the funding. If there is a legitimate reason, out of the Department's control, which has caused delays, it is recommended that these are reviewed by Committee as needed.
 6. The Committee Contingency Fund is used to fund unforeseen items of expenditure when no specific provision exists within the Policy Committee's budget such as hosting one-off events.
 7. The Committee's Project Reserve is a limited reserve which has been established from funds moved from the Projects Sub Committee Contingency Fund as approved in May 2019's Policy and Resources Committee. This reserve of £450,000 from the Project Sub Committee is not an annual Contingency but a one-off sum. It is suggested that this reserve is used for project type spend.
 8. The COVID19 Contingency Fund is a time limited fund established to meet any unforeseen items of expenditure due to the COVID19 virus such as; to enact contingency planning arrangements, support unforeseen expenditure required to support service community which cannot be met from local budgets and to support/implement guidance issued by the government where there is no other compensating source of funding. The Town Clerk and Chamberlain have delegated authority to approve bids to this fund that are under £250,000.

9. The Brexit Contingency Fund is a time limited fund established to meet any unforeseen items of expenditure due to the UK leaving the EU such as; communicating the interests of the City, helping mitigate the risks identified in the Corporate Risk Register or managing any urgent unforeseen issues arising from Brexit. The Town Clerk and Chamberlain have delegated authority to approve bids to this fund that are under £100,000.

Current Position

10. Appendices 1 to 3 list committed projects and activities approved by this Committee for the current and future financial years with the remaining balances available for the PIF (Appendix 1), your Committee's Contingency (Appendix 2), and the Policy & Resources Project Reserve (Appendix 3). Bids against the COVID19 Contingency Fund (Appendix 4) and the Brexit Contingency (Appendix 5) have either been approved by the Town Clerk and Chamberlain under delegated authority or by this Committee.
11. The balances that are currently available in the Policy Initiatives Fund, Committee Contingency Fund, Brexit Contingency Fund and Committee's Project Reserve for 2020/21 are shown in the Table below.

Fund	2020/21 Opening Balance	2020/21 Approved Bids	2020/21 Balance Remaining after 2020/21 Approved Bids	2020/21 Pending Bids	2020/21 Balance Remaining after 2020/21 Pending Bids
	£	£	£	£	£
Policy Initiative Fund	1,969,348	(1,372,266)	597,082	(100,000)	497,082
Policy and Resources Contingency	664,569	(256,850)	407,719	0	407,719
Policy and Resources Project Reserve	420,000	(15,000)	405,000	0	405,000
COVID19 Contingency	1,500,000	(1,080,000)	420,000	0	420,000
Brexit Contingency Fund	639,860	0	639,860	0	639,860

12. The remaining multiyear allocation is shown in the Table below with details, as shown in Appendix 1, prior to any allowances being made for any other proposals on today's agenda.

	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Balance remaining of Multiyear PIF allocation	£54,365	£393,365	£590,000

Corporate & Strategic Implications

13. Although each PIF application has to be judged on its merits, it can be assumed that they may be helping towards contributing to a flourishing society, supporting a thriving economy and shaping outstanding environments as per the corporate plan.
14. Each PIF application should be approved on a case by case basis and Departments should look to local budgets first before seeking PIF approval, with PIF requests only being submitted if there is no funding within local budgets available.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – PIF 2020/21 and Future Years
- Appendix 2 – P&R Contingency 2020/21 and Future Years
- Appendix 3 – P&R Project Reserve 2020/21
- Appendix 4 – COVID19 Contingency 2020/21
- Appendix 5 – Brexit Contingency 2020/21

Laura Tuckey

Senior Accountant, Chamberlains

T: 020 7332 1761

E: laura.tuckey@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Policy and Resources Committee - Policy Initiative Fund

Budget	2020/21		2021/22	2022/23
Initial budget	£ 1,250,000		£ 1,250,000	£ 1,250,000
Uncommitted balance brought forward from 2019/20	£ 437,248		£ -	£ -
unspent balances deferred from 2019/20	£ 239,631		£ -	£ -
unspent balances in 2019/20 returned to Fund	£ 42,469		£ -	£ -
Revised Budget	£ 1,969,348		£ 1,250,000	£ 1,250,000

Date	Name	2020/21 Bid	2020/21 Actual	2021/22 Bid	2022/23 Bid
07/07/16	London Councils Summit	£ 16,000	£ -		
16/11/17	Proposed Grant to retain the Centre for the Study of Financial Innovation	£ 6,635	£ -	£ 6,635	
22/02/18	Continued Sponsorship to support Innovate Finance	£ 250,000	£ 125,000		
15/03/18	Match Funding from The Honourable Irish Society to the National Citizenship Scheme	£ 11,000	£ -		
03/05/18	Saudi Arabia Vision 2030, Public Investment Fund and Financial Services	£ 27,487	£ -		
07/06/18	City of London Corporation - Engagement with Strategy World Economic Forum (WEF)	£ 77,899	£ 1,560		
07/06/18	Social Mobility: Sponsorship of the Social Mobility Employer Index	£ 15,573	£ -		
05/07/18	Events Partnership with The Strand Group, King's College London	£ 35,787	£ -		
17/01/19	Sponsorship of the CPS Margaret Thatcher Conference on Britain & America	£ 4,475	£ -		
17/01/19	Sponsorship of Children's Book with Guy Fox History Project Ltd	£ 2,885	£ -		
21/02/19	London and Partners: domestic promotion of London	£ 100,000	£ -	£ 100,000	
14/03/19	Think Tank Review and Memberships 2019-20	£ 8,025	£ 8,025		
04/07/19	Recognition of Women: a City Response	£ 23,000	£ -		
23/10/19	Renewal of CWEIC Strategic Partnership	£ 30,000	£ 10,000		
23/01/20	Sponsorship of New Local Govt Network 'Community Mobilisation' Project	£ 12,500	£ 12,500		
20/02/20	Future.Now - Application for Funding	£ 17,000	£ -		
20/02/20	Secretariat of Standing International Forum of Commercial Courts	£ 60,000	£ 60,000		
20/02/20	Tokyo 2020 Games	£ 40,000	£ -		
19/03/20	London Messaging Research	£ 40,000	£ -		
16/04 2020	Sponsorship of London 2050 Project	£ 21,500	£ 20,000		
16/04/20	Sheltered Employment Programme - Corporate Catering at the Guildhall Offices	£ 90,000	£ -	£ 90,000	
11/06/20	British Foreign Policy Group	£ 35,000	£ -		
Urgency	Supplementary City Premium Grant to Academies	£ 330,000	£ 330,000		
Urgency	Additional Innovate Finance	£ 100,000	£ -		
24/09/20	Commitment to UN Sustainable Development Goals	£ 10,000	£ -	£ 10,000	£ 10,000
Urgency	Report on UK Legal Services	£ 7,500	£ -	£ -	£ -
	Total Allocations	£ 1,372,266	£ 567,085	£ 206,635	£ 10,000
	Balance Remaining	£ 597,082		£ 1,043,365	£ 1,240,000

Bids for Committee's Approval: 19 November 2020

- Recovery Task Force: Placemaking for a world-leading Square Mile	£100,000	-	-
-	-	-	-
Total Balance if pending bids are approved	£ 497,082	£ 1,043,365	£ 1,240,000

	Multi Year PIF Bids	2020/21 Bid	2021/22 Bid	2022/23 Bid
	Multi Year PIF Allocation	£ 600,000	£ 600,000	£ 600,000
07/07/16	London Councils Summit	£ 16,000		
16/11/17	Proposed Grant to retain the Centre for the Study of Financial Innovation	£ 6,635	£ 6,635	
22/02/18	Sponsorship of the Wincott Foundation's 'Wincott Awards'	£ 4,000		
22/02/18	Continued Sponsorship to support Innovate Finance	£ 250,000		
15/03/18	Match Funding from The Honourable Irish Society to the National Citizenship Scheme	£ 11,000		
07/06/18	City of London Corporation - Engagement with Strategy World Economic Forum (WEF)	£ 38,000		
21/02/19	London and Partners: domestic promotion of London	£ 100,000	£ 100,000	
23/10/19	Renewal of CWEIC Strategic Partnership	£ 20,000		
16/04/20	Sheltered Employment Programme - Corporate Catering at Guildhall Offices	£ 90,000	£ 90,000	
24/09/20	Commitment to UN Sustainable Development Goalws	£ 10,000	£ 10,000	£ 10,000
	Multi Year PIF Allocation Balance	£ 54,365	£ 393,365	£ 590,000

Bids for Committee's Approval: 19 November 2020

-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-
Total Balance if pending bids are approved	£ 54,365	£ 393,365	£ 590,000

This page is intentionally left blank

Policy and Resources Committee - Contingency

Budget	2020/21		2021/22	2022/23
Initial Budget	£ 300,000		£ 300,000	£ 300,000
Uncommitted balance brought forward from 2019/20	£ 233,753		£ -	£ -
Unspent balances deferred from 2019/20	£ 129,850		£ -	£ -
Unspent balances in 2019/20 returned to Fund	£ 966		£ -	£ -
Revised Budget	£ 664,569		£ 300,000	£ 300,000

Date	Name	2020/21 Bid	2020/21 Actual	2021/22 Bid	2022/23 Bid
08/05/14	City of London Scholarship - Anglo-Irish Literature	£ 19,850	£ -		
17/11/16	Police Arboretum Memorial Fundraising Dinner	£ 30,000	£ -	£ -	
04/10/18	Beech Street Transformation Project	£ 55,000	£ -	£ -	
12/12/19	Administrative, consultancy and support fees associated with governance review activities	£ 25,000	£ 25,000.00	£ -	
20/02/20	Common Council Elections in March 2021 - funding a high-profile advertising campaign	£ 127,000	£ 355.00	£ -	
				£ -	
				£ -	
				£ -	
	Total Allocations	£ 256,850	£ 25,355.00	£ -	£ -
	Balance Remaining	£ 407,719		£ 300,000	£ 300,000

Bids for Committee's Approval: **19 November 2020**

- Census 2021	-	18,000	-
-	-	-	-
Total Balance if pending bids are approved	£ 407,719	£ 282,000	£ 300,000

This page is intentionally left blank

Policy and Resources Committee Project Reserve: 2020/21

Budget	2020/21
Initial Budget	£ 450,000
Less: Allocation spent in 2019/20	-£ 30,000
Revised Budget	£ 420,000

Date	Name	2020/21 Bid	2020/21 Actual
06/06/19	Housing Delivery Strategy - Request for funding to Appoint Advisors	£ 15,000	£ -
	Total Allocations	£ 15,000	£ -
	Balance Remaining	£ 405,000	

Bids for Committee's Approval: **19 November 2020**

-	-
-	-
Total Balance if pending bids are approved	£ 405,000

This page is intentionally left blank

Policy & Resources Committee - COVID Contingency 2020/21

Budget	2020/21
Initial Budget	£ 1,500,000
	£ -
Revised Budget	£ 1,500,000

Date	Name	2020/21 Bid
03/04/20	SMTA Rates Bill	£ 67,000
07/04/20	Provision of laptops	£ 45,000
21/04/20	COLPAI - CCTV	£ 41,000
17/04/20	Support the Mortality Management Group	£ 27,000
24/04/20	Direct Access Server Replacement + Additional Server	£ 37,000
06/05/20	PPE Purchasing	£ 4,000
11/05/20	CoLP IT Resilience	£ 263,000
28/05/20	Open Spaces PPE and HSE	£ 65,000
09/06/20	Using Public Transport and Social Distancing - Face Coverings	£ 25,000
24/06/20	CoL IT - Remote Working upgrades and expenses	£ 81,000
09/07/20	City of London Academies Trust Funding Request for Summer Provision 2020/21	£ 70,000
08/07/20	Everyone In - Rough sleeping response	£ 261,000
27/07/20	Brakespear Mortuary	£ 44,000
05/10/20	Public Health Communications Officer	£ 50,000
	Total Allocations	£ 1,080,000
	Balance Remaining	£ 420,000

Bids for Committee's Approval: **19 November 2020**

-	-
-	-
Total Balance if pending bids are approved	£ 420,000

This page is intentionally left blank

Policy and Resources Committee - Brexit Contingency 2020/21

Budget	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Initial Budget	£ 2,000,000.00	£ -	£ -
MHCLG Funding	£ 105,000.00	£ 210,000.00	£ 229,760.00
Unspent balance brought forward as agreed by Committee	£ -	£ 2,017,420.00	£ 410,100.00
Funding moved to create COVID Contingency	£ -	-£ 1,500,000.00	£ -
Revised Budget	£ 2,105,000.00	£ 727,420.00	£ 639,860.00

Date	Name	2018/19 Bid	2019/20 Bid	2020/21 Bid	Actuals to date
11/01/19	Brexit Engagement Action Plan	£ 20,000.00	£ 40,000.00	£ -	£ 57,200.00
05/02/19	No Deal Preparation - Adverts	£ 13,680.00	£ -		£ 13,680.00
07/02/19	Post Funding for Mitigation of Reputational Risk	£ -	£ 13,000.00	£ -	£ 12,560.00
08/03/19	Supply Chain category card analysis	£ 9,900.00	£ -	£ -	£ 9,900.00
27/03/19	Police costs as a result of protest activities	£ 44,000.00	£ -	£ -	£ 44,000.00
03/04/19	Guildhall School of Music & Drama Expanded Recruitment	£ -	£ 20,000.00	£ -	£ 19,624.00
23/09/19	Preparation comms	£ -	£ 14,560.00	£ -	£ 5,490.00
	Total Allocations	£ 87,580.00	£ 87,560.00	£ -	£ 162,454.00
	Balance Remaining	£ 2,017,420.00	£ 639,860.00	£ 639,860.00	

Bids for Committee's Approval: 19 November 2020

-
-

-
-

Total Balance if pending bids are approved

£ 639,860

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) 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 7 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) 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank